

KASDI MERBAH UNIVERSITY-OUARGLA
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of Letters and English Language



Dissertation:
ACADEMIC MASTER
Domain: Letters and Foreign Languages
Field: English Language and Literature and Civilization
Speciality: Applied Linguistics and English for Specific Purposes

Prepared by: Boumaza Abdelouahab

Title

Worlds in Words
Critical Discourse Analysis Approach to G.W. Bush's Speeches Before and
After 9/11: Pragmatic Perspectives

Publicly defended
On: 22 /05/2016

Before the jury:

Mr. BOURAHLA DjelloulPresident (KMU Ouargla)
Mrs. SAADOUNE Farida.....Supervisor (KMU Ouargla)
Miss. BAHRI FouziaExaminer (KMU Ouargla)

Academic Year: 2015/2016

Dedication

To the soul of the statesman, the scholar and the thinker who mastered
languages of the world and glorified his own

Mouloud Kacem Nait Belkacem

I also dedicate this work to my friends Abdul-Aziz, Mokdad, Maamor and the
miraculous Bachir whose commitment was inspiring for all students.

Finally, this effort is dedicated to my family for their patience all these years
taking from their valuable time and care. May Allah watch over you and
guide you to his right path.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, Praise to Allah the almighty for having bestowed his mercy on me.

My deepest thanks go to **Mrs. Farida SAADOUNE** for accepting supervising and guiding me in this subject and for providing the necessary advice and books that helped this work to achieve something. I wish for her all the best and ask Allah the Almighty to grant her the happiness and the success she deserves.

I also thank the members of the jury for honoring me with their remarks that aim to refine my work and give it the value that corresponds to our University's rank and place.

Finally, to all the teachers of the English department who spared no effort to give students the tools and the knowledge for mastering such needed Language great thanks and regards.

Abstract

From all kinds of conversations and speeches, political discourse might be the best structural genre that clarifies the use of language in social settings. This study critically analyses selected speeches of George W. Bush the 43rd president of the USA before and after 9/11/2001. It attempts to show how linguistic and psycholinguistic words (personal pronouns and metaphor) are pragmatically used in the process of shaping the world according to the speaker's ideology and the contextual environment. For this purpose, critical discourse analysis could be a relevant method to implement in such a case since it doesn't allow taking for granted every single statement. Thus the study adopted Fairclough's framework (1997) (as cited in Van Dijk, 2001 .p. 353) to analyse this discourse. Also, a top down processing of the speeches helps us to see every word in the light of the whole macrostructure theme. The study shows that G. Bush used these strategies in order to expose his ideological representation of some global concepts such as freedom to justify the US reactions after 9/11 attacks. Applied in EFL classroom, this study suggests that Students should be made familiar with critical analysis of political discourse as authentic instance of language use in context.

Key words: Political discourse, Pragmatics, Critical discourse analysis, Context

List of Abbreviations

PD : Political Discourse

US : United States

CDA : Critical Discourse Analysis

9/11: September, 11, 2001

Table of Contents

Dedication	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Abstract	iii
Liste of abbreviations	iii
Table of contents	iv

General Introduction

1. Research background.....	1
2. The significance of the study.....	1
3. The purpose of the study	2
4. Objectives of the study	2
5. The research questions	2
6. Methodology	3
7. Limitations of the study.....	3

Chapter One: Discourse Analysis

Introduction	4
1.1 Levels of discourse analysis	
1.1.1 Sound systems	4
1.1.2 Morphology	5
1.1.3 Syntax	5

1.1.4	Semantics	6
1.1.5	Pragmatics	7
1.2	Strategies of discourse analysis	10
1.2.1	Bottom up processing.....	10
1.2.2	Top down interpretation.....	10
1.2.3	Integrative method	11
Conclusion	12

Chapter Two: Political discourse

Introduction	13
2.1	Language and Politics	13
2.2	Ideology and discourse	15
2.3	Cognitive science and political discourse	17
2.4	Critical discourse analysis	19
Conclusion	20

Chapter Three: The Context and Data Analysis

Introduction	21
3.1	The context.....	21
3.1.1	The American context	21
3.1.2	The events of 9/11	22
3.2	Data Analysis	23
3.2.1	G W. Bush First Inaugural Address. January , 2001	24
3.2.2	G W. Bush, Second Inaugural Address 2005	26

3.2.3 Address to the Joint Session. February 27, 2001	29
3.2.4 State of the Union Address. January 29, 2002	32
Conclusion	34

General Conclusion

Conclusion	35
Recommandations.....	36
References	37

Appendices: speeches transcripts

Appendix A: Bush First Inaugural Address January, 2001	40
Appendix B: Bush, Second Inaugural Address January, 2005.....	46
Appendix C: Address to the Congress February, 2001.....	53
Appendix D: State of the Union Address January, 2002.....	68

ملخص الدراسة

General Introduction

1. Research Background

The last century was characterized by “the development of competing language teaching ideologies” (Richards and Rodgers, 2014.p.3) with many approaches based on different language descriptions or learning theories. These different lines of thought have provided the global library with billions of books, journals and thousands of conferences all around the world that studied diverse fields of life where language was involved. They went from school teaching to political rhetoric through family relation management and media advertisements. All, at least, share a common awareness of the fact that a simple preposition’s change in a text could have tragic costs on the whole business.

Learning or teaching English as a second or foreign language could not be done effectively only within the boundaries of its structure. Despite the importance of the latter in building the basics of any language, processing its study through many levels other than grammar is better to see the complete beautiful picture of the language. In human interactions and language use where words are very important to shape and reshape people’s relations, this idea is more relevant, needs more focus and will be an interesting applied linguistics area of research

2. Research Significance

Political discourse (henceforth PD)which will be the subject of this study has in addition to the linguistic features many other dimensions and fields of investigation that could be called upon in its investigation from social science to cognitive and political science. Working in collaboration these different grounds could help to resolve many applied problems that need multidisciplinary effort and partnership.

3. The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to show the important role of political discourse in teaching language in use. It will try to find out how linguistic and psycholinguistic tools are used in the production of a discourse that profiles the realities of the world. The aim is to explicitly illustrate the relation between language, society and power which may contribute to understand discourse in general and to promote its teaching.

4. Objectives of the Study

This study takes as subject the PD of the United States (henceforth US) President G.W. Bush before and after 9/11 attacks. This discourse shifted from adopting universal ideals and values before the attacks to a process of ownership and guardian of these values after. In analysing this discourse three main objectives are aimed at:

1. Emphasize the role and effect of the context on discourse and its interpretation.
2. Highlight the importance of the pragmatic level in teaching discourse analysis.
3. Illustrate the relation between language, society and power.

Students at the comprehension end of the process as will be suggested may benefit more if they are introduced and made familiar with critical analysis of this kind at early stages. This profit can go beyond the scholar carrier to entail their social future lives.

5. The Research Questions

The present study attempts to provide appropriate answer to the following questions:

1. How discourse could be understood in the light of a given context?
2. How political discourse could illustrates the relation between language and power?
3. Why emphasizing pragmatics in teaching discourse analysis?

6. Methodology

A qualitative comparative analysis of the US president speeches before and after 9/11 attacks will attempt to find out how personal and possessive pronouns on the one hand, metaphor and frames on the other hand are pragmatically used to reshape many human concepts like identity, citizenship, war and freedom according to the ideological background of the speaker and to the new context of conflict.

This study will adopt critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA) model to deal with such particular subject. It will then stand its own position and point of view about this topic. Fortunately for data collection, many of the speeches were video recorded. It will be helpful in addition to the transcripts to use these video data in order to have better analysis. These transcripts are available in many websites and should be verified in authentic official and academic ones.

7. Limitation of the Study

This is a multidisciplinary study that could be seen as richness but for some it will lack specification. It is like when a student of psychology undertake a research on psychosomatic diseases where nor doctors neither psychologist are happy with the results that will look for them as specialists someway vague. In our case, important information from sociology, political and cognitive sciences could be needed and important to explain in detail some concepts or terms but will be unfortunately out of the space limits and the focused scope of the study.

Chapter One

Discourse Analysis

Introduction

Language learners and especially discourse analysts are always aware of the importance of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics and how they combine in a deeper investigation of texts and discourses. This chapter gives an overview of these levels usually accounted for when dealing with discourse and which could provide separately a wide range of study subjects. The question is whether the bottom up processing or the top down interpretation is better or more appropriate in discourse analysis and in teaching a second or foreign language. It will be mentioned later some arguments given by supporters of both ways especially in teaching some skills.

1.1. Levels of Discourse Analysis

1.1.1. Sound Systems

Processing a piece of language using phonological features is the basic and logical way to do language analysis with the spoken mode. The branch that studies this system is called Phonology. It deals with “the range and function of sounds in specific languages..., and with the rules which can be written to show the types of phonetic relationships that relate and contrast words and other linguistic units.” (Crystal, 2008, p.365) This study will not focus on this level though it could be more relevant in some other pragmatic studies mainly concerned with the realization of the meaning through the sound system and Phonetics. In this case not only the phonological features of the speech will be important but also the body language as hand movements, face expressions and so on will be taken into account being expressed in the same time.

1.1.2. Morphology

Moving one step up to the next level, language analysis will process the written text. Morphology is a “cover term for inflection and word formation... In various ways word formation is treated as an independent discipline beside morphology or as a further sub discipline of morphology.” (Bussmann, 2006, p. 370) Again this level is not present in our study as such, but we will focus on the lexical choice made in discourse to send a message which could fit the writer’s intentions. An example is the expression ‘army of refugees’ that some press writers use and which “indicates not only that these refugees are numerous, but that they are dangerous, by signaling a negative attitude to them.”(Widdowson, 2007, p. 72) This example shows a cognitive strategy we will talk about later where lexical choices are used for other purposes than the word formation rules are prescribed in this level.

1.1.3. Syntax

For generations, grammar was an important tool in language teaching. Important parts of evaluation procedures rely on the mastery of its rules and the syntactic prior knowledge to assess the learner’s competences. That seems logic in the sense that grammar is the basic structure of the language system. Even with the revolutionary theories of language for communication, grammar still keeps a good place for many teachers worldwide.

By mastering grammar, a finite number of rules will facilitate an infinite number of sentences. In contrast, many native speakers of a language could have no formal knowledge of grammar and yet are still proficient in speaking an accurately grammatical language mostly acquired in the childhood.

Crystal (2008) distinguishes between grammar and syntax by defining the latter as “the study of the rules governing the way words are combined to form sentences in a

language.”(p. 471).The choice of grammatical combinations and structures is defined by the writer’s attitude towards a given situation. The active and passive voices are good examples that illustrate how the passive for instance could be a way “to withhold information about agency” (Widdowson, 2007, p. 74) as in: “one protestor was shot dead this morning”. Here the journalist could be ignoring the agent or simply ‘withholding information’ about him. Grammar then is one of the realizations of meaning that could be by itself a rich area for researchers in discourse analysis.

1.1.4. Semantics

Grammar was at the heart of Chomsky’s revolutionary ideas. His famous sentence “colorless green ideas sleep furiously” and the conclusion he supposed “that only a purely formal basis can provide a firm and productive foundation for the construction of grammatical theory” (Chomsky, 1957, p.100) led many linguists to condemn his theory of neglecting the role of meaning in language analysis. But Chomsky (ibid)suggests “that this purely formal investigation of the structure of language has certain interesting implications for semantic studies” (p.12). Semantics starts since then to take the importance in linguistic studies.

Semantics according to Crystal (2008) “examines the relations between linguistic expressions and the phenomena in the world to which they refer, and considers the conditions under which such expressions can be said to be true or false.” (p. 428).

The interpretation of meaning is then a complex process that needs more than the acknowledgement of the words uttered or written and their dictionary references, but also needs information about the context and the participants. A teacher for instance who utters “good job” to his student means that the he has done good at the exam. The student could have said nothing, but from the context it’s understood because the utterance came after

this exam. Knowing additional information of course, many other interpretations could be said to be true or false as using the same utterance for the sake of irony.

In this study the meaning of the word is not important by itself only if it reflects or expresses the meaning intended by the speaker and/or interpreted by the reader which leads us to the next level of language analysis.

1.1.5. Pragmatics

In all aspects of human life from the smooth mother- child daily interaction to the fierce political debate, the discourse analyst “is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for.”(Brown and Yule, 1988, p. 1) Thus the importance of language formulated by words combinations is not given by focusing on the structural features only but on what it aims to do with these words in real life. A two years old child for instance simply saying: “water” is given to drink and not asked to formulate an adequate question. His parents -as language- users have acquired what is known as ‘pragmatic competence’

Yule (1996) asserts that:

Pragmatics has more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterance than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves... The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people’s intended meaning, their assumptions, their purposes or goals and the kind of actions. (pp.3 - 4)

For discourse analyst this gives a good help in a deeper investigation of some specific discourses related to social interactions where many problems are raised and/or resolved using pragmatic tools and level of analysis

One of the focuses in pragmatics as stated by Crystal (2008) is “to make the contrast between what information the speaker presupposes or imposes as known and true and other information that are new for the listener;.” (p.384)

In pragmatic analysis then, new or old (given) information are important in discourse comprehension but most importantly for discourse production. The speaker may rely on presupposed given or taken for granted information to carry easily out his point of view. In contrast, selling new ideas needs more effort. For instance, the war in Afghanistan was easy to handle because 9/11 attacks were very known facts, but the case of Iraq was more difficult because the information about Saddam’s threat were new and not taken for granted by all Americans. (Giving this example itself presupposes that these information about wars are known facts because may be the case of Iraq was not that difficult)

This level enables discourse analyst to see carefully the interpersonal communication as “a communicative activity (a locutionary act), defined with reference to the intentions of speakers while speaking (the illocutionary force of their utterances) and the effects they achieve on listeners (the perlocutionary effect of their utterances).” (Crystal, 2008, p. 446)

In practice, this pragmatic level goes beyond the words uttered by the speaker/writer to their psychological force on the hearer/reader to entail their effects that could be nonlinguistic for example closing a door as a response to a friend’s uttering “it is cold!”

Pragmatics also arms us with the necessary tools for making the correct reference of the speaker’s words. Also called ‘deictic expressions’ which are used “to indicate people via person deixis (me, you) or location via special deixis (here, there) or time via temporal deixis (now, then)” (Yule, 1996, p.9). For instance, big part of our focus in this dissertation will be on the deictic function of the personal pronoun “we” and its importance in building

the relation between the speaker / writer with the hearer/ reader by using “we” exclusively or inclusively. (Petersoo, 2007, p.424)

Political discourse is one of the subjects of many pragmatic studies each tackled one of its countless corners. Bjorn Viberg (2015) reviewed “In the name of freedom” the public discourses of the United States president Obama and his predecessor Bush from a post-colonial perspective looking into two linguistic features: pronouns and ideologically contested words and made a qualitative and comparative study of their inaugural speeches. The result of the study shows that there are indeed some connections to a colonial or neocolonial way of thinking although it is not very clear what direct political consequences comes out of these.

The article entitled “*Obama and Bush: their victory and non-victory speeches*”(2015) and co-authored by Fernández, D.M and Trujillo González, V.C aimed to analyze the use of the first person plural, second person and third person references in Obama’s and Bush’s victory speeches. The contrasting circumstances surrounding the election of both presidents were imprinted on discourse through different patterns of personal references. The rhetoric of change is present in both of them, the promise of progress or the partisanship. Nevertheless, as has been argued in this paper, the function of participants and the responsibility of their actions in those issues differ.

This dissertation will try to build on these studies and others to investigate political discourse in order to benefit from the results in language learning in general and teaching in particular.

1.2. Strategies of Discourse Analysis

Knowing these levels is not enough to explain their importance in language processing. Many strategies some time conflicting are used in the field of teaching second and foreign language. Below is a brief word about each one and their relevance to this study.

1.2.1. Bottom up Processing

Mainly in teaching a second language for adults or a mother tongue for kids structures are introduced by scaffolding or as expressed by Leech (1983: 21–4) by postulating:

(1) rules governing the pronunciation of sounds; the ways that words are put together; the manner in which phrases, clauses, and sentences are structured; and, ultimately, the ways that meaning is created; (2) principles stipulating how the structures that rules create should be used (e.g. which forms will be polite in which contexts, which forms will not. (As cited in Meyer, 2009.p.6)

Progressing language this way is following the traditional method known as bottom up which is still used despite the advents of new approaches to second language teaching.

1.2.2. Top down Interpretation

The other way around has also its advocates who would argue that a top down processing is more helpful for discourse interpretation in certain cases and at certain levels in second language teaching classes. Among them, a model developed in a work carried out by the linguist Van Dijk and the psychologist W. Kintch. They assumed (1983) at the end of the first chapter that:

This chapter has sketched the interdisciplinary backgrounds as well as the major assumptions of the model and its limitations. It outlined the various components of a

strategic approach to discourse processing. It shows the role of beliefs, opinions, and attitudes; the nature and the role of stylistic, rhetorical, conversational, and interactional strategies; and, in general, the embedding of the model into a broader model of strategic verbal interaction in the social context. (p.19)

This model then will provide a solution to the theoretical gap between linguistics and social science and open multidisciplinary new area in the future of social studies that could have important and fruitful problem solving results.

1.2.3. Integrative Method

Carrel (1988) diagnosed the problems of reading in second language learners with ‘overreliance’ on one mode and neglect of others stating that:

Some second language readers are not efficient interactive text processors, either because they attempt to process in a totally bottom-up fashion, and may be effortful decoders at that, or because they attempt to process in a totally top-down fashion and are hence subject to schema failures or schema interference. (p.239)

All these three types of text processing are important and have their applications according to the student’s level, the skill being taught, and of course the teacher’s choice. In this study the top down method was chosen just to emphasize the importance of prior knowledge about the context and the participants in understanding the overall meaning of the discourse. Every single structure, word or sound will then be interpreted in the light of this knowledge. In addition, the subject of the study and the presupposed practical implications of its results are intended to target students at an intermediate level where the bottom up processing will seem overhead or at least less relevant.

Conclusion

This chapter aimed to overview the role played by each level of analysis in understanding and producing discourse. The analysis undertaken in this study will focus on the whole meaning as intended by the writer and/or Interpreted by the reader. In the socio political context this idea is important since the relation's aim between the participants is that one party want to influence the other to accept and adopt his point of view and ultimately to think or act in prescribed way by the author.

Taking into consideration all what have been presented, the next chapters will start discovering political discourse to show the role and the importance of critical discourse analysis model in understanding and eventually exposing the use and abuse of language in social interactions. Some suggestions about ways to benefit from the results in second and foreign language classroom settings will be provided at the end of the study.

Chapter Two

Political Discourse

Introduction

This chapter deserves some focus in the sense that it states explicitly the relation between social power and PD with language studies in general and language teaching in particular.

Some teachers may believe as many ordinary people do that politics is about a number of lies delivered in order to reach or maintain power or may consider as Orwell (1969: 225) suggests, for example, that “political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible.”(As cited in Wilson, 2001, p.400) Instead, it could be seen as an instance of language use by which power is exercised on daily basis. What is true though is that the selection of material that fit every level is a worth noting hard task that needs big effort to accomplish.

2.1. Language and Politics

In this field, Norman Fairclough one of the famous leaders has written a book with the same title “language and power” where he mentioned that the ‘underestimation’ and unconsciousness about the importance that language plays in the exercise of power is what motivates him to write the book and it is this same purpose that stimulates undertaking this study because we believe as Fairclough (1989) did that “consciousness is the first step towards emancipation.” (p.1)

The approach adopted by the author (ibid) emphasized “the common-sense assumptions which are implicit in the conventions according to which people interact linguistically, and of which people are generally not consciously aware.” (p.2)

An example was given about the conventions of a traditional type of consultation between doctors and patients in which the 'commonsense' assumptions that the doctor's better knowledge about how a health problem should be dealt with gives him the natural right to control the course of the consultation.

The same thing could be said about the relation between teacher and students, parents and child and other social cases where these assumptions are worked out in a way or in another. In the same line of thought Van Dijk (2001) Notes that “power is not always exercised in obviously abusive acts of dominant group members, but may be enacted in the myriad of taken-for-granted actions of everyday life (p. 355)

For this reason Fairclough (1989) wants “to link this gap between the level of consciousness which the contemporary position of language demands, and the level it actually attracts.” (p.3). A practical example from the book itself was given by the writer:

I have sometimes used the pronoun 'we' inclusively, to refer to the reader and myself. But as I suggest in Chapter 5, this use of 'we' can be manipulative... I hope that readers will not feel similarly dragooned into partnership: obviously, some readers will not see themselves as partners in critical discourse analysis, but in view of the practical objectives of the book, I have found it easier to write as if they did. (p.15)

The struggle for power then as exemplified above is discursive and political speeches are good instances of this struggle where the use and choice of words could make the difference that leads some to power and others home.

2.2. Ideology and Discourse

Fairclough (1989) asserted that “The exercise of power, in modern society, is increasingly achieved through ideology, and more particularly through the ideological workings of language.” (p.3)

The relevance of ideology to discourse analysis is motivated by the idea that people generally understand and produce ideologies by the use of text in daily oral interactions. The study of this relation is in fact multidisciplinary and involves linguistics, sociology and psychology.

Ideologies are defined by Van Dijk (2006) “as foundational beliefs that underlie the shared social representations of specific kinds of social groups. These representations are in turn the basis of discourse and other social practices.” (p.120) This statement gives more proof to the importance of our study assuming that language use in political context is not neutral. It reflects more or less the beliefs shared within a community of people who will take them for granted. As producer, a politician may build his discourse on this shared feature of ideology to go forward when talking to the same group.

For instance, it is a shared belief in western community in general that Terrorism has religious origin. It became also shared that it's about Islam more precisely. How these beliefs are built and become shared is another subject that sociologists have more to say about, but on this idea it is easy to produce within the western community a discourse that aims to justify any action against a Muslim nation as we will see in our chosen data.

This shared knowledge is present in all variables according to Van Dijk (ibid) “Intonation, pronouns, nominalizations, topic choice ... among a host of other discourse

structures may thus strategically 'index' the ideology of the speaker or writer. At each of these levels we may find codification of underlying ideologies" (p.123)

The codification of ideology through discourse is made possible with the use of some discursive strategies and structures. It is claimed for instance as Wilson (2001) said "that leading politicians and political supporters may make adjustments within their phonological systems for political effect. (p.410)

Also, the pronoun ' we' as we will see in later chapters deictically denotes the group to which the speaker belongs within "a general strategy of positive self-presentation (boasting) and negative other-presentation (derogation)." (Van Dijk, 2006.p.126)

There is no doubt, then, as Van Dijk (ibid) mentions that: "in an important political speech of a president or presidential candidate, practically, each word is chosen as a function of its ideological and communicative presuppositions and implications."(p.128)

The trick, however, following Wilson's (2001) advice "is not to lose linguistic rigor for the sake of sociopolitical claims, but equally not to simply continue producing language-based analyses which do not fully consider why, in social and political terms, specific linguistic choices have been made."(p. 411)

Likewise, in certain specific contexts, some speakers may of course have the ability to conceal their ideological opinions or may not have them at all. Discourse analysis procedures do not in all cases help to decipher speaker's or writers' ideological beliefs. In this study then, it is bear in mind as Van Dijk (2006) warned that "as such, words, phrases, topics or intonations are not ideologically biased. It is their specific use in specific communicative situations that make them so."(p.128)

In the same line Fairclough (1989) notices that “neither the dependence of discourse on background assumptions, nor the ideological properties of these assumptions which link them to social struggles and relations of power are generally obvious to discourse participants (p.141)

For this reason this dissertation suggests the top down analysis procedure adopting what Fairclough, N and Fairclough, I. (2012) addressed to critical discourse analysts “the claim that analysis of texts should focus upon the generic features of whole texts rather than isolated features of the text. (p.1)

2.3. Cognitive Science and Political Discourse

As for ideology cognitive science contributed with many concepts that are important to understand contemporary political discourse. Frames and metaphors are two good examples that will be briefly introduced here since they will appear in our analysis of the speeches in the last chapter.

Frames as defined by George Lakoff (2004) are:

Mental structures that shape the way we see the world. As a result, they shape the goals we seek, the plans we make, the way we act, and what counts as a good or bad outcome of our actions. We also know frames through language. All words are defined relative to conceptual frames. When you hear a word, its frame (or collection of frames) is activated in your brain (p. Xv)

All words are then activators of mental structures built with the time in the brain. The word hospital for instance is a frame that activates many structures as of white dressed people giving health services for some or doing heartless job for others. It also activates the structure of blood and injuries and so on. The word America is also a frame that

activates mental structures of power, opportunities for some but of arrogant and self-interested empire for others.

Fillmore (1977c) illustrated with an example the difference in meaning between the following sentences where the same word 'land' is used:

(1) I spent three hours on land this afternoon.

(2) I spent three hours on the ground this afternoon.

He argues that the background for the first sentence is a sea voyage while the second sentence refers to an interruption of an air travel.”(As cited in Hamm, F. 2015)

Frame assemblies could also be extra linguistics. Laughing for example doesn't fit the frame of an accident or a funeral where people are usually sad, silent and may be wearing special clothing. At the opposite keeping silent and sad doesn't fit the wedding ceremony where the frame of happiness and enthusiasm are activated.

Another important cognitive concept is that of metaphor. It is defined as a process of understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another. Thus a conceptual metaphor such as “Theories Are Buildings”, as described by George Lakoff (b. 1941) and Mark Johnson (b. 1949), has physical objects as source and abstract mental entities as target, and gives rise to an open set of linguistic metaphors, such as your theories lack foundation and He needs to construct a stronger argument. (Crystal, D.2008.p.98)

This metaphor as explained by Lakoff (1991) “can kill”. He brought the example of the war in the gulf, When secretary of state Baker sees Saddam Hussein as ‘sitting on our economic lifeline’ ...or having a ‘stranglehold’ on our economy as expressed by Bush. The use of such metaphors justified wars that killed many people.

Cognitive concepts, then, frequently used in PD show the contribution of psychology that should be limited in benefits of linguistics. For instance, in his thesis “Framing America” Jan van den Berg (2014) investigates the conceptual metaphors use of four former United States presidents in representing their worldviews. A review of the researchers regarding this topic shows that Democrats and Republicans although applying different cognitive models to structure their worldviews shared American exceptionalism.

2.4. Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA is “a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context.” (Van Dijk, 2001 .p. 352)

It is then a multidisciplinary approach aiming to fill the gap between linguistic and social studies. Critical analysts in addition to their role of linguistic studies, play a social role focusing on social and political issues. They will investigate as explained above how discourse structures are set up to reproduce social dominance.

The main tenets of CDA are summarized by Fairclough and Wodak (1997) and cited in Van Dijk, 2001 .p. 353. We give a general explanation of some of them here:

CDA is mainly concerned with the use of language and other means in setting social inequality and dominance of a group over others. In the same society, the relation between people especially that of power is traditionally transmitted and maintained by discourse

In different society however, people differ according to their discursive culture transmitted from generation to generation. This historical codification of ideologies could only be revealed by close examination of the text associated with context background analysis which investigates the normal continuity within a society of historical traditions.

The link between text and society then is not neutral or ‘value free’. The relation for instance between the isolated word “freedom” and “freedom” in a specific society is not the same. It needs some effort to decipher all the meanings decoded in the language.

CDA then is not a normal kind of analysis. It is rather a form of social action. The work undertaken by critical discourse analyst “is not just an academic exercise of analysis but as a campaign against what is seen to be a stealthy undercover operation by those in power to control opinion to their own advantage” (Widdowson, 2007 .p.71)

This control according to Van Dijk (2001) is a first major form of power. He stated that “controlling people’s minds is the other fundamental way to reproduce dominance and hegemony.” (p. 357) He explained in the same article that minds could be controlled “because of speakers’ credibility or institutional obligations as in education. People also could have no alternatives or because their discursive competences are not enough to analyze this kind of control.”(p.358)

With these characteristics, CDA seems the best model to follow in dealing with PD. This study aims to emphasize its role in order to suggest some applied recommendations related to enhancing student’s discourse analysis competences.

Conclusion

Political discourse, as explained in this chapter, is analyzed to expose how language is related to power using tools from linguistics, cognitive science and sociology. The latter is the most important since “language use is a matter of constructing and construing texts by keying them into contexts so as to realize discourse meaning.” (Widdowson, 2007, p.71) In the next chapter the contextual feature is tackled in order to help “keying” the chosen speeches into their context of production.

Chapter Three

The Context and Data Analysis

Introduction

The Bounds between discourse and context are very strong. What is said by X to Y in a given place at a given time in a given social, economic or political environment would be interpreted in a total different way if only one variable changes. The participants, the place, the time or the environment had always an impact on the discourse production and comprehension.

In our case the same speaker (the 43rd American president) gave different political speeches on different occasions. This study attempts to interpret them in the light of the new context of conflict and wars that follow 9/11 attacks. We, thus, have to give an overview of this context in order to help understand and decipher some of the concepts and ideas expressed in the speeches.

3.1 The Context

3.1.1 The American Context

The United States of America became after the Second World War one of the most powerful states in the world along with the former Soviet Union.

Whether conservators or liberals, it is shared and believed in the US foreign policy that in order “to preserve peace and stability in the world, and sometimes to achieve it, America has had no choice but to build powerful and far-reaching armed forces. In achieving these aims, the rest of the free world benefited as well.”(Tracy, 2004.p.195) This belief is rooted

in the idea that the great American Revolution values give it the right to lead the cause of peace in the world.

However, the relations of the US with the Middle East were of particular kind. Before 9/11 these relations were not based on American values, but on American best and high interests which was and still an economic value by itself. Tracy (2004) explicitly states that “as long as the oil continued to flow from the oil fields along the Persian Gulf, the problems in that area were not considered to be the business of America.” (p. 196)

3.1.2 The Events of 9/ 11

The final report of the national commission on terrorist attacks was delivered in the late 2004. This report of 585 pages explicitly talked about “19 young Arabs acting at the behest of islamists extremists headquartered in distant Afghanistan “(p.2).The country was then ruled by the Taliban regime accused to be close ally of Al-Qaida leader Usama Bin Laden. By 2001, this latter according to the report (ibid) developed: “a sophisticated network of highly trained leaders, intelligence and financial abilities to act against the US interests.” (p.3)

US security system was at a high level of awareness about an important threat but as the report stated “none of the measures adopted by the US government from 1998 to 2001 disturbed or even delayed the progress of Al Qaeda plot. Across the government, there were failures of imaginations, policy, capabilities and management”. (p.9)The report of course went on giving further details about these failures.

Three years before this report was released, the president G. Bush sent American troops into Afghanistan. These troops according to Bush (2002) “destroyed Afghanistan’s terrorist training camps, saved a people from starvation, and freed a country from brutal

oppression.”(See transcript. p.57.) In few months, Taliban Regime was unsettled but Bin Laden managed to escape until President Obama declared his killing many years later. Bush also invaded Iraq in 2003 “to rid the world of a murderous dictator who controlled unlimited billions of dollars, and who was prepared to provide arms, money and resources to terrorists who would strike America and Americans anywhere. (Tracy, 2004, p.198)

This second war was only triggered by 9/11 attacks. A long process started many years ago aiming to investigate Iraq’s possession of mass destruction arms by the United Nation and the International Agency of Nuclear Power. 9/11 attacks gave bush a good reason to anticipate any investigation results from these institutions and invade Iraq claiming that Saddam ‘was prepared to provide terrorists with these arms’.

Ideologically, this war in Iraq and many other wars that preceded and may follow are rooted in the rightwing politics (Bush’s Republican Party)as explained by Lakoff (2004) who connected it with the strict father family model that James Dobson used to teach republicans with in order to raise their kids. This model assumes “that the world is a dangerous place, and it always will be, because there is evil out there in the world,”(p.6) which paves the way for setting an eternal enemy for an eternal war.

3.2 Data Analysis

Using this context, we selected four speeches from tens delivered during the eight years of Bush’s presidency. For comparative reasons we selected two speeches that were delivered before and after the attacks. Having serving two terms, Bush gave two inauguration speeches on January 2001, and on January 2005. Likewise, this study selects two states of the union addresses: One on February 2001 and the other on January 2002 four months after the attacks. This may help us to see the influence of the new context on the linguistic choices of the speaker in different genres of political discourse.

3.2.1 First Inaugural Address, January, 2001

Delivered in a relative global peace this moderately short speech has a general theme of glorifying American ideals, constitution and history. It suggests for Americans and appeals them “to live out our nation's promise through civility, courage, compassion and character.” (See appendix, p.42) The speech went on calling all citizens of the United States to act and react upon these ideals.

In the light of this general theme Bush uses most of the third personal pronoun “we” inclusively. He criticizes the actual state of political dispute “*And sometimes our differences run so deep, it seems we share a continent, but not a country.*” (ibid.p.41). The president then intends to involve Americans in a process of rebuilding a new spirit of citizenship away from any political tendency: “*We are bound by ideals that move us beyond our backgrounds, lift us above our interests and teach us what it means to be citizens.*”(ibid.p.41)

Even when he mentioned some technical tasks of governments, Bush continues to use “we” that embrace normal citizens as in “*If we permit our economy to drift and decline, the vulnerable will suffer most.*” (ibid.p.42) or in “*Together, we will reclaim America's schools... We will reform Social Security and Medicare...*” (ibid.p.42)

To some extent, this seems normal for a new elected president who didn't yet start a real executive team work, but sometimes it is confusing as in this example: “*And I can pledge our nation to a goal: When we see that wounded traveler on the road to Jericho, we will not pass to the other side.*” (ibid.p.44) Here for instance how could he as president guarantee this pledge for hundreds of potential wounded travellers? The “we” seems more referring to social act or value than to a governmental one.

Metaphor is present with the personification when as stated by Lakoff (1991)

A state is conceptualized as a person engaging in social relations within a world community. It lives in neighbourhood and has neighbors and friends and enemies. States are seen as having. Inherent dispositions, they can be peaceful or aggressive, responsible or irresponsible, industrious or lazy. (p.1)

Many examples could be quoted from the speech:

“America has never been united by blood or birth or soil” ((See appendix, p.41)

“America, at its best, matches a commitment to principle with a concern for civility”
(*ibid.p.42*)

“America, at its best, is also courageous” (*ibid.p.42*)

“America, at its best, is compassionate” (*ibid.p.43*)

using this strategy Bush don't have to explain to whom all his “we-s” are referring to since this metaphor has played its illocutionary effect of releasing a well-founded nationalism and exceptionalism in the American personality.

To sum up, in this context of peace, the domestic issues were emphasized and George Bush was using the deictic function of the personal pronoun “we” in calling himself and his s fellow citizens to rely on American ideals “an ideal we carry but do not own,” (*ibid .p.38*) to start his first term in the white house.

3.2.2 Second Inauguration Speech January, 2005

In a clear contrast with the first inauguration address, the second term speech of G. Bush was delivered in a totally different environment of conflict. Following the event of 9/11, a war was declared and conducted in Afghanistan on 2001 and later in Iraq on 2003. Both countries were accused for the harm to the US citizens and economy caused by the attacks.

Away from any political or judiciary investigations of this claim which is out of the scope of this study, Language was used to motivate American reactions after the attacks. The general theme of this speech was a prophecy for the US to lead the task of ending tyranny in the world: “*Advancing these ideals is the mission that created our Nation*”. (See appendix, .p.47) but the objective is to leave in local peace “*to protect this nation and its people against further attacks and emerging threats*”. (ibid.p.47)

After the rituals of the speech openings, Bush qualified the situation in which Americans lived before the attacks as: “*years of relative quiet, years of repose, years of sabbatical—and then there came a day of fire.*” (ibid.p.46)

This last sentence is a metaphor used here in a negative sense of harm and danger. The same metaphor is used later in a positive way of enlightenment: “*By our efforts, we have lit a fire as well ...and one day this untamed fire of freedom will reach the darkest corners of our world.*” (ibid.p.49)

In both cases metaphor was used to give different senses about war according to the speaker’s point of view. 9/11 attacks (the bad fire) murdered thousands of innocent American people, but the two declared wars (the good fire) murdered –and still-tens of thousands innocent Afghani and Iraqi people. This “collateral damage” was motivated in

the 2002 action drama where a firefighter goes in search of the responsible after his family was killed by a terrorist act. This damage is also divinely motivated since it aims to liberate man and women “*because they bear the image of the Maker of Heaven and earth*”. (See appendix, p.47)

In this speech Bush uses sometimes “we” that refers to Americans as in the beginning:

“We celebrate the durable wisdom of our Constitution,” (ibid.p.46)

“We have seen our vulnerability—and we have seen its deepest source” (ibid.p.46)

But most of the time he used “we” to refer to himself and his government:

“We will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation” (ibid.p.48)

“America's influence is considerable, and we will use it confidently in freedom's cause.” (ibid.p.47)

In other times, Bush used the personified America or United States in the place of “we” that refers to the government claiming himself the right to give orders to other nations and leaders:

Today, America speaks anew to the peoples of the world. All who live in tyranny and hopelessness can know: the United States will not ignore your oppression, or excuse your oppressors. When you stand for your liberty, we will stand with you. Democratic reformers facing repression, prison, or exile can know: America sees you for who you are: the future leaders of your free country. (ibid.p.48)

When Bush went back to address domestic issues, he sometimes used “we” referring to the government as in:

“We will bring the highest standards to our schools, and build an ownership” (ibid.p.50)

Some other times “we” was used to include American citizens: *“We felt the unity and fellowship of our nation when freedom came under attack” (See Appendix, p.51)*

Here he uses a metaphor (freedom under attack) to refer to 9/11 attacks. This use aims to give the picture of a war led in the name of a freedom as mankind value, but unfortunately the “we” that refers and includes mankind for whom all this war was claimed to be conducted for is not used in this speech.

To conclude the second inauguration speech was mainly aiming to address the whole world after the invasion of Iraq. The intended illocutionary effect was that American influence can reach any nation where freedom is undermined. This feeling expressed with a strong exclusive “we” along with metaphorical expressions is present all over the speech. In contrast the first inauguration address as mentioned above was that of noble ideas using an inclusive “we” that aims to have a totally opposite effect. Of course many other elements could be accounted for but we restrain ourselves to this aspect in respect to our methodology.

3.2.3 Address to the Joint Session of the Congress February, 2001

This speech shared with the first inauguration address given a month earlier the context of the pre 9/11 events but differs in two main things .It is firstly not oriented to the public but to the elite congressmen and women aiming mainly to convince them to adopt the new budget plan. Secondly, and unlike the general political subject of the inauguration speech, it tackles economic issues such as the tax cuts. We will go no further in this topic simply because it's far out of the limits and the scope of this study. We will however mention the importance of economy and especially taxation in the history and politics of the United States that make relevance to the linguistic focus of our study.

The revolutionary war for instance was declared (1775–1783) by thirteen states for many reasons among which were the taxes imposed by the British parliament on the new colonies. As stated by Cullen(2003) “Most of us walk around with some sense of the grievances that sparked the conflict-taxes on tea, something about stamps-but the list is hard to keep straight because it is essentially trivial. To be sure, taxation remains a hot button in American life.” (p. 37)

Taxation continued to be at the core of American political campaign before and after the presidencies. For Bush, the general theme of this speech as first state of the union was then that Americans are and should feel safe because his budget is too generous “*We have funded our priorities. We paid down all the available debt. We have prepared for contingencies. And we still have money left over.*” (See appendix. p.59) This speech delivered few weeks after the inauguration of the new republican president aims to convince both parties but especially democrats to support his new budget plan.

For this purpose, Bush used the personal pronoun “we” in a way to include them on his side. He summed: “*A budget's impact is counted in dollars, but measured in lives.*

Excellent schools, quality health care, a secure retirement, a cleaner environment, a stronger defense — these are all important needs, and we fund them.” (See appendix, .p.54)

The pronoun “we” here could mean the government which is republican but the president wants it to be understood as referring to the American congress. For this he added “*education is my top priority and, by supporting this budget, you’ll make it yours, as well.*” (ibid.p.54) *In another place he stated: “my budget is to keep the vital promises of Medicare and Social Security, and together we will do so”* (ibid.p.56)

But when it comes to numbers and facts the pronoun “we” is replaced by the first personal pronoun “I” or “my”. Many examples could be quoted:

“My budget dedicates \$238 billion to Medicare next year alone” (ibid.p.56)

“I’m requesting \$5.7 billion in increased military pay and benefits” (ibid.p.57)

“My budget sets aside almost a trillion dollars over 10 years for additional needs” (ibid.p.60)

It means that as a president it is my duty and responsibility to propose spending this amount because it is a common sense right and we as American’s leaders should support what is right regardless of our political tendencies. Bush explicitly conveyed this faith saying:

I hope America is noticing the difference, because we’re making progress. Together, we are changing the tone in the Nation’s Capital. And this spirit of respect and cooperation is vital, because, in the end, we will be judged not only by what we say or how we say it, we will be judged by what we’re able to accomplish. (ibid.p.53)

Sometime however, Bush used “we” referring to himself as in the statement about racism: *“I asked John Ashcroft, the Attorney General, to develop specific recommendations to end racial profiling. It’s wrong and we will end it in America.”* (See appendix, p.59) This “wandering we”(Petersoo: 2007,p . 428) from referring sometimes to Bush and others to his government then to the congress doesn’t last for long time because the president always go back to use it inclusively in order to gain more support to his plan. For this purpose, He may went to replace the frequently used “my budget” with “our budget” as in *“Our budget provides more than \$700 million over the next 10 years for a federal compassion capital fund, with a focused and noble mission”* (ibid.p.58)

To conclude, this speech was about the president budget plan that needed large support from republicans but most importantly democrats who should feel -after their presidential campaign defeat- incorporated in the same plan. For this reason Bush’s first state of the union was linguistically unifying by the good use of what Petersoo (2007) called the “inclusive we” (p 426).

3.2.4 State of the Union Address January, 2002

This is another state of the union which as we've seen in that of 2001 is delivered to the congress seeking usually to support a budget plan. The difference is that this speech came four months after 9/11 attacks and its theme turns around a frame phrased by Bush with the statement: "*As we gather tonight, our nation is at war.*" (See appendix. p.68)

Frames as we explained in previous chapter are "mental structures that shape the way we see the world. As a result, they shape the goals we seek, the plans we make, the way we act, and what counts as a good or bad outcome of our actions." (Lakoff, 2004, p. Xv) The mental structures of the war are: too much fear, death threat, security and army that should be trusted because they control information and actions. Here, however, it's not a traditional war. It is rather something conducted as stated in different place of the speech in Afghanistan, Philippine, Bosnia, Somalia and somehow against Hamas, Hezbollah, Jaish-i-Mohammed, Iraq, Iran and even North Korea. There is simply no unanimous enemy in a defined place like traditional wars, yet the frame is used to benefit from its effects in sending the message.

In that message the speaker presupposes that the audience will not immediately investigate its credibility until the mission is finished. But this mission as Bush stated "*is well begun, but it is only begun. This campaign may not be finished on our watch.*" (ibid.p.72) By this he guarantee that the frame continues for long time to has its strong effect on his addressees. They have been told that what happened on 9/11 was just a step in a big plan that targeted "*American nuclear power plants and public water facilities and many American cities*" (ibid.p.69) which maps where found in the terrorist camps of Afghanistan.

The word “regime” is another frame used to draw a mental picture about the governments of Iraq, Iran and North Korea describing them as “axe of evil.”(See appendix, p.71) Bush believes that they “*attempt to blackmail the United States*” (ibid.p.71) because “*they could provide these arms (weapons of mass destruction) to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred.*” (ibid.p.71)

Now, whatever we may know or think about these governments, a normal citizen or even a congress member put in such context and feeling of war could do nothing but believe this description of dangerous “regimes”. This feeling overwhelmed the whole speech supported by scary information fitting the frame and given without verifiable proofs by the supreme authority in this war.

With this picture in mind the personal pronoun “we” mostly used in the speech will be referring to Bush and his government who will assume the responsibility to secure Americans from a real threat. Examples: “*we are winning the war on terror.*” (ibid.p.68) “*Whatever it costs to defend our country, we will pay.*” (ibid.p.73), or “*We’ll increase funding to help states and communities, train and equip our heroic police and firefighters.*” (ibid.p.73)

Only in few instances that this pronoun refers to the American citizens as in: “*We were reminded that we are citizens, with obligations to each other, to our country, and to history. We began to think less of the goods we can accumulate, and more about the good we can do.*” (ibid.p.77)

Also Bush used only once “our budget” in the place of “my budget” when mentioning a deficit : “*our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short-term, so long as Congress restrains spending and acts in a fiscally responsible manner.*” (ibid.p.74)

Within the frame of war, unlike the inclusive “we” used in the previous state of the union, the pronoun “we” though referring to the government will not prevent the congress to accept the president’s version and to adopt “his budget” that *“includes the largest increase in defense spending in two decades — because while the price of freedom and security is high, it is never too high.”* (See appendix, p.73)

Metaphor is also used in this speech to complete the picture of a country that is not at war only as a reaction but of a country that have a mission expressed by this statement: *“History has called America and our allies to action, and it is both our responsibility and our privilege to fight freedom’s fight.”* (ibid.p.72) This is an double metaphor (history call and freedom’s fight) used to express that all what have been done in Afghanistan and will be done in other places will be assigned by human history and for human freedom.

Summary of the results

The study analyzed some selected speeches delivered in different contexts. The linguistic choice of words was meticulously done with a specific social purpose. As a president G. Bush needed more power than the one given by elections. The relation between a president and his fellow citizens and parliament which enables him to exercise his constitutional duty needed a discourse where the personal pronoun was used with particular care helped with some psycholinguistic structures and strategies.

The results showed that the personal pronoun “we” was used inclusively or exclusively according to the context of discourse production, the audience and the discourse subjects. In addition, frames and metaphor were helped sending not only the intended locutionary message but also its aimed illocutionary force of living the frame’s feelings and the perlocutionary effect of supporting the budget plan after the state of the union and reelecting a president of war after the first term on 2005

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

The results of this study show that discourse in general and political discourse in particular is never neutral as the words and structures used mean by themselves. It is rather a ‘manipulation’ of these words to fit the ideological background of the discourse producer. Cognitive science working with linguistics provided us with good strategies of discourse comprehension and interpretation in order to decode this manipulation. This multidisciplinary way to deal with discourse is new era after the traditional models that were limited to the structural boundaries of language, and that despite their countless achievements still not enough to answer all the questions about language

Political discourse then according to the results of the study is a perfect illustration of this pragmatic use of language. The meaning of words should be interpreted according to the producer’s background and intentions connected with the context of the discourse production. A top down processing of this discourse helped to see every single word in the light of the macrostructure of the whole discourse.

In addition, CDA is not neutral as well. This model is not only an academic inquiry but also a kind of social activity that aims to study the discursive relation of power and dominance within a society maintained through the pragmatic use and abuse of language.

Recommendations

The results are important if they are to be applied in the foreign and second language teaching class. Students can profit more if they are made familiar with critical analysis of political discourse. It will increase their awareness of the pragmatic aspect of language and improve their critical proficiencies in doing discourse analysis.

Developing critical and meaning negotiating competences is then a good objective to set for second language teaching. This could be reached by:

- a) Training graduate students in critical analysis of political discourse: assignments and home works could be used to assess students' achievements. Other activities could be a role play that engages some students to write letters for supporting a cause and others to analyse these letters and criticize them.
- b) Giving more focus on pragmatics in the teaching syllabus: Pragmatics could be taught for its own sake not as a part of discourse analysis. Linguistic Laboratories could also be involved in launching projects that engage many postgraduate students of applied linguistics in a social problem solving career instead of focusing only on pure academic researches.
- c) Initiating further studies to design the courses and to choose materials needed for each level of language learning and learners. This decidedly refined task is left to the course designers and scientific institutions at high academic levels of proficiency and experience.
- d) Following the course of multidisciplinary studies, other researches in the fields of sociology, cognitive and political science could be undertaken to benefit from this linguistic investigation and to build on its results to complete the picture of PD using their specialised theories and methods

Thus, all levels of language practitioner and language related fields will be engaged in a process of giving language its significant place. This became more serious in a society that with technology tends to undermine the decisive role of our words in shaping our world.

References

Books

- Brown, G., and Yule, G. (1988). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Bussmann, H. (2006). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. London: Routledge
- Carrell, PL., Devine, J., and Eskey, DE. (1988). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. Paris: Mouton publishers, The Hague
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: BLACKWELL
- Cullen, J. (2003) *American dream: A shorth history of an idea that shaped a nation*. Oxford : Oxford University Press
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman
- Jorgensen, M and Phillips, L. (2002) *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications
- Lakoff, G. (1991). *Metaphor and war: The Metaphor system used to justify war in the gulf*. . Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23609916>
- Lakoff, G. (1993). *The Contemporary theory of metaphor. Metaphor and thought* (2nd edition), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant!* , Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing

Meyer, C.F. (2009). *Introducing English linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Petersoo, P. (2007) what does 'we' mean? National deixis in the media. "*Journal of Language and Politics*" volume 6 (3), 419-39

Richards, J.C., and Rodgers, T.S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. 3rd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Tracy, B. (2004). *Something for nothing*. Las Vegas: Eagle House

Van Dijk, T and Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press

Van Dijk, T. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. *The Handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd

Van Dijk, T. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis: *Journal of Political Ideologies*. 11(2), 115-140

Widdowson, H.G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford : Oxford University Press

Wilson, J. (2001). Political discourse. *The Handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Websites

Fairclough, N., & Fairclough, I. (2012). *Analysis and evaluation of argumentation in critical discourse analysis: Deliberation and the dialectic of enlightenment*. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/3775784/>

Freidel, F., and Sidey, H. (2006). *The Presidents of the United States of America.*”

Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/1600/presidents/georgewbush>

Hamm, F. (2016). *Frame semantics.* Retrieved from: [http://www.uni-](http://www.uni-stuttgart.de/linguistik/sfb732/files/hamm_framesemantics.pdf)

[stuttgart.de/linguistik/sfb732/files/hamm_framesemantics.pdf](http://www.uni-stuttgart.de/linguistik/sfb732/files/hamm_framesemantics.pdf)

Martinez, D.F., and Trujillo Gonzalez, V.C. (2015). *Obama and Bush: their victory and*

non-victory speeches. Retrieved from

<http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1345/134524361010.pdf>

The final report of the national commission on terrorist attacks upon the United States.

Executive summary. (2016). retrieved from [http://www.9-](http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report_Exec.pdf)

[11commission.gov/report/911Report_Exec.pdf](http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report_Exec.pdf)

Van den Berg, J. (2015). *Framing America.* Retrieved from

<https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/32761>

Viberg, B. (2015). *In the Name of freedom.* Retrieved from

https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/26216/1/gupea_2077_26216_1.pdf

Appendices

The transcripts are retrieved and selected from: http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf accessed May, 11, 2015

A. George W. Bush First Inaugural Address January, 2001

Chief justice Frankfurter. President Carter President Bush, President Clinton, distinguished guests and my fellow citizens, the peaceful transfer of authority is rare in history, yet common in our country. With a simple oath, we affirm old traditions and make new beginnings.

As I begin, I thank President Clinton for his service to our nation.

And I thank Vice President Gore for a contest conducted with spirit and ended with grace.

I am honored and humbled to stand here, where so many of America's leaders have come before me, and so many will follow.

We have a place, all of us, in a long story—a story we continue, but whose end we will not see. It is the story of a new world that became a friend and liberator of the old, a story of a slave-holding society that became a servant of freedom, the story of a power that went into the world to protect but not possess, to defend but not to conquer.

It is the American story—a story of flawed and fallible people, united across the generations by grand and enduring ideals.

The grandest of these ideals is an unfolding American promise that everyone belongs, that everyone deserves a chance, that no insignificant person was ever born.

Americans are called to enact this promise in our lives and in our laws. And though our nation has sometimes halted, and sometimes delayed, we must follow no other course.

Through much of the last century, America's faith in freedom and democracy was a rock in a raging sea. Now it is a seed upon the wind, taking root in many nations.

Our democratic faith is more than the creed of our country, it is the inborn hope of our humanity, an ideal we carry but do not own, a trust we bear and pass along. And even after nearly 225 years, we have a long way yet to travel.

While many of our citizens prosper, others doubt the promise, even the justice, of our own country. The ambitions of some Americans are limited by failing schools and hidden prejudice and the circumstances of their birth. And sometimes our differences run so deep, it seems we share a continent, but not a country.

We do not accept this, and we will not allow it. Our unity, our union, is the serious work of leaders and citizens in every generation. And this is my solemn pledge: I will work to build a single nation of justice and opportunity.

I know this is in our reach because we are guided by a power larger than ourselves who creates us equal in His image.

And we are confident in principles that unite and lead us onward.

America has never been united by blood or birth or soil. We are bound by ideals that move us beyond our backgrounds, lift us above our interests and teach us what it means to be citizens. Every child must be taught these principles. Every citizen must uphold them. And every immigrant, by embracing these ideals, makes our country more, not less, American.

Today, we affirm a new commitment to live out our nation's promise through civility, courage, compassion and character.

America, at its best, matches a commitment to principle with a concern for civility. A civil society demands from each of us good will and respect, fair dealing and forgiveness.

Some seem to believe that our politics can afford to be petty because, in a time of peace, the stakes of our debates appear small.

But the stakes for America are never small. *If our country does not lead the cause of freedom, it will not be led.* If we do not turn the hearts of children toward knowledge and character, we will lose their gifts and undermine their idealism. If we permit our economy to drift and decline, the vulnerable will suffer most.

We must live up to the calling we share. Civility is not a tactic or a sentiment. It is the determined choice of trust over cynicism, of community over chaos. And this commitment, if we keep it, is a way to shared accomplishment.

America, at its best, is also courageous.

Our national courage has been clear in times of depression and war, when defending common dangers defined our common good. Now we must choose if the example of our fathers and mothers will inspire us or condemn us. We must show courage in a time of blessing by confronting problems instead of passing them on to future generations.

Together, we will reclaim America's schools, before ignorance and apathy claim more young lives.

We will reform Social Security and Medicare, sparing our children from struggles we have the power to prevent. And we will reduce taxes, to recover the momentum of our economy and reward the effort and enterprise of working Americans.

We will build our defenses beyond challenge, lest weakness invite challenge.

We will confront weapons of mass destruction, so that a new century is spared new horrors.

The enemies of liberty and our country should make no mistake: America remains engaged in the world by history and by choice, shaping a balance of power that favors freedom. We will defend our allies and our interests. We will show purpose without arrogance. We will meet aggression and bad faith with resolve and strength. And to all nations, we will speak for the values that gave our nation birth.

America, *at its best*, is compassionate. In the quiet of American conscience, we know that *deep, persistent poverty* is unworthy of our nation's promise.

And whatever our views of its cause, we can agree that children at risk are not at fault. Abandonment and abuse are not acts of God, they are failures of love.

And the proliferation of prisons, however necessary, is no substitute for hope and order in our souls.

Where there is suffering, there is duty. Americans in need are not strangers; they are citizens, not problems, but priorities. And all of us are diminished when any are hopeless.

Government has great responsibilities for public safety and public health, for civil rights and common schools. Yet compassion is the work of a nation, not just a government.

And some needs and hurts are so deep they will only respond to a mentor's touch or a pastor's prayer. Church and charity, synagogue and mosque lend our communities their humanity, and they will have an honored place in our plans and in our laws.

Many in our country do not know the pain of poverty, but we can listen to those who do.

And I can pledge our nation to a goal: When we see that wounded traveler on the road to Jericho, we will not pass to the other side.

America, at its best, is a place where personal responsibility is valued and expected.

Encouraging responsibility is not a search for scapegoats; it is a call to conscience. And though it requires sacrifice, it brings a deeper fulfillment. We find the fullness of life not only in options, but in commitments. And we find that children and community are the commitments that set us free.

Our public interest depends on private character, on civic duty and family bonds and basic fairness, on uncounted, unhonored acts of decency which give direction to our freedom.

Sometimes in life we are called to do great things. But as a saint of our times has said, every day we are called to do small things with great love. The most important tasks of a democracy are done by everyone.

I will live and lead by these principles: to advance my convictions with *civility*, to pursue the public interest with *courage*, to speak for greater justice and *compassion*, to call for *responsibility* and try to live it as well.

In all these ways, I will bring the values of our history to the care of our times.

What you do is as important as anything government does. I ask you to seek a common good beyond your comfort; to defend needed reforms against easy attacks; to serve your

nation, beginning with your neighbor. I ask you to be citizens: citizens, not spectators; citizens, not subjects; responsible citizens, building communities of service and a nation of character.

Americans are generous and strong and decent, not because we believe in ourselves, but because we hold beliefs beyond ourselves. When this spirit of citizenship is missing, no government program can replace it. When this spirit is present, no wrong can stand against it.

After the Declaration of Independence was signed, Virginia statesman John Page wrote to Thomas Jefferson: "We know the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong. Do you not think an angel rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm?"

Much time has passed since Jefferson arrived for his inauguration. The years and changes accumulate. But the themes of this day he would know: our nation's grand story of courage and its simple dream of dignity.

We are not this story's author, who fills time and eternity with his purpose. Yet his purpose is achieved in our duty, and our duty is fulfilled in service to one another.

Never tiring, never yielding, never finishing, we renew that purpose today, to make our country more just and generous, to affirm the dignity of our lives and every life.

This work continues. This story goes on. And an angel still rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm.

God bless you all, and God bless America.

B. George W. Bush, Second Inaugural Address January, 2005

Vice President Cheney, Mr. Chief Justice, President Carter, President Bush, President Clinton, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, fellow citizens:

On this day, prescribed by law and marked by ceremony, we celebrate the durable wisdom of our Constitution, and recall the deep commitments that unite our country. I am grateful for the honor of this hour, mindful of the consequential times in which we live, and determined to fulfill the oath that I have sworn and you have witnessed.

At this second gathering, our duties are defined not by the words I use, but by the history we have seen together. For a half century, America defended our own freedom by standing watch on distant borders. After the shipwreck of communism came years of relative quiet, years of repose, years of sabbatical—and then there came a day of fire.

We have seen our vulnerability—and we have seen its deepest source. For as long as whole regions of the world simmer in resentment and tyranny—prone to ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder—violence will gather, and multiply in destructive power, and cross the most defended borders, and raise a mortal threat. There is only one force of history that can break the reign of hatred and resentment, and expose the pretensions of tyrants, and reward the hopes of the decent and tolerant, and that is the force of human freedom.

We are led, by events and common sense, to one conclusion: The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.

America's vital interests and our deepest beliefs are now one. From the day of our Founding, we have proclaimed that every man and woman on this earth has rights, and

dignity, and matchless value, because they bear the image of the Maker of Heaven and earth. Across the generations we have proclaimed the imperative of self-government, because no one is fit to be a master, and no one deserves to be a slave. Advancing these ideals is the mission that created our Nation. It is the honorable achievement of our fathers. Now it is the urgent requirement of our nation's security, and the calling of our time.

So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.

This is not primarily the task of arms, though we will defend ourselves and our friends by force of arms when necessary. Freedom, by its nature, must be chosen, and defended by citizens, and sustained by the rule of law and the protection of minorities. And when the soul of a nation finally speaks, the institutions that arise may reflect customs and traditions very different from our own. America will not impose our own style of government on the unwilling. Our goal instead is to help others find their own voice, attain their own freedom, and make their own way.

The great objective of ending tyranny is the concentrated work of generations. The difficulty of the task is no excuse for avoiding it. America's influence is not unlimited, but fortunately for the oppressed, America's influence is considerable, and we will use it confidently in freedom's cause.

My most solemn duty is to protect this nation and its people against further attacks and emerging threats. Some have unwisely chosen to test America's resolve, and have found it firm.

We will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation: The moral choice between oppression, which is always wrong, and freedom, which is eternally right. America will not pretend that jailed dissidents prefer their chains, or that women welcome humiliation and servitude, or that any human being aspires to live at the mercy of bullies.

We will encourage reform in other governments by making clear that success in our relations will require the decent treatment of their own people. America's belief in human dignity will guide our policies, yet rights must be more than the grudging concessions of dictators; they are secured by free dissent and the participation of the governed. In the long run, there is no justice without freedom, and there can be no human rights without human liberty.

Some, I know, have questioned the global appeal of liberty—though this time in history, four decades defined by the swiftest advance of freedom ever seen, is an odd time for doubt. Americans, of all people, should never be surprised by the power of our ideals. Eventually, the call of freedom comes to every mind and every soul. We do not accept the existence of permanent tyranny because we do not accept the possibility of permanent slavery. Liberty will come to those who love it.

Today, America speaks anew to the peoples of the world:

All who live in tyranny and hopelessness can know: the United States will not ignore your oppression, or excuse your oppressors. When you stand for your liberty, we will stand with you.

Democratic reformers facing repression, prison, or exile can know: America sees you for who you are: the future leaders of your free country.

The rulers of outlaw regimes can know that we still believe as Abraham Lincoln did: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it."

The leaders of governments with long habits of control need to know: To serve your people you must learn to trust them. Start on this journey of progress and justice, and America will walk at your side.

And all the allies of the United States can know: we honor your friendship, we rely on your counsel, and we depend on your help. Division among free nations is a primary goal of freedom's enemies. The concerted effort of free nations to promote democracy is a prelude to our enemies' defeat.

Today, I also speak anew to my fellow citizens:

From all of you, I have asked patience in the hard task of securing America, which you have granted in good measure. Our country has accepted obligations that are difficult to fulfill, and would be dishonorable to abandon. Yet because we have acted in the great liberating tradition of this nation, tens of millions have achieved their freedom. And as hope kindles hope, millions more will find it. By our efforts, we have lit a fire as well—a fire in the minds of men. It warms those who feel its power, it burns those who fight its progress, and one day this untamed fire of freedom will reach the darkest corners of our world.

A few Americans have accepted the hardest duties in this cause—in the quiet work of intelligence and diplomacy...the idealistic work of helping raise up free governments...the dangerous and necessary work of fighting our enemies. Some have

shown their devotion to our country in deaths that honored their whole lives—and we will always honor their names and their sacrifice.

All Americans have witnessed this idealism, and some for the first time. I ask our youngest citizens to believe the evidence of your eyes. You have seen duty and allegiance in the determined faces of our soldiers. You have seen that life is fragile, and evil is real, and courage triumphs. Make the choice to serve in a cause larger than your wants, larger than yourself—and in your days you will add not just to the wealth of our country, but to its character.

America has need of idealism and courage, because we have essential work at home—the unfinished work of American freedom. In a world moving toward liberty, we are determined to show the meaning and promise of liberty.

In America's ideal of freedom, citizens find the dignity and security of economic independence, instead of laboring on the edge of subsistence. This is the broader definition of liberty that motivated the Homestead Act, the Social Security Act, and the G.I. Bill of Rights. And now we will extend this vision by reforming great institutions to serve the needs of our time. To give every American a stake in the promise and future of our country, we will bring the highest standards to our schools, and build an ownership society. We will widen the ownership of homes and businesses, retirement savings and health insurance—preparing our people for the challenges of life in a free society. By making every citizen an agent of his or her own destiny, we will give our fellow Americans greater freedom from want and fear, and make our society more prosperous and just and equal.

In America's ideal of freedom, the public interest depends on private character—on integrity, and tolerance toward others, and the rule of conscience in our own lives. Self-

government relies, in the end, on the governing of the self. That edifice of character is built in families, supported by communities with standards, and sustained in our national life by the truths of Sinai, the Sermon on the Mount, the words of the Koran, and the varied faiths of our people. Americans move forward in every generation by reaffirming all that is good and true that came before—ideals of justice and conduct that are the same yesterday, today, and forever.

In America's ideal of freedom, the exercise of rights is ennobled by service, and mercy, and a heart for the weak. Liberty for all does not mean independence from one another. Our nation relies on men and women who look after a neighbor and surround the lost with love. Americans, at our best, value the life we see in one another, and must always remember that even the unwanted have worth. And our country must abandon all the habits of racism, because we cannot carry the message of freedom and the baggage of bigotry at the same time.

From the perspective of a single day, including this day of dedication, the issues and questions before our country are many. From the viewpoint of centuries, the questions that come to us are narrowed and few. Did our generation advance the cause of freedom? And did our character bring credit to that cause?

These questions that judge us also unite us, because Americans of every party and background, Americans by choice and by birth, are bound to one another in the cause of freedom. We have known divisions, which must be healed to move forward in great purposes—and I will strive in good faith to heal them. Yet those divisions do not define America. We felt the unity and fellowship of our nation when freedom came under attack, and our response came like a single hand over a single heart. And we can feel that same

unity and pride whenever America acts for good, and the victims of disaster are given hope, and the unjust encounter justice, and the captives are set free.

We go forward with complete confidence in the eventual triumph of freedom. Not because history runs on the wheels of inevitability; it is human choices that move events. Not because we consider ourselves a chosen nation; God moves and chooses as He wills. We have confidence because freedom is the permanent hope of mankind, the hunger in dark places, the longing of the soul. When our Founders declared a new order of the ages; when soldiers died in wave upon wave for a union based on liberty; when citizens marched in peaceful outrage under the banner "Freedom Now"—they were acting on an ancient hope that is meant to be fulfilled. History has an ebb and flow of justice, but history also has a visible direction, set by liberty and the Author of Liberty.

When the Declaration of Independence was first read in public and the Liberty Bell was sounded in celebration, a witness said, "It rang as if it meant something." In our time it means something still. America, in this young century, proclaims liberty throughout all the world, and to all the inhabitants thereof. Renewed in our strength—tested, but not weary—we are ready for the greatest achievements in the history of freedom.

May God bless you, and may He watch over the United States of America.

C. Address to the joint session of the Congress February, 2001

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, members of Congress: It's a great privilege to be here to outline a new budget and a new approach for governing our great country. I thank you for your invitation to speak here tonight. I know Congress had to formally invite me, and it could have been a close vote. So, Mr. Vice President, I appreciate you being here to break the tie.

I want to thank so many of you who have accepted my invitation to come to the White House to discuss important issues. We're off to a good start. I will continue to meet with you and ask for your input. You have been kind and candid, and I thank you for making a new President feel welcome.

The last time I visited the Capitol, I came to take an oath on the steps of this building. I pledged to honor our Constitution and laws. And I asked you to join me in setting a tone of civility and respect in Washington.

I hope America is noticing the difference, because we're making progress. Together, we are changing the tone in the Nation's Capital. And this spirit of respect and cooperation is vital, because, in the end, we will be judged not only by what we say or how we say it, we will be judged by what we're able to accomplish.

America today is a nation with great challenges, but greater resources. An artist using statistics as a brush could paint two very different pictures of our country. One would have warning signs: increasing layoffs, rising energy prices, too many failing schools, persistent poverty, the stubborn vestiges of racism.

Another picture would be full of blessings: a balanced budget, big surpluses, a military that is second to none, a country at peace with its neighbors, technology that is

revolutionizing the world, and our greatest strength — concerned citizens who care for our country and care for each other.

Neither picture is complete in and of itself. And tonight I challenge and invite Congress to work with me to use the resources of one picture to repaint the other; to direct the advantages of our time to solve the problems of our people. Some of these resources will come from government. Some, but not all.

Year after year in Washington, budget debates seem to come down to an old, tired argument: on one side, those who want more government, regardless of the cost; on the other, those who want less government, regardless of the need. We should leave those arguments to the last century, and chart a different course.

Government has a role, and an important role. Yet, too much government crowds out initiative and hard work, private charity and the private economy. Our new governing vision says government should be active, but limited; engaged, but not overbearing. And my budget is based on that philosophy.

It is reasonable, and it is responsible. It meets our obligations, and funds our growing needs. We increase spending next year for Social Security and Medicare, and other entitlement programs, by \$81 billion. We've increased spending for discretionary programs by a very responsible 4 percent, above the rate of inflation. My plan pays down an unprecedented amount of our national debt. And then, when money is still left over, my plan returns it to the people who earned it in the first place.

A budget's impact is counted in dollars, but measured in lives. Excellent schools, quality health care, a secure retirement, a cleaner environment, a stronger defense — these are all important needs, and we fund them. The highest percentage increase in our budget

should go to our children's education. Education is not my top priority — education is my top priority and, by supporting this budget, you'll make it yours, as well.

Reading is the foundation of all learning. So during the next five years, we triple spending, adding \$5 billion to help every child in America learn to read. Values are important, so we've tripled funding for character education to teach our children not only reading and writing, but right from wrong.

We've increased funding to train and recruit teachers, because we know a good education starts with a good teacher. And I have a wonderful partner in this effort. I like teachers so much, I married one. Laura has begun a new effort to recruit Americans to the profession that will shape our future — teaching. She will travel across America to promote sound teaching practices and early reading skills in our schools and in programs such as Head Start.

When it comes to our schools, dollars alone do not always make the difference. Funding is important, and so is reform. So we must tie funding to higher standards and accountability for results.

I believe in local control of schools. We should not, and we will not, run public schools from Washington, D.C. Yet when the federal government spends tax dollars, we must insist on results. Children should be tested on basic reading and math skills every year between grades three and eight. Measuring is the only way to know whether all our children are learning. And I want to know, because I refuse to leave any child behind in America.

Critics of testing contend it distracts from learning. They talk about teaching to the test. But let's put that logic to the test. If you test a child on basic math and reading skills,

and you're teaching to the test, you're teaching math and reading. And that's the whole idea. As standards rise, local schools will need more flexibility to meet them. So we must streamline the dozens of federal education programs into five, and let states spend money in those categories as they see fit.

Schools will be given a reasonable chance to improve and the support to do so. Yet, if they don't, if they continue to fail, we must give parents and students different options — a better public school, a private school, tutoring or a charter school. In the end, every child in a bad situation must be given a better choice because, when it comes to our children, failure is simply not an option.

Another priority in my budget is to keep the vital promises of Medicare and Social Security, and together we will do so. To meet the health care needs of all America's seniors, we double the Medicare budget over the next 10 years. My budget dedicates \$238 billion to Medicare next year alone, enough to fund all current programs and to begin a new prescription drug benefit for low-income seniors. No senior in America should have to choose between buying food and buying prescriptions.

To make sure the retirement savings of America's seniors are not diverted in any other program, my budget protects all \$2.6 trillion of the Social Security surplus for Social Security, and for Social Security alone.

My budget puts a priority on access to health care, without telling Americans what doctor they have to see or what coverage they must choose. Many working Americans do not have health care coverage, so we will help them buy their own insurance with refundable tax credits. And to provide quality care in low-income neighborhoods, over the next five years we will double the number of people served at community health care centers.

And we will address the concerns of those who have health coverage, yet worry their insurance company doesn't care and won't pay. Together this Congress and this President will find common ground to make sure doctors make medical decisions, and patients get the health care they deserve with a patients' bill of rights. When it comes to their health, people want to get the medical care they need, not be forced to go to court because they didn't get it. We will ensure access to the courts for those with legitimate claims. But first, let's put in place a strong, independent review so we promote quality health care, not frivolous lawsuits.

My budget also increases funding for medical research, which gives hope to many who struggle with serious disease. Our prayers tonight are with one of your own who is engaged in his own fight against cancer — a fine representative, and a good man , Congressman Joe Moakley. I can think of no more appropriate tribute to Joe than to have the Congress finish the job of doubling the budget for the National Institutes of Health.

My new Freedom Initiative for Americans with Disabilities funds new technologies, expands opportunities to work, and makes our society more welcoming. For the more than 50 million Americans with disabilities, we need to break down barriers to equality.

The budget I propose to you also supports the people who keep our country strong and free, the men and women who serve in the United States military. I'm requesting \$5.7 billion in increased military pay and benefits, and health care and housing. Our men and women in uniform give America their best and we owe them our support.

America's veterans honored their commitment to our country through their military service. I will honor our commitment to them with a million-dollar increase to ensure better access to quality care and faster decisions on benefit claims.

My budget will improve our environment by accelerating the cleanup of toxic brownfields. And I propose we make a major investment in conservation by fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Our national parks have a special place in our country's life. Our parks are places of great natural beauty and history. As good stewards, we must leave them better than we found them. So I propose providing \$4.9 billion over five years for the upkeep of these national treasures.

And my budget adopts a hopeful new approach to help the poor and the disadvantaged. We must encourage and support the work of charities and faith-based and community groups that offer help and love one person at a time. These groups are working in every neighborhood in America to fight homelessness and addiction and domestic violence; to provide a hot meal or a mentor or a safe haven for our children. Government should welcome these groups to apply for funds, not discriminate against them.

Government cannot be replaced by charities or volunteers. Government should not fund religious activities. But our nation should support the good works of these good people who are helping their neighbors in need. So I propose allowing all taxpayers, whether they itemize or not, to deduct their charitable contributions. Estimates show this could encourage as much as \$14 billion a year in new charitable giving, money that will save and change lives.

Our budget provides more than \$700 million over the next 10 years for a federal compassion capital fund, with a focused and noble mission, to provide a mentor to the more than 100 million children with a parent in prison, and to support other local efforts to fight illiteracy, teen pregnancy, drug addiction and other difficult problems.

With us tonight is the Mayor of Philadelphia. Please help me welcome Mayor John Street. Mayor Street has encouraged faith based and community organizations to make a

significant difference in Philadelphia. He's invited me to his city this summer to see compassionate action. I'm personally aware of just how effective the Mayor is. Mayor Street's a Democrat. Let the record show, I lost his city, big time. But some things are bigger than politics.

So I look forward to coming to your city, to see your faith-based programs in action. As government promotes compassion, it also must promote justice. Too many of our citizens have cause to doubt our nation's justice, when the law points a finger of suspicion at groups, instead of individuals. All our citizens are created equal, and must be treated equally.

Earlier today, I asked John Ashcroft, the Attorney General, to develop specific recommendations to end racial profiling. It's wrong and we will end it in America. In so doing, we will not hinder the work of our nation's brave police officers. They protect us every day — often at great risk. But by stopping the abuses of a few, we will add to the public confidence our police officers earn and deserve.

My budget has funded a responsible increase in our ongoing operations. It has funded our nation's important priorities. It has protected Social Security and Medicare. And our surpluses are big enough that there is still money left over.

Many of you have talked about the need to pay down our national debt. I listened, and I agree. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to act now, and I hope you will join me to pay down \$2 trillion in debt during the next 10 years. At the end of those 10 years, we will have paid down all the debt that is available to retire. That is more debt, repaid more quickly than has ever been repaid by any nation at any time in history.

We should also prepare for the unexpected, for the uncertainties of the future. We should approach our nation's budget as any prudent family would, with a contingency fund for emergencies or additional spending needs. For example, after a strategic review, we may need to increase defense spending. We may need to increase spending for our farmers or additional money to reform Medicare.

And so, my budget sets aside almost a trillion dollars over 10 years for additional needs. That is one trillion additional reasons you can feel comfortable supporting this budget. We have increased our budget at a responsible 4 percent. We have funded our priorities. We paid down all the available debt. We have prepared for contingencies. And we still have money left over.

Yogi Berra once said, "When you come to a fork in the road, take it." Now, we come to a fork in the road; we have two choices. Even though we have already met our needs, we could spend the money on more and bigger government. That's the road our nation has traveled in recent years.

Last year, government spending shot up 8 percent. That's far more than our economy grew, far more than personal income grew, and far more than the rate of inflation. If you continue on that road, you will spend the surplus and have to dip into Social Security to pay other bills. Unrestrained government spending is a dangerous road to deficits, so we must take a different path. The other choice is to let the American people spend their own money to meet their own needs.

I hope you will join me in standing firmly on the side of the people. You see, the growing surplus exists because taxes are too high and government is charging more than it needs. The people of America have been overcharged and, on their behalf, I am here asking for a refund.

Some say my tax plan is too big. Others say it's too small. I respectfully disagree. This plan is just right. I didn't throw darts at the board to come up with a number for tax relief. I didn't take a poll or develop an arbitrary formula that might sound good. I looked at problems in the Tax Code and calculated the cost to fix them.

A tax rate of 15 percent is too high for those who earn low wages, so we must lower the rate to 10 percent. No one should pay more than a third of the money they earn in federal income taxes, so we lowered the top rate to 33 percent.

This reform will be welcome relief for America's small businesses, which often pay taxes at the highest rate. And help for small business means jobs for Americans. We simplified the Tax Code by reducing the number of tax rates from the current five rates to four lower ones, 10 percent, 15, 25 and 33 percent. In my plan, no one is targeted in or targeted out. Everyone who pays income taxes will get relief.

Our government should not tax, and thereby discourage marriage, so we reduced the marriage penalty. I want to help families rear and support their children, so we doubled the child credit to \$1,000 per child. It's not fair to tax the same earnings twice — once when you earn them, and again when you die — so we must repeal the death tax.

These changes add up to significant help. A typical family with two children will save \$1,600 a year on their federal income taxes. Now, \$1,600 may not sound like a lot to some, but it means a lot to many families: \$1,600 buys gas for two cars for an entire year; it pays tuition for a year at a community college; it pays the average family grocery bill for three months. That's real money.

With us tonight representing many American families are Steven and Josefin Ramos. They are from Pennsylvania. But they could be from any one of your districts.

Steven is the network administrator for a school district. Josefina is a Spanish teacher at a charter school. And they have a two-year-old daughter.

Steven and Josefina tell me they pay almost \$8,000 a year in federal income taxes. My plan will save them more than \$2,000. Let me tell you what Steven says: “Two thousand dollars a year means a lot to my family. If we had this money, it would help us reach our goal of paying off our personal debt in two years’ time.” After that, Steven and Josefina want to start saving for Lianna’s college education.

My attitude is, government should never stand in the way of families achieving their dreams. And as we debate this issue, always remember, the surplus is not the government’s money, the surplus is the people’s money.

For lower-income families, my tax plan restores basic fairness. Right now, complicated tax rules punish hard work. A waitress supporting two children on \$25,000 a year can lose nearly half of every additional dollar she earns above the \$25,000. Her overtime, her hardest hours, are taxed at nearly 20 percent. This sends a terrible message: you’ll never get ahead. But America’s message must be different. We must honor hard work, never punish it.

With tax relief, overtime will no longer be over-taxed time for the waitress. People with the smallest incomes will get the highest percentage of reductions. And millions of additional American families will be removed from the income tax rolls entirely.

Tax relief is right and tax relief is urgent. The long economic expansion that began almost 10 years ago is faltering. Lower interest rates will eventually help, but we cannot assume they will do the job all by themselves.

Forty years ago, and then 20 years ago, two Presidents, one Democrat, one Republican, John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan, advocated tax cuts to, in President Kennedy's words, get this country moving again. They knew then what we must do now. To create economic growth and opportunity, we must put money back into the hands of the people who buy goods and create jobs.

We must act quickly. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve has testified before Congress that tax cuts often come too late to stimulate economic recovery. So I want to work with you to give our economy an important jump-start by making tax relief retroactive.

We must act now because it is the right thing to do. We must also act now because we have other things to do. We must show courage to confront and resolve tough challenges, to restructure our nation's defenses, to meet our growing need for energy, and to reform Medicare and Social Security.

America has a window of opportunity to extend and secure our present peace by promoting a distinctly American internationalism. We will work with our allies and friends to be a force for good and a champion of freedom. We will work for free markets, free trade and freedom from oppression. Nations making progress toward freedom will find America is their friend. We will promote our values. We will promote the peace. And we need a strong military to keep the peace.

But our military was shaped to confront the challenges of the past. So I've asked the Secretary of Defense to review America's Armed Forces and prepare to transform them to meet emerging threats. My budget makes a down payment on the research and development that will be required. Yet, in our broader transformation effort, we must put strategy first, then spending.

Our defense vision will drive our defense budget, not the other way around. Our nation also needs a clear strategy to confront the threats of the 21st century — threats that are more widespread and less certain. They range from terrorists who threaten with bombs to tyrants in rogue nations intent upon developing weapons of mass destruction. To protect our own people, our allies and friends, we must develop and we must deploy effective missile defenses.

And as we transform our military, we can discard Cold War relics, and reduce our own nuclear forces to reflect today's needs. A strong America is the world's best hope for peace and freedom. Yet the cause of freedom rests on more than our ability to defend ourselves and our allies. Freedom is exported every day, as we ship goods and products that improve the lives of millions of people.

Free trade brings greater political and personal freedom. Each of the previous five Presidents has had the ability to negotiate far reaching trade agreements. Tonight I ask you to give me the strong hand of presidential trade promotion authority, and to do so quickly.

As we meet tonight, many citizens are struggling with the high cost of energy. We have a serious energy problem that demands a national energy policy. The West is confronting a major energy shortage that has resulted in high prices and uncertainty. I've asked federal agencies to work with California officials to help speed construction of new energy sources, and I have direct Vice President Cheney, Commerce Secretary Evans, Energy Secretary Abraham and other senior members in my administration to develop a national energy policy.

Our energy demand outstrips our supply. We can produce more energy at home while protecting our environment, and we must. We can produce more electricity to meet

demand, and we must. We can promote alternative energy sources and conservation, and we must.

America must become more energy-independent, and we will. Perhaps the biggest test of our foresight and courage will be reforming Medicare and Social Security. Medicare's finances are strained and its coverage is outdated. Ninety-nine percent of employer-provided health plans offer some form of prescription drug coverage; Medicare does not. The framework for reform has been developed by Senators Frist and Breaux and Congressman Thomas, and now is the time to act.

Medicare must be modernized, and we must make sure that every senior on Medicare can choose a health care plan that offers prescription drugs.

Seven years from now, the baby boom generation will begin to claim Social Security benefits. Everyone in this chamber knows that Social Security is not prepared to fully fund their retirement.

And we only have a couple of years to get prepared. Without reform, this country will one day awaken to a stark choice: either a drastic rise in payroll taxes or a radical cut in retirement benefits.

There is a better way. This spring I will form a presidential commission to reform Social Security. The commission will make its recommendations by next fall. Reform should be based on these principles: It must preserve the benefits of all current retirees and those nearing retirement. It must return Social Security to sound financial footing. And it must offer personal savings accounts to younger workers who want them.

Social Security now offers workers a return of less than 2 percent on the money they pay into the system. To save the system, we must increase that by allowing younger

workers to make safe, sound investments that yield a higher rate of return. Ownership, access to wealth and independence should not be the privilege of the few.

They are the hope of every American, and we must make them the foundation of Social Security. By confronting the tough challenge of reform, by being responsible with our budget, we can earn the trust of the American people. And we can add to that trust by enacting fair and balanced election and campaign reforms.

The agenda I have set before you tonight is worthy of a great nation. America is a nation at peace, but not a nation at rest.

Much has been given to us, and much is expected. Let us agree to bridge old divides. But let us also agree that our goodwill must be dedicated to great goals. Bipartisan is more than minding our matters. It is doing our duty.

No one can speak in this Capitol and not be awed by its history. As so many turning points, debates in these chambers have reflected the collected or divided conscience of our country. And when we walk through Statuary Hall and see those men and women of marble, we're reminded of their courage and achievement.

Yet America's purpose is never found only in statues or history. America's purpose always stands before us. Our generation must show courage in a time of blessing, as our nation has always shown in times of crisis. And our courage, issue by issue, can gather to greatness and serve our country. This is the privilege and responsibility we share. And if we work together, we can prove that public service is noble.

We all came here for a reason. We all have things we want to accomplish and promises to keep. *Juntos podemos* — together we can.

We can make Americans proud of their government. Together we can share in the credit of making our country more prosperous and generous and just, and earn from our conscience and from our fellow citizens the highest possible praise: Well done, good and faithful servants.

Thank you all. Good night and God bless.

D. State of the Union Address January , 2002

Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, members of Congress, distinguished guests, fellow citizens: As we gather tonight, our nation is at war, our economy is in recession, and the civilized world faces unprecedented dangers. Yet the state of our Union has never been stronger.

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

The American flag flies again over our embassy in Kabul. Terrorists who once occupied Afghanistan now occupy cells at Guantanamo Bay. And terrorist leaders who urged followers to sacrifice their lives are running for their own.

America and Afghanistan are now allies against terror. We'll be partners in rebuilding that country. And this evening we welcome the distinguished interim leader of a liberated Afghanistan: Chairman Hamid Karzai.

The last time we met in this chamber, the mothers and daughters of Afghanistan were captives in their own homes, forbidden from working or going to school. Today women are free, and are part of Afghanistan's new government. And we welcome the new Minister of Women's Affairs, Doctor Sima Samar. Our progress is a tribute to the spirit of the Afghan people, to the resolve of our coalition, and to the might of the United States military. When I called our troops into action, I did so with complete confidence in their courage and skill. And tonight, thanks to them, we are winning the war on terror. The man

and women of our Armed Forces have delivered a message now clear to every enemy of the United States: Even 7,000 miles away, across oceans and continents, on mountaintops and in caves — you will not escape the justice of this nation.

For many Americans, these four months have brought sorrow, and pain that will never completely go away. Every day a retired fire fighter returns to Ground Zero, to feel closer to his two sons who died there. At a memorial in New York, a little boy left his football with a note for his lost father: Dear Daddy, please take this to heaven. I don't want to play football until I can play with you again someday.

Last month, at the grave of her husband, Michael, a CIA officer and Marine who died in Mazur-e-Sharif, Shannon Spann said these words of farewell: "Semper Fi, my love." Shannon is with us tonight.

Shannon, I assure you and all who have lost a loved one that our cause is just, and our country will never forget the debt we owe Michael and all who gave their lives for freedom. Our cause is just, and it continues. Our discoveries in Afghanistan confirmed our worst fears, and showed us the true scope of the task ahead.

We have seen the depth of our enemies' hatred in videos, where they laugh about the loss of innocent life. And the depth of their hatred is equaled by the madness of the destruction they design. We have found diagrams of American nuclear power plants and public water facilities, detailed instructions for making chemical weapons, surveillance maps of American cities, and thorough descriptions of landmarks in America and throughout the world.

What we have found in Afghanistan confirms that, far from ending there, our war against terror is only beginning. Most of the 19 men who hijacked planes on September the

11th were trained in Afghanistan's camps, and so were tens of thousands of others. Thousands of dangerous killers, schooled in the methods of murder, often supported by outlaw regimes, are now spread throughout the world like ticking time bombs, set to go off without warning.

Thanks to the work of our law enforcement officials and coalition partners, hundreds of terrorists have been arrested. Yet, tens of thousands of trained terrorists are still at large. These enemies view the entire world as a battlefield, and we must pursue them wherever they are. So long as training camps operate, so long as nations harbor terrorists, freedom is at risk. And America and our allies must not, and will not, allow it.

Our nation will continue to be steadfast and patient and persistent in the pursuit of two great objectives. First, we will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And, second, we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world.

Our military has put the terror training camps of Afghanistan out of business, yet camps still exist in at least a dozen countries. A terrorist underworld — including groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, Jaish-i-Mohammed — operates in remote jungles and deserts, and hides in the centers of large cities.

While the most visible military action is in Afghanistan, America is acting elsewhere. We now have troops in the Philippines, helping to train that country's armed forces to go after terrorist cells that have executed an American, and still hold hostages. Our soldiers, working with the Bosnian government, seized terrorists who were plotting to bomb our embassy. Our Navy is patrolling the coast of Africa to block the shipment of weapons and the establishment of terrorist camps in Somalia.

My hope is that all nations will heed our call, and eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own. Many nations are acting forcefully. Pakistan is now cracking down on terror, and I admire the strong leadership of President Musharraf. But some governments will be timid in the face of terror. And make no mistake about it: If they do not act, America will.

Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction. Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September the 11th. But we know their true nature. North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens.

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

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens — leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections — then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world. States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic. We will work closely with our coalition to deny terrorists and their state sponsors the materials, technology, and expertise to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction. We will develop and deploy effective

missile defenses to protect America and our allies from sudden attack. And all nations should know: America will do what is necessary to ensure our nation's security.

We'll be deliberate, yet time is not on our side. I will not wait on events, while dangers gather. I will not stand by, as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons.

Our war on terror is well begun, but it is only begun. This campaign may not be finished on our watch — yet it must be and it will be waged on our watch.

We can't stop short. If we stop now — leaving terror camps intact and terror states unchecked — our sense of security would be false and temporary. History has called America and our allies to action, and it is both our responsibility and our privilege to fight freedom's fight.

Our first priority must always be the security of our nation, and that will be reflected in the budget I send to Congress. My budget supports three great goals for America: We will win this war; we'll protect our homeland; and we will revive our economy.

September the 11th brought out the best in America, and the best in this Congress. And I join the American people in applauding your unity and resolve. Now Americans deserve to have this same spirit directed toward addressing problems here at home. I'm a proud member of my party — yet as we act to win the war, protect our people, and create jobs in America, we must act, first and foremost, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans.

It costs a lot to fight this war. We have spent more than a billion dollars a month — over \$30 million a day — and we must be prepared for future operations. Afghanistan

proved that expensive precision weapons defeat the enemy and spare innocent lives, and we need more of them. We need to replace aging aircraft and make our military more agile, to put our troops anywhere in the world quickly and safely. Our men and women in uniform deserve the best weapons, the best equipment, the best training — and they also deserve another pay raise.

My budget includes the largest increase in defense spending in two decades — because while the price of freedom and security is high, it is never too high. Whatever it costs to defend our country, we will pay.

The next priority of my budget is to do everything possible to protect our citizens and strengthen our nation against the ongoing threat of another attack. Time and distance from the events of September the 11th will not make us safer unless we act on its lessons. America is no longer protected by vast oceans. We are protected from attack only by vigorous action abroad, and increased vigilance at home.

My budget nearly doubles funding for a sustained strategy of homeland security, focused on four key areas: bioterrorism, emergency response, airport and border security, and improved intelligence. We will develop vaccines to fight anthrax and other deadly diseases. We'll increase funding to help states and communities train and equip our heroic police and firefighters. We will improve intelligence collection and sharing, expand patrols at our borders, strengthen the security of air travel, and use technology to track the arrivals and departures of visitors to the United States.

Homeland security will make America not only stronger, but, in many ways, better. Knowledge gained from bioterrorism research will improve public health. Stronger police and fire departments will mean safer neighborhoods. Stricter border enforcement will help

combat illegal drugs. And as government works to better secure our homeland, America will continue to depend on the eyes and ears of alert citizens.

A few days before Christmas, an airline flight attendant spotted a passenger lighting a match. The crew and passengers quickly subdued the man, who had been trained by al Qaeda and was armed with explosives. The people on that plane were alert and, as a result, likely saved nearly 200 lives. And tonight we welcome and thank flight attendants Hermis Moutardier and Christina Jones.

Once we have funded our national security and our homeland security, the final great priority of my budget is economic security for the American people. To achieve these great national objectives — to win the war, protect the homeland, and revitalize our economy — our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short-term, so long as Congress restrains spending and acts in a fiscally responsible manner. We have clear priorities and we must act at home with the same purpose and resolve we have shown overseas: We'll prevail in the war, and we will defeat this recession.

Americans who have lost their jobs need our help and I support extending unemployment benefits and direct assistance for health care coverage. Yet, American workers want more than unemployment checks — they want a steady paycheck. When America works, America prospers, so my economic security plan can be summed up in one word: jobs.

Good jobs begin with good schools, and here we've made a fine start. Republicans and Democrats worked together to achieve historic education reform so that no child is left behind. I was proud to work with members of both parties: Chairman John Boehner and Congressman George Miller. Senator Judd Gregg.

And I was so proud of our work, I even had nice things to say about my friend, Ted Kennedy. I know the folks at the Crawford coffee shop couldn't believe I'd say such a thing, but our work on this bill shows what is possible if we set aside posturing and focus on results.

There is more to do. We need to prepare our children to read and succeed in school with improved Head Start and early childhood development programs. We must upgrade our teacher colleges and teacher training and launch a major recruiting drive with a great goal for America: a quality teacher in every classroom.

Good jobs also depend on reliable and affordable energy. This Congress must act to encourage conservation, promote technology, build infrastructure, and it must act to increase energy production at home so America is less dependent on foreign oil.

Good jobs depend on expanded trade. Selling into new markets creates new jobs, so I ask Congress to finally approve trade promotion authority. On these two key issues, trade and energy, the House of Representatives has acted to create jobs, and I urge the Senate to pass this legislation.

Good jobs depend on sound tax policy. Last year, some in this hall thought my tax relief plan was too small; some thought it was too big. But when the checks arrived in the mail, most Americans thought tax relief was just about right. Congress listened to the people and responded by reducing tax rates, doubling the child credit, and ending the death tax. For the sake of long-term growth and to help Americans plan for the future, let's make these tax cuts permanent.

The way out of this recession, the way to create jobs, is to grow the economy by encouraging investment in factories and equipment, and by speeding up tax relief so

people have more money to spend. For the sake of American workers, let's pass a stimulus package.

Good jobs must be the aim of welfare reform. As we reauthorize these important reforms, we must always remember the goal is to reduce dependency on government and offer every American the dignity of a job.

Americans know economic security can vanish in an instant without health security. I ask Congress to join me this year to enact a patients' bill of rights to give uninsured workers credits to help buy health coverage, to approve an historic increase in the spending for veterans' health, and to give seniors a sound and modern Medicare system that includes coverage for prescription drugs.

A good job should lead to security in retirement. I ask Congress to enact new safeguards for 401K and pension plans. Employees who have worked hard and saved all their lives should not have to risk losing everything if their company fails. Through stricter accounting standards and tougher disclosure requirements, corporate America must be made more accountable to employees and shareholders and held to the highest standards of conduct.

Retirement security also depends upon keeping the commitments of Social Security, and we will. We must make Social Security financially stable and allow personal retirement accounts for younger workers who choose them.

Members, you and I will work together in the months ahead on other issues: productive farm policy, a cleaner environment, broader home ownership, especially among minorities, and ways to encourage the good work of charities and faith-based groups. I ask you to join

me on these important domestic issues in the same spirit of cooperation we've applied to our war against terrorism.

During these last few months, I've been humbled and privileged to see the true character of this country in a time of testing. Our enemies believed America was weak and materialistic, that we would splinter in fear and selfishness. They were as wrong as they are evil.

The American people have responded magnificently, with courage and compassion, strength and resolve. As I have met the heroes, hugged the families, and looked into the tired faces of rescuers, I have stood in awe of the American people.

And I hope you will join me — I hope you will join me in expressing thanks to one American for the strength and calm and comfort she brings to our nation in crisis, our First Lady, Laura Bush.

None of us would ever wish the evil that was done on September the 11th. Yet after America was attacked, it was as if our entire country looked into a mirror and saw our better selves. We were reminded that we are citizens, with obligations to each other, to our country, and to history. We began to think less of the goods we can accumulate, and more about the good we can do.

For too long our culture has said, "If it feels good, do it." Now America is embracing a new ethic and a new creed: "Let's roll." In the sacrifice of soldiers, the fierce brotherhood of fire fighters, and the bravery and generosity of ordinary citizens, we have glimpsed what a new culture of responsibility could look like. We want to be a nation that serves goals larger than self. We've been offered a unique opportunity, and we must not let this moment pass.

My call tonight is for every American to commit at least two years — 4,000 hours over the rest of your lifetime — to the service of your neighbors and your nation. Many are already serving, and I thank you. If you aren't sure how to help, I've got a good place to start. To sustain and extend the best that has emerged in America, I invite you to join the new USA Freedom Corps. The Freedom Corps will focus on three areas of need: responding in case of crisis at home; rebuilding our communities; and extending American compassion throughout the world. One purpose of the USA Freedom Corps will be homeland security. America needs retired doctors and nurses who can be mobilized in major emergencies; volunteers to help police and fire departments; transportation and utility workers well-trained in spotting danger.

Our country also needs citizens working to rebuild our communities. We need mentors to love children, especially children whose parents are in prison. And we need more talented teachers in troubled schools. USA Freedom Corps will expand and improve the good efforts of AmeriCorps and Senior Corps to recruit more than 200,000 new volunteers.

And America needs citizens to extend the compassion of our country to every part of the world. So we will renew the promise of the Peace Corps, double its volunteers over the next five years, and ask it to join a new effort to encourage development and education and opportunity in the Islamic world.

This time of adversity offers a unique moment of opportunity — a moment we must seize to change our culture. Through the gathering momentum of millions of acts of service and decency and kindness, I know we can overcome evil with greater good. And we have a great opportunity during this time of war to lead the world toward the values that will bring lasting peace.

All fathers and mothers, in all societies, want their children to be educated, and live free from poverty and violence. No people on Earth yearn to be oppressed, or aspire to servitude, or eagerly await the midnight knock of the secret police.

If anyone doubts this, let them look to Afghanistan, where the Islamic “street” greeted the fall of tyranny with song and celebration. Let the skeptics look to Islam’s own rich history, with its centuries of learning, and tolerance and progress. America will lead by defending liberty and justice because they are right and true and unchanging for all people everywhere.

No nation owns these aspirations, and no nation is exempt from them. We have no intention of imposing our culture. But America will always stand firm for the non-negotiable demands of human dignity: the rule of law; limits on the power of the state; respect for women; private property; free speech; equal justice; and religious tolerance.

America will take the side of brave men and women who advocate these values around the world, including the Islamic world, because we have a greater objective than eliminating threats and containing resentment. We seek a just and peaceful world beyond the war on terror.

In this moment of opportunity, a common danger is erasing old rivalries. America is working with Russia and China and India, in ways we have never before, to achieve peace and prosperity.

In every region, free markets and free trade and free societies are proving their power to lift lives. Together with friends and allies from Europe to Asia, and Africa to Latin America, we will demonstrate that the forces of terror cannot stop the momentum of freedom.

The last time I spoke here, I expressed the hope that life would return to normal. In some ways, it has. In others, it never will. Those of us who have lived through these challenging times have been changed by them. We've come to know truths that we will never question: evil is real, and it must be opposed. Beyond all differences of race or creed, we are one country, mourning together and facing danger together. Deep in the American character, there is honor, and it is stronger than cynicism. And many have discovered again that even in tragedy — especially in tragedy — God is near.

In a single instant, we realized that this will be a decisive decade in the history of liberty, that we've been called to a unique role in human events. Rarely has the world faced a choice more clear or consequential.

Our enemies send other people's children on missions of suicide and murder. They embrace tyranny and death as a cause and a creed. We stand for a different choice, made long ago, on the day of our founding. We affirm it again today. We choose freedom and the dignity of every life.

Steadfast in our purpose, we now press on. We have known freedom's price. We have shown freedom's power. And in this great conflict, my fellow Americans, we will see freedom's victory.

Thank you all. May God bless you.

ملخص الدراسة

من حوار يومي عادي إلى إعلان حرب، يعتبر الخطاب السياسي النموذج الأمثل لتوضيح إستعمالات اللغة في الوسط الإجتماعي. تتناول هاته الدراسة النقدية بالتحليل مختارات من خطابات الرئيس الثالث و الأربعين للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية جورج بوش الابن قبل وبعد أحداث الحادي عشر سبتمبر 2001 . تحاول الدراسة توضيح كيفية الإستعمال التداولي للكلمات ذات الدلالة اللغوية و النفسية (الضمير الشخصي، الإستعارات و الصور الذهنية) في عملية ممنهجة لرسم صورة للعالم تتفق مع التوجهات الإيديولوجية للمتكلم و السياق المحيط. تبين الدراسة أن جورج بوش إستعمل هاته الطرق بغرض عرض تصورات الإيديولوجية لجملة من المفاهيم العالمية كالحرية بغرض تبرير رداة فعل الولايات المتحدة بعد هجمات الحادي عشر سبتمبر. لهذا الغرض يعتبر تبني التحليل النقدي للخطاب الطريقة المناسبة لهاته الحالة كونها لا تسمح بقبول المسلمات في أي تصريح و "تسعى لفهم و عرض و في أقصى الأحوال مقاومة اللامساوات الإجتماعية" (فان دايك ، 2001 ، ص. 352). كما يسمح تناول الخطاب من القمة إلى الأسفل برؤية كل كلمة تحت ضوء الفكرة الشاملة.. لتطبيق نتائج هاته الدراسة في التعليم تقترح الدراسة أن يتعود الطلبة على التحليل النقدي للخطاب السياسي كمثال حي لإستعمال اللغة حسب الوسط.

كلمات دلالية: الخطاب السياسي، علم التداولية، التحليل النقدي للخطاب