universität wien

Diplomarbeit

Titel der Diplomarbeit

Rhetorical Devices used in Political Speeches

An analysis of metaphorical and pronominal devices in political speeches given by George Bush junior and Barack Obama from critical discourse analytical perspectives

Verfasser

Daniel Hämmerle

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magister der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, 2011

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:	A 190 313 344
Diplomarbeitsgebiet lt. Studienblatt:	UF Englisch
Betreut von:	Ao. Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Ute Smit

Table of figures and abbreviations:

Figures and tables:

Table 1: The contextual micro and macro level **p. 17**

Table 2: Mapping - Target and Source **p. 49**

Table 3: Spatial reference in orientational metaphors **p. 53**

Table 4: Metonymy in emotional categories **p. 59**

Table 5: Pronominal frequency **p. 73**

Table 6: Comparison of the I-WE and the E-WE **p. 75**

Table 7: Comparison of frequently occurring words **p. 120**

Abbreviations:

B1	**Bush speech 1: State of the Union Address 2005**
B2	**Bush speech 2: State of the Union Address 2008**
CDA	**Critical Discourse Analysis**
CL	**Critical Linguistics**
DA	**Discourse Analysis**
DHA	**Discourse Historical Approach**
'E-WE'	**Exclusive use of the first person plural pronoun**
'I'	**First person subjective singular pronoun**
'I-WE'	**Inclusive use of the first person plural pronoun**
'THESE'	**Demonstrative plural pronoun of closeness**
'THEY'	**Third person subjective plural pronoun**
'THOSE'	**Demonstrative plural pronoun of distance**
'YOU'	**Second person subjective singular/plural pronoun**
O1	**Obama speech 1: State of the Union Address 2010**
O2	**Obama speech 2: Address to a Joint Session of Congress 2010**

Table of content:

Page

Acknowledgments

1. Introduction 1

2. Critical Discourse Analysis 3

2.1 What does Critical Discourse Analysis mean? 3

2.2 Historical Development of CDA 7

2.3 Different Critical Discourse Analytical Approaches 10

2.3.1 Norman Fairclough: Textually Oriented Discourse Analysis 10

2.3.2 Ruth Wodak: Discourse Historical Approach 10

2.3.3 Teun A. Van Dijk: Socio-Psychological Approach 12

2.4 Central Concepts 13

2.4.1 Context 13

2.4.1.1 A Multidisciplinary Theory on Context 15

2.4.1.2 The Macro-Structure in Context Models 17

2.4.2 Power and Ideology 18

2.4.2.1 Power and Dominance 18

2.4.2.2 Power in CDA 20

2.4.2.3 Control of Text and Talk through the Control of Mind 21

2.4.3 Dissemination or Implementation as the Result of Discursive Power 22

2.4.4 Ideology 23

3. Political Rhetoric 27

3.1 What is Political Rhetoric? 27

3.2 A Politolinguistic Approach 29

3.3 Pronouns 30

3.3.1 Pronouns in Political Speeches 32

3.3.1.1 'WE' – First Person Plural 33

3.3.1.2 'I'- First Person Singular 35

3.3.1.3 'YOU' – Second person Plural/ Singular 36

3.3.1.4 Referring to Opponents 37

3.4 Lexical Choice 39
3.5 Repetition 41
3.6 Metaphors 44
3.6.1 Non-Cognitive Approach on Metaphors 44
3.6.2 Metaphors in Cognitive Linguistics 45
3.6.2.1 Metaphorical Mapping 48
3.6.2.2 The Power of Metaphors 50
3.6.3 Different Types of Cognitive Metaphors 51
3.6.3.1 Generic and Specific Level Metaphors 51
3.6.3.2 Structural and Orientational Metaphors 52
3.6.3.3 Ontological Metaphors: Entity and Substance Metaphors 54
3.6.3.4 Container Metaphors 56
3.6.3.5 Image Metaphors 56
3.6.3.6 Personification 57
3.6.4 Metonymy 58
3.6.5 Metaphors in Politics 60
3.6.6 Differentiation between Liberal and Conservative Metaphors 62
3.6.6.1 Conservative vs. Liberal Accounting Schemes 65
3.6.6.2 The Conservative Strict-Father Model 66
3.6.6.3 The Liberal Nurturant Parent Model 67
3.6.6.4 The Nation-as-Family Metaphor 69
4. Analysis of Bush's and Obama's Rhetorical Devices 70
4.1 General Remarks on the Politicians 70
4.2 Research Goals and Set Up 71
4.3 Analysis of the Pronominal Use of Bush and Obama 73
4.3.1 General Observations 73
4.3.2 'WE' – First Person Plural 74
4.3.3 'I' – First Person Singular 79
4.3.4 'YOU' – Second Person Plural/ Singular 81
4.3.5 Referring to Opponents 83

4.3.6 Summary of the Pronominal Systems of Bush and Obama 85
4.4 Metaphorical Analysis of Bush and Obama 86
4.4.1 Similarities in Bush's and Obama's Metaphorical Choices 87
4.4.2 Topic-Specific Analysis of the Metaphorical System 92
4.4.2.1 Obama on War *92*
4.4.2.2 Bush on War *94*
4.4.2.3 Obama on Economy *98*
4.4.2.4 Bush on Economy *101*
4.4.2.5 Obama on Health Care *103*
4.4.2.6 Bush on Health Care *106*
4.4.2.7 Obama on Education *107*
4.4.2.8 Bush on Education *109*
4.4.2.9 Obama on Energy *111*
4.4.2.10 Bush on Foreign Policy *113*
4.4.2.11 Bush on Family *115*
4.4.3 Summary of the Metaphorical Systems of Bush and Obama 116
4.5 Repetition 118
5. Conclusion **121**
6. Bibliography **126**
7. Appendix **135**
(1) George W. Bush 2005 State of the Union Address (B1) 135
(2) George W. Bush 2008 State of the Union Address (B2) 143
(3) Barack Obama 2010 State of the Union Address (O1) 151
(4) Barack Obama 2009 First Speech to a Joint Session of Congress (O2) 162
(5) Abstract English **171**
(6) Abstract German **173**
(7) Curriculum Vitae **175**

Acknowledgments

First, I want to express my wholehearted thanks to my supervisor Prof. Ute Smit who was always very supportive and patient with me during periods of little progress. Her devotion and competence was not only encouraging but also inspiring. Moreover, I really appreciated her exemplary professional skills but also various stimulating discussions about both scientific and non-scientific topics we had.

I also want to thank all the people who have accompanied and supported me throughout my studies and thereby, directly or indirectly made this thesis possible. Furthermore, I want to use the opportunity to mention how much I have enjoyed studying at the English Department at the University of Vienna and therefore, considering myself being very privileged.

And let us not forget all my friends who always had an open ear and I could share my worries and fears with. I will definitely remember the relaxing lunch breaks, the many funny events and festivities. Their support made me stay on track and keep my motivation and joy over the entire period.

Last but not least, I sincerely and with all my heart want to thank my grandparents Evy and Thorvald Eriksson for their great and never-ending love and support, my parents Britt-Marie and Martin, if it was not for you I would not be the person I am now, my sister Johanna, for all her love and for taking care of me if wanted or not, my brother Tobias, for all the love and all the shared musical experiences and my girlfriend Julia, for being a great friend and a patient listener.
I am very fortunate of having people like you in my life!!!

Thank you all, Vielen Dank, Tack så mycket!!!

1. Introduction

We are aware that even though, the currently elected US president, Barack Obama has only been in office for a year there is no doubt that he has changed American policy and by that also the political orientation of the country profoundly. Compared to Bush's policy, where two wars and the constant struggle against terrorism were the main focus, other topics, such as health care, environmental concerns, unemployment and new energy resources, have gained momentum. Moreover, Obama's policy has brought a softer tone when it comes to questions of foreign policy and willingness for a stronger cooperation with other countries.

While analyzing speeches given by those two politicians, one soon realizes that their political ideologies and aims are very different. The main aim of this thesis will be to examine speeches delivered by the two politicians from a linguistic point of view and to detect in how far ideology is manifested in grammatical structures and cognitive choices and which manipulative rhetorical devices are used by the two politicians to get the people on their sides. I will try to determine in how far Obama's and Bush's rhetorics differ and in how far one can trace back their linguistic choices to their ideological convictions. More precisely, liberal and conservative language will be compared. This will be done from the perspective of a critical discourse analyst as political decisions are a response to social conditions and are embedded in social and historical situations. Such a historical or social situation is defined by the contextual concepts of action, time and place. All kind of ideological language should therefore be analysed from a context-oriented perspective**.** In the first instance, van Dijk's and Wodak's theoretical specification on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) will serve as a frame. Chapter two summarizes the main concepts and core idea of CDA. It will contain a brief description of its historical development, the most important specifications of CDA and applicable definitions of terms like context, ideology, power and dominance.

As CDA does not provide one with concrete methodological guidelines but considers itself as an ideological frame, other linguistic approaches will be necessary to examine the linguistic differences of

conservative and liberal language. These theories will be dealt with in the subsequent chapter, which provides the reader with information on linguistic theories for the analysis of Bush's and Obama's rhetorical devices. The main focal point will be on the rhetorical value of pronouns, the strength and weakness of conceptual metaphor theory and the importance of repetition as a rhetorical strategy. Particular attention is given to Lakoff's (1995, 1996) theory on the metaphorical grounding of political ideology. His 'moral accounting scheme', which claims that morality and ideology is governed by a cognitive model with two different types of idealized families, will serve to interpret the difference of conservative and liberal usage of rhetorical devices.

Finally, chapter four contains a critical analysis of four speeches performed by George W. Bush and Barack Obama. The analysis will be the core of this paper and will hopefully yield interesting findings with regard to the linguistic theories in question. Particularly, the aim of this paper will be to investigate the rhetorical concepts used in speeches given by George W. Bush and Barack Obama between 2005 and 2010 from a critical discourse analytic perspective and to filter out how and to what extent conservative and liberal rhetorics differ from each other.

The two last chapters will serve as a summary but may also serve as a thought-provoking impulse for further research.

2. Critical Discourse Analysis

The roots of CDA are found in classical rhetorics, sociolinguistics and pragmatics (Wodak 2001: 3). The term was introduced by Norman Fairclough in 1989 in *Language and Power* in which the core idea of Discourse Analysis (DA) was criticised as it does not discuss "how discursive practices are socially shaped" (Fairclough 1995: 23) and thereby, denies the social effect of discourse (Fairclough 1995: 23).

Norman Fairclough and other linguists created an analytical framework which should serve to study the relationship between discourse, power and ideology. CDA claims that each single discourse situation has an ideological character, "contributing to the positioning of people as social subjects" (Fairclough 1995: 23). This means that critical discourse analysts assume that discourse cannot be unbiased as it is performed by people with ideologies, which rub off on grammatical or lexical choices.

2.1 What does Critical Discourse Analysis mean?

Discourse is a rather fuzzy concept as it is used by different social theorists, critical linguists and also critical discourse analysts and all of them define the term slightly differently. Generally, there are two perspectives from which discourse can be viewed. Firstly, there is the formalist's or structuralist's point of view, with a focus upon structural properties like organization or cohesion. They simply define discourse as "language above the clause" (Stubbs 1983: 1). Secondly, functional analysts are concerned about the social aspect of language and claim that "discourse is language in use" (Mayr 2008: 7).

> [T]he analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs.
>
> (Brown and Yule 1983: 1)

As functionalists accentuate the importance of the various functions of language, they claim that there is no sense in analyzing language without

considering its purpose. “Language is used to ‘mean’ and to ‘do’ something” (Richardson 2007: 24) and in order to understand the ‘meaning and doing’ one has to be aware of the context in which discourse appears (Mayr 2008: 7). That means that the analysis of interpersonal, institutional, socio-cultural and material context is a necessity (Mayr, 2008: 7). It becomes obvious that discourse does not appear in a social vacuum but that it is shaped by situational, institutional and social structures and that it vice versa creates these contexts (Mayr 2008: 10).

The term ‘critical’ can be traced back to Habermas and the Frankfurt School even though it is used in a broader sense nowadays. It denotes the interconnection of “’social and political engagement’ with ‘a sociologically informed construction of society’” (Krings, quoted in Wodak 2001: 2). Most critical discourse analysts support Habermas’s claim that

> language is also a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimize relations of organized power. In so far as the legitimations of power relations, […] are not articulated, […] language is also ideological’ (Wodak 2001: 2).

Generally, CDA studies the manifestation of social power and ideology in discourse, meaning text and talk, and how a deliberate use of discourse can have an impact on society and political conditions respectively (van Dijk 1998). In other words, CDA tries to display how discourse (re)produces and maintains the relation of dominance and inequality (Mayr 2008: 8). Thereby, critical discourse analysts take an explicit socio-political stance in which they try to expose social inequality.

CDA has to be regarded as a reaction against the dominant formal and uncritical forms of discourse analysis of the 1960s and 1970s (van Dijk 1998). Still, one should not understand it as a method of analysis but rather as a perspective which allows analysing discourse from a critical angle. There is no uniform theoretical concept as CDA rather has to be considered as an ideological viewpoint. Michael Meyer sums up CDA as following;

> (…) there is no guiding theoretical viewpoint that is used consistently within CDA, nor do CDA protagonists proceed consistently from the area of theory to the field of discourse and then back to theory. (Meyer, quoted in Oberhuber 2008: 274)

CDA rejects the possibility of value-free science and argues that discourse in general, thereby also scientific practices, is based on a relationship between scholarship and society and that instead of denying such a relationship it should be studied with awareness to that notion (van Dijk 1998).

Even if there is no clear theoretical concept of CDA, Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 271-280) tried to summarize its main tenets:

1. CDA addresses social problems.
2. Power relations are discursive.
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture.
4. Discourse does ideological work.
5. Discourse is historical.
6. The link between text and society is mediated.
7. Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory.
8. Discourse is a form of social action.

CDA studies how specific discourse structures create, reproduce and preserve social dominance. Therefore, typical vocabulary of CDA covers terms such as "'power', 'dominance', 'hegemony', 'ideology', 'class', 'gender', 'race', 'discrimination', 'interests', 'reproduction', 'institutions', 'social structure'" (van Dijk 1998), social order, context, dissemination and implementation.

To regard "language as a social practice" (Fairclough, Wodak 1997 quoted, in Wodak 2008: 297) means to accept the two-way relationship between 'discursive events' and discourse itself.[1] That in turn means that language displays and at the same time also plays a part in the (re)production of social reality (Mayr 2008: 8).

As CDA is concerned with the mediation of social and linguistic problems it is obvious that interdisciplinary work of different scientific fields is necessary to understand how language actually works and how

[1] The concept of context and van Dijk's theoretical findings will be considered and explained more closely in chapter 2.4.1

knowledge, information or power is transmitted (Oberhuber 2008: 274). Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak claim that

> [d]escribing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s), and social structure(s) which frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. That is, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned – it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain it and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is so socially consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power. (Oberhuber 2008: 274)

Wodak (2008: 297) mentions four concepts which are of great importance to practice CDA;

1. Concept of critique: "Basically, 'critical' could be understood as having distance to the data, embedding the data in the social, making the political stance explicit, and having a focus on self-reflection as scholars undertaking research" (Wodak 2008: 298)
2. Concept of power: Language is not powerful on its own but gains power by the use powerful people make of it.
3. Concept of history
4. Concept of ideology: In CDA ideology is used in order to establish and protect unequal power relations.

The meaning of these concepts will be described and become clearer in the proceeding chapters.

As CDA takes accounts of non-linguistic and social external macro-influences when analyzing discourse, it enables to examine ideology, power and inequality. Fairclough claims that CDA

> (…) analyses texts and interactions, but it does not start from texts and interactions. It starts rather from social issues and problems, problems which people face in their social lives, issues which are taken up within sociology, political science and/or cultural studies. (Fairclough 2001: 26)

That leads to the understanding that the main aim of CDA is to examine how the macrostructure of society is related to the microstructure of language (Mayr 2008: 9). CDA tries to demystify discourse by exposing ideology (Wodak 2001: 10).

2.2 Historical Development of CDA

Before the 1970's, most linguistic research put its focus on formal aspects of language and, thereby, ignored the historical or social impacts on language. DA slowly emerged in the 1970s as linguists started to realize the influence of language on power relations in society. Still, sociolinguists were not yet concerned with social hierarchy and power relations between discourse actors but instead they tried to describe language variations, language change and the structure of communicative interaction.

In the early 1990s a network of scholars developed the concept of CDA after a small symposium in Amsterdam. Teun van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, Gunther Kress, Theo van Leeuwen and Ruth Wodak spent two days and discussed different approaches of CDA, a diversity which is still a characteristic of today's CDA. Together they tried to set principles of CDA which should cover and label all the differences and similarities of the various schools (Wodak 2001: 4). Further important cornerstones of CDA are also van Dijk's journal *Discourse and Society* (1990), the publication of Norman Fairclough's *Language and Power* (1989) and Ruth Wodak's *Language, Power and Ideology* (1989) (Oberhuber 2008: 274). Meanwhile, CDA has been recognized as a linguistic research frame even though it is still frequently subject to criticism among scholars.

The philosophical foundation of CDA can be traced back to Michel Foucault. His writings are of significant importance when it comes to conceptualizing the relationship of discursive and non-discursive practices. Foucault initiated the tradition to analyse the constitutive function of discourse in order to (re)construct reality. He introduced and defined many terms (e.g. 'dispositive', 'diagram', 'discipline', 'microphysics of power', 'governmentality') for that purpose. Foucault started by analysing the internal structure and the systematic conception of discourse. Then he

described social practices and institutions only to afterwards observe the relationship between these two scientific fields. He coined the concept of power/knowledge and stated that

> (…) power and knowledge directly imply one another (…) there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. (Foucault quoted, in Oberhuber 2008: 277)

With that notion Foucault displayed the direct influence language can have upon social reality.

Power in a Foucauldian tradition can basically be found everywhere as it is understood as the "structuring of a possible field of action" (Oberhuber 2008: 277). Thereby, it is found in every social field, no matter of the importance or grandness. Local power is always related to discursive practices and, moreover, knowledge is always crucial for the reproduction of institutionalised power (Oberhuber 2008: 278). Besides Foucault, CDA is also inspired by other philosophers — Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser, Jürgen Habermas and Pierre Bourdieu — who also worked on power relations involved in discourse.

From a linguistic point of view, most critical discourse analysts use Halliday's systematic functional grammar as a linguistic reference. That means that an understanding of Halliday's theoretical approaches seem to be of great importance to apply CDA properly (Wodak 2001: 9). Halliday stresses the importance of the relation between grammatical systems and the social and personal functions language has to serve. He differentiates between different tasks of language; he distinguishes between;

1. Ideational meta-function: language lends structure to experience
2. Interpersonal meta-function*:* serves a better understanding of the relationship between participants of discourse
3. Textual meta-function: displays the coherence and cohesion of a discourse situation (after Wodak 2001: 9).

Against this background, CDA emerged from a theoretical approach developed by Gunther Kress called Critical Linguistics (CL) (Wodak 2001: 5). Many of the basic assumptions of CDA can also be found in CL. These include presumptions like;

a) language is a social phenomenon
b) not only individuals but also larger institutions or social groups have certain ideologies which they express through language
c) the text is the most relevant unit for communication
d) readers/ hearers are no passive recipients and there are similarities between the language of science and the one of institutions (Wodak 2001: 6).

As already mentioned above, CDA cannot be regarded as a theoretical unity and therefore, scholars are not bound to a certain linguistic approach to analyse texts. Consequently, many different sub branches have developed within CDA. The lack of a uniform theory is why it is generally agreed upon that any method in linguistics, humanities and social sciences can be used in order to gain insights into the pragmatic relationship between social and political power inequalities and discourse. Therefore, different approaches developed which are represented by different scholars. The most important one's are Fairclough, Wodak and van Dijk and the characteristics of their approaches will be examined more closely in the subsequent chapters to show the wide range of possibilities of CDA. While Norman Fairclough defines the relationship between language and society according to Halliday's multifunctional linguistic theory and the concept of orderliness in accordance to Foucault (Fairclough 1995: 29 f.), Wodak and van Dijk introduce a socio-cognitive level (Meyer 2001: 15).

2.3 Different Critical Discourse Analytical Approaches

2.3.1 Norman Fairclough: Textually Oriented Discourse Analysis

Norman Fairclough's work is inspired by Marxist theory, which he uses in order to display social conflicts and injustices manifested in discourse. His approach is especially concerned with dominance, difference and resistance and it is based on Foucault who claims that all kind of action is discursive and that intrinsic properties of discourse are crucial for gaining a reliable interpretation of a situation. He is interested in how far social practices and norms are shaped by discourse.

Fairclough understands CDA as a method to analyse the dialectic relationship between semiosis and other aspects of social practices (Meyer 2001: 22). "These semiotic aspects of social practices are responsible for the constitution of genres and styles" (Meyer 2001: 22). That means that Fairclough is especially interested in the double effect of formal linguistic properties, sociolinguistic speech genres, and formally sociological practices. In *Language and Power* (1989) he developed the concept of 'synthetic personalisation' which serves to analyse the effects of mass-crafted discourse, such as advertising, marketing and political or media discourse, upon people. In his opinion, 'synthetic personalisation' is part of a large-scaled technologization of discourse. Technical developments in the field of communication would bring new scientific possibilities for the interpretation of discourse.

Fairclough's main proposition is that practices are discursively shaped and that with the help of CDA a better understanding of these practices is possible. In light of Halliday's systematic functional linguistics, Fairclough tries to examine the social task language serves (Meyer 2001: 22).

2.3.2 Ruth Wodak: Discourse Historical Approach

Ruth Wodak has to be regarded as a linguistically orientated critical discourse analyst. Together with her Austrian colleague Martin Reisigl she

tries to establish a 'theory of discourse'. Her Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) is interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, and analyzes the development of discourse over a certain time. She constantly tries to combine theoretical discourse studies with ethnographic fieldwork.

Her theory of DHA was developed in 1986 during the Austrian presidential campaign of Kurt Waldheim. She tried to investigate the anti-semitic 'Feindbild' and how it was presented in public discourse (Wodak 2008: 300).

Ruth Wodak defines discourse as a

> complex bundle of simultaneous and sequential, interrelated linguistic acts, which manifest themselves within and across the social fields of action as thematically interrelated semiotic, oral or written tokens, very often as 'texts', that belong to specific semiotic types, i.e. genres.
>
> (Meyer 2001: 21)

In her approach she explores the interrelationship between fields of action, genres, discourse and texts which leads to the conclusion that DHA is closely related to general social theory. Basically, her theory can be considered a historical analysis of discourse. This in its turn forces her to use the term 'context' in a slightly different way than other critical discourse analysts.

Wodak claims that one should not try to establish standardised grand social theories but rather develop individual conceptual tools which serve to solve specific problems as every problem is individual. The main field of DHA is political discourse and she uses linguistic theories, such as the argumentation theory, to gain insights (Meyer 2001: 22). Five basic research questions are especially relevant according to her theory (Wodak 2008: 302);

1. How are persons referred to linguistically?
2. What qualities and characteristics are they attributed with?
3. By what reasoning are certain people included into or excluded from a certain group?
4. From what perspective are they attributed?

5. Are the “respective utterances articulated overtly, (…) intensified or (…) mitigated” (Wodak 2008: 302)

Maybe one reason why DHA was developed by an Austrian linguist can be traced back to the fact that in the German-speaking academic tradition, research on language and politics has always had a strong historical focus. This has its origins in the 19th century when ‘historism’ became the dominant paradigm in humanities. Therefore, not only historians but also scholars from other classical, humanistic fields tried to use historical approaches in their own disciplines in order to describe the meaning of “specific constellations of institutions and cultural productions” (Oberhuber 2008: 272). The aim was to depict the individual characteristics of every event rather than to develop superficial approaches of analysis. As a consequence, there was a focus on the historical roots of their objects of studies (Oberhuber 2008: 272).

2.3.3 Teun A. van Dijk: Socio-Psychological Approach

Social theories claim that discourse participants do not only rely on personal experiences in speech acts but mainly upon collective social perceptions which are named ‘social representations’. Social representations have to be understood as the link between personal, cognitive and social systems. They are shared by a group of individuals but are not global systems representing society as a whole. These constructs together with personal, cognitive experiences “constitute a hierarchical order of mutual dependency” (Meyer 2001: 21).

Van Dijk does not entirely agree with this approach. He developed a socio-psychological approach of analysis and claims that there are mental constructs which are stored in episodic memory - a part of the long-term memory - where people can store experiences. With the help of his ‘context model’ theory he can constitute mental representations of the structure of communicative situations that are important for a discourse participant in a certain discourse situation. The cognitively based theory turns out to be part of a broader social theory (van Dijk 2008: 23). ‘Context models’ control the

‘pragmatic’ part of discourse while ‘event models’ deal with the semantic part (Meyer 2001: 21).

Van Dijk mentions three important social representations which are relevant for the understanding of discourse; knowledge (e.g.: personal, cultural, …), attitudes and ideologies. He claims that discourse can only be understood if the social situation and structure, action and actor are conceptualized via social representations (Meyer 2001: 21).

Van Dijk highlights that not all types of discourse have the same impact upon the (re)production of social reality and that, for example, public discourse is more influential than private discourse. Typically, influential discourse can be found in symbolic elite positions such as politics, journalism, science, schools or literature. These institutions play an important role when it comes to the construction of “dominant knowledge and ideology in society” (Wodak 2008: 299). Since prejudice or ideology is at least partially acquired by society these ‘elite’ positions are a prime source of shared ethnic prejudices, ideologies and common sense in general. Here van Dijk puts his main focus; in the development of theoretical models which explain cognitive processes which cause the production or the reproduction of racist ideologies.

2.4 Central Concepts

2.4.1 Context

The definition of context varies significantly in different linguistic genres. As context is a main concern for critical discourse analysts, it is important to discuss the meaning of the term. ‘Context’ is often used both in scholarly and everyday discourse without really specifying the actual meaning of the word. Generally, one can say that it informs about the ‘situation’, ‘circumstance’ or ‘environment’ of a text.

Using the term informally, one would roughly describe place, time and participants of an event. In other words, it can wrongly be understood as ‘background material’. This view is even supported by many critical discourse analysts who are not too concerned with the theoretical

background of ‘context’. For example, Fairclough states that context is background knowledge and he considers “all background material as ‘knowledge’” (1995: 44). From his point of view, context is important to make sense out of certain information. This does not seem to be enough, at least not when it comes to the analysis of political discourse where other factors, like political conditions, ideological viewpoints of both speakers and the recipient seem even more important than a superficial description of a situation.

That means that the understanding of a text and its interpretation requires profound historical and contextual information (van Dijk 2008: 5). Moreover, it is important to keep in mind that context, as the word already indicates, can also be property of previous texts, meaning that it is not always clearly expressed but rather signalled or assumed (van Dijk 2008: 19).

Basically, CDA proposes that discourse should be analysed with regard to the social condition it appears in, especially when it comes to the analysis of power and power abuse. Teun van Dijk has been very influential in the development of explicit theories.

It is important to realize that even if context is not the same as ‘background knowledge’ or ‘knowledge of the world’, it is closely related. In the preface of his book *Discourse and context. A sociocognitive approach* van Dijk (2008) defines his basic premise:

> It is not the social situation that influences (or is influenced by) discourse, but the way the participants *define* such a situation.

In order to produce and to interpret a text or talk reliably, the awareness of the context in which it was produced is a necessity. This is, as already mentioned above, especially the case when it comes to the understanding of political discourse where power relations between actors, place, time, institution, political action and knowledge affects the way of acting in a most obvious way (van Dijk 2008: 3). Therefore, the analysis of political discourse has to go beyond a grammatical, lexical, textual or interactional examination. One needs specific political knowledge of the world, call it macro-knowledge, to understand political meanings (van Dijk 1998).

> In other words, understanding discourse means understanding text/talk-in-context. Hence, discourse analysis and conversation analysis need to make explicit what contexts are and how exactly their relations between contexts and text or talk are to be analyzed in ways how language users do this. (van Dijk 2008:3)

2.4.1.1 A Multidisciplinary Theory on Context

Van Dijk has developed a theoretical concept which depicts the difference and interdependency of what he defines as the macro and micro level of context. He states that context has to be understood as a depiction of the subjective understanding of a discourse situation and that it would be wrong to ascribe only objective qualities to it (van Dijk 2008: 16). Still, he does not deny that there are objective elements such as time or place and that these elements can be quantified. In spite of these objective elements, the understanding of social situations is dependent on the listener's subjective interpretation of a situation. As communicative situations can only be interpreted subjectively, contexts are always unique constructs.

These subjective constructs are named 'context models'. They represent relevant information which is necessary to understand the communicative environment and an ongoing discourse. That means that in principle the function of such a model is to make sure that participants are able to produce and understand texts (van Dijk 2008: 18). These models are necessary in order to find solutions to complex everyday problems and are dynamic, meaning that they are constructed newly in every communicative situation and then constantly updated and redefined (van Dijk 2008: 18).

> These dynamic models control all ongoing perception and interaction and consist of such basic categories as spatiotemporal Setting, Participants and their various identities, ongoing Events or Actions, as well as current Goal(s). (van Dijk 2008: 16)

However, context models do not have to be rebuilt entirely from scratch in every single interaction. As the interpretation of a unique, ongoing event has to go fast one can presume that all contexts consist of certain schemas – a certain basis of information - as otherwise a participant would not be able to actually understand conversation in real-time. These

context schemas might be culturally variable even if some contents might be universal (van Dijk 2008: 22).

The most important assumption which has to be considered when talking about context is the fact that it has a cognitive basis which controls discourse production and comprehension. This cognitive basis is what has formerly been called the influence of society on text and talk and it guarantees that language users are able to produce appropriate discourse in certain communicative situations. That means that a broader cognitive theory is necessary as the theory has to consider social and cultural conditions which are shared by the discourse participants (van Dijk 2008: 17).

Even though each model is a unique interpretation of a communicative situation, van Dijk highlights that a shared social basis can be found in structure and construction of, for example, shared social cognitions as knowledge, attitude, ideologies or grammar. That means that there is an intersubjective dimension which is necessary to participate in coherent discourse. This intersubjective dimension is similar to the concept of ‘common ground‘ (van Dijk 2008: 17), which has a similar meaning as ‘common knowledge’.

Overall, the concept of context consists of two dimensions which are running simultaneously; firstly, there is the personal context which tells about your subjective, previous knowledge and secondly, there is the social knowledge which is closely associated with what can be understood as “common ground” (van Dijk 2008: 16 f.).

Furthermore, there is also a great ego-centric element in context. This ego-centric nature affects deictic choices e.g. the distinction between in-group or out-group members, which is expressed by ideological pronouns *Us* and *Them* (van Dijk 2008: 20). That means that context also influences the appropriateness of certain expressions in certain communicative situations.[2] For example, *tu* and *vous* are on a par from a semantic point of view but they carry and evoke different connotations and denotations. The term ‘appropriateness’ is not defined very precisely and

[2] For instance, one’s register depends on the communicative situation. The same information is presented differently to different people, e.g. one speaks differently to a collegue, apprentice, employer or emplyoee.

therefore, all levels of text or talk (intonation, lexical selection, turn distribution or frequency) would need a precise register description.

2.4.1.2 The Macro-Structure in Context Models

As already mentioned above, cognitive context schemes are simply structured as otherwise the production and understanding of discourse in real-time could not work out. That leads to the assumption that these schemas do not contain broad social or cultural information. However, such a conclusion would contradict the generally accepted assumption that discourse is controlled by social structure or culture. In the unpublished text "Macro contexts" (van Dijk 2004), Van Dijk claims that a cognitive level of understanding providing us with macro-information would solve the problem.

The 'macro level' needs similar categories as the situation-specific 'micro-level'. Van Dijk claims that the two different cognitive levels are interrelated but separated (van Dijk 2004). The table below demonstrates how the macro- and micro-level correlate with each other.

	Micro	**Macro**
Setting	*interaction time, location*	*period (days, months, …), space (city, country*
Participants	*persons*	*groups, institutions, organisations*
Identities	*professor*	*e.g., ethnic group, school*
Roles	*teach*	*e.g., education*
Relations	*personal power*	*e.g., institutional power*
Knowledge	*personal knowledge*	*social knowledge*
Action	*e.g., explain*	*macro act of group, institution: educate, etc.*

Table 1: The contextual micro and macro level (after van Dijk 2004)

We can see that much of the information we gain from the macro categories is information one would take for granted and is accessible

whenever we need it. Discourse participants do not always constantly have to be aware of the macro-information but can revert to it when cognition problems or conflicts need to be solved.

The awareness of macro information permits the discourse producer to avoid the permanent start from the scratch. Mostly, a text producer considers the setting information, meaning date, year, country and city, as the macro context. This macro context is not permanently activated in the working memory but should be regarded as situational knowledge which is available when needed, for example, in a control memory (van Dijk 2004). The macro contextual information is only aroused when needed. “(F)or instance, when setting information is referred to or presupposed in the discourse” (van Dijk 2004). When writing for a newspaper the text producer has to evaluate the prototypical readership and by that decides on the knowledge s/he can presuppose. Hereby, the awareness of the macro context is useful as its permanent repetition would bore the readership (van Dijk 2004).

To sum up, macro and micro information use the same categories but move on different levels. The information one gains on the macro level summarizes the social environment in which discourse takes place, while the micro level provides one with more specific information about a certain situations (van Dijk 2004).

2.4.2 Power and Ideology

2.4.2.1 Power and Dominance

Generally there are two approaches for the definition of ‘power’ and ‘dominance’. Firstly, the ‘mainstream tradition of power research’ goes back to Weber and his analysis of authority in a state and secondly, the ‘second-stream tradition of power research’ which is often referred to as the ‘persuasive form’ of the usage of power.

The ‘mainstream tradition of power research’ claims that power is not only found in states but also in sovereign institutions and Weber accentuates the fact that power in a state is based upon an

interdependency between the state and its people, meaning that power only exists when people accept the executed power (Mayr 2008: 12). The mainstream tradition labels ‘power as domination’. It is based upon the critical power studies of Lukes’ (1974) in which he exposes his own theoretical concept. Lukes is concerned with how certain issues are kept out of politics altogether and according to him, “conflicts of interest are latent rather than actual” (Mayr, 2008: 12). By that, he indicates his concern about the lack of transparency of the real interests of which recipients are often not aware. This leads to the conclusion that institutions can shape values through discourse and influence people’s actions even when political aims are not coherent with the true interests of the public (Mayr 2008: 13). According to Lukes, “A exercises power over B when A affects B in a manner contrary to B’s interest” (Lukes 1974: 34, quoted in Mayr 2008: 14).

When it comes to the ‘second-stream tradition of power research’ the focus is not so much on the organizational description of power but rather on the analysis of strategies and techniques used in order to gain power (Mayr 2008: 13). A central figure in the development of the second-stream tradition is Gramsci whose concept of ‘hegemony’ describes how mechanisms are used by dominant groups to persuade subordinate groups to accept values and cognitive concepts through ideological means. Gramsci’s approach leads us to the main question of CDA; How does discourse construct ideology which often appears to be ‘common sense’?

Gramsci states that a major factor for the establishment of power is the necessity of ‘consent’ between subordinate groups. ‘Authority’ of institutions is protected through coercion executed by installed organizations such as the military or police (Mayr 2008: 14).

Foucault examines the relationship between power, knowledge and institutions. He regards power as “far more diffused and dispersed, and describes it as a ‘productive network which runs through the whole social body’” (Mayr 2008: 15) and is characterized through the vital role of discourse. Foucault accentuates that power “produces reality (…) identities, knowledge and possibilities for behaviour and it does this through discourse” (Mayr 2008: 15). According to him, power is irrevocably interconnected with ‘knowledge’ as the two concepts directly imply each

other. Just as Gramsci, Foucault proposes that power is established through the internalization of norms and values and that people are originally born as free ‘subjects’, who through the implementation of commonsensical knowledge are turned into ‘disciplined individuals’.

2.4.2.2 Power in CDA

Non-linguistic concepts such as ‘power’ and ‘dominance’ in discourse situations are a main issue for critical discourse analysts. It is particularly important for the analysis of political speeches as the fundamental idea of politics can be summarized as an attempt to gain or extend power. Van Dijk summarizes complex philosophical and social analyses and simply defines power in terms of ‘control’ (van Dijk 1998). His definition is functional and he defines ‘power’ by characterizing it;

a) Power is manifested in interaction
b) It creates ideology
c) It operates on the mind of people

Power can be described by the principle that a group that has power is able to control or influence acts and minds of other groups (van Dijk 1998). One gains power with the help of a strategic manipulation of people’s ideology, namely with the help of an ideological usage of language (Fairclough 2001: 2).

Critical discourse analysts generally regard power as a central condition in social life. Fairclough claims that power is found in every discursive event and has to be defined both in its local and global social context (van Dijk 1998). He uses a Gramscian approach towards power and hegemony and considers discursive practices as social struggles against the hegemony over the order of discourse. That means that language is used to challenge, subvert or alter power conditions (Wodak 2001: 11).

Power is not only established with the help of grammatical or lexical forms but also with positions and control in social occasions. “It is often

exactly within the genres associated with given social occasions that power is exercised or challenged" (Wodak 2001: 11). Power does not exclusively or automatically result from a witty usage of language. It can develop because of different reasons, including the obvious modality of physical force (Fairclough, 2001: 3). It is noteworthy that power is only seldom absolute but mostly shared between participants (Wodak 2008: 298). There are different forms of power which can be used by people in different ways. These ways of exercising power are dynamical and depend on the behaviour of the discourse participants (van Dijk 1998).

There are different ways how people can gain power in discourse. Fairclough states that the most prominent and obvious devices are 'interruption', 'enforcing explicitness', 'controlling topic', 'formulation' (2001: 113). These strategic forms are useful in active discourse, where at least two participants take part in discourse situations. In political speeches, on the other hand, they are only useful to a certain degree as e.g. interruption does not really take place. Only formulation and enforcing explicitness can be seen as sources of power in speeches. Therefore, politicians have to use grammatical and lexical strategies to expand support and thereby increase their power.

2.4.2.3 Control of Text and Talk through the Control of Mind

Both, control of content and rhetorical style are important if one wants to use text or talk to increase power. Through the use of certain lexical or grammatical choices a "Positive Self-Presentation of the dominant ingroup, and a Negative Other-Presentation of the dominated outgroups" (van Dijk 1998) can be created and by that power relations are adjusted.

The control and steerage of discourse situations is a major form of performing power. Therefore, it should also be mentioned that through a skilful usage of language dominance and hegemony can be achieved. The handy phrase of 'mind control' summarizes a complex cognitive process. According to van Dijk (1998) power and dominance can be achieved in different ways; i.e.

a) recipients tend to believe sources which they regard as authoritative
b) there are situations where participants are obliged to be consumers of discourse e.g. in education where pupils are supposed to learn the material given to them by a powerful instructor
c) often there is no alternative material that can provide the listener with alternative opinions on a topic
d) social actors might not really have the knowledge and therefore not the position to question information which is exposed to them.

These points suggest that discursive mind control mainly is a result of a lack of alternative sources. A limited access to discursive freedom is therefore, part of the definition of power, hegemony and domination.

2.4.3 Dissemination or Implementation as the Result of Discursive Power

The central idea of political language is the dissemination and implementation of political concepts and ideas. Even if there is not yet a systematic field of scientific enquiry, Oberhuber (2008) tries to give a broad overview of these two concepts which I will summarize as they are of central concern for 'spin doctors'[3] and thereby, also for critical discourse analysts.

Oberhuber claims that both dissemination and implementation do not only result from linguistic but also from 'extra-linguistic' processes. Therefore, they cannot be discussed as exclusively linguistic concepts. Linguists try to use other scientific disciplines such as sociology or political science in order to explain these phenomena (2008: 271). Both dissemination and implementation are understood from an 'actor-centred perspective', meaning the main questions are,

[3] 'Spin doctors' are political advisors and speech writers. For instance, Obama's speeches were written by Jonathan Favreau.

> who tries to disseminate what, where, why and by what means? Who implements what, why, in what context and by what means? (Oberhuber, 2008: 271).

Oberhuber adapts Norman Fairclough's ideas on dissemination and implementation of political concepts and summarizes them in a cyclical model (2008: 275). First, there is the 'establishment and articulation' of emerging discourse which brings elements of already existing discourse "into a particular, new articulation" (Oberhuber 2008: 275) and through political struggle the new discourse may become hegemonic in certain social fields. The next step is 'dissemination' which takes place across institutional structures (e.g. between social or public services such as education or health care) and different scales (e.g. global vs. international, national vs. local). Dissemination causes recontextualisation of "discourse into new social fields, institutions, organisations, countries, localities" (Oberhuber 2008: 275). Finally, there is 'implementation' where discourse has changed discursive, as well as non-discursive elements of social realities and institutionalised discourse. Implementation results into new ways of acting and being but also into new organised, institutional social relations.

2.4.4 Ideology

The aim of CDA is to explore ideologies, understand their reasons and afterwards 'demystify' and 'denaturalize' them by deciphering them (Fairclough 1995: 36). Mayr (2008: 10) defines 'ideology' as a fuzzy term which is hard to explain. Still, one can identify two broad categories of definitions;

> a relativist definition, denoting systems of ideas, beliefs and practices, and a critical definition, allied with Marxist theory, which sees it as working in the interests of a social class and/or cultural group (Mayr 2008:10).

Eagleton took a closer look at different theories that have handled the issue of ideology and came to the conclusion that these theories have in common that ideology is always the result of history. He claims that there

are specific historical reasons for why people “feel, reason, desire and imagine as they do” (Wodak 2001: 10).

Thompson (1990) defines the study of ideology as the study of how meaning is constructed and mediated by “symbolic forms of various kinds” (Thompson 1990, quoted in Wodak 2001: 10). The analyst can investigate in how far these forms establish or sustain constructs of hegemony. His definition is widely accepted among critical discourse analysts.

CDA uses the term ideology in a critical sense which is based upon Gramsci’s concept of hegemony through consent. Fairclough (1992: 87) in his turn defines ideology as

> significations/constructions of reality (the physical world, social relations, social identities) which are built into various dimensions of the forms/meanings of discursive practices, and which contribute to the production, reproduction or transformation of relations of domination. (Mayr 2008: 11)

With this critical understanding of the term Fairclough defines ideology as “meaning in the service of power” (Fairclough in Mayr 2008: 11). Ideologies serve the interests of powerful groups or institutions and ensure that certain behaviour and practices are considered being commonsensical. Ideology turns out to be an important concept for dominant groups as it provides them with a notion about how subordinate groups around them interpret the world (Mayr 2008: 11).

Fairclough affirms that ideology is neither only due to grammatical and lexical ‘structure’, nor only to the event itself (1995: 71). Van Dijk supports Fairclough’s accentuation of the grammatical and lexical influence and agrees that not only the event carries ideological meaning but that also lexical and syntactical surface structure influences the recipient (1998). An example of how lexical structures influence viewpoints would be the lexical construction ‘freedom fighter’ or ‘terrorist’ which evoke different connotations, even though one might refer to the same person. Another example is the presentation of opinions with the help of grammatical strategies, e.g. the choice between active or passive sentence structures.

Fairclough highlights the discursive event itself and points out that ideology can be found in ‘texts’. The question of what level of language is

ideologically most loaded is justified and depends on the concrete discursive situation.

Although, there is the common assumption that mainly lexical meanings carry ideology, there are also other important factors. For instance, “presuppositions, implicatures, metaphors, and coherence” (Fairclough 1995: 74) are all aspects of meaning. Also style may be of great importance when it comes to the creation of ideology, especially when it comes to speeches where politicians choose a certain style to persuade their listeners and thereby try to create a positive self-presentation.

While it is true that both style and content of a text bear ideological implications it is also true that a text itself cannot form ideology as the ideological message depends upon the interpretation of the recipient (Fairclough 1995: 71). The aim to discover ideological processes only through the analysis of texts is therefore obsolete and one realizes that only a more profound investigation can deliver reliable findings. Such a profound investigation requires the consideration of the historical situation in which a text appears.

A critical discourse analyst, as already mentioned above in this chapter, tries to demystify texts and filter out ideology which skilled speakers try to naturalize. In order to do so, ‘commonsensical ideology’ and ‘background knowledge’, which are closely connected to each other, have to be considered. Common sense is the colloquial use of language of which people are not really consciously aware (Fairclough 2001: 2). When views or opinions become commonsensical they are imperceptible as ideologies (Fairclough 1995: 42). For instance, Fairclough gives the example of how we understand and treat authority as natural. A doctor knows about medicine while the patient does not. Therefore, the doctor is in the position to tell how a health problem should be dealt with while the patient is not. The prototypical correlation between the two participants is that the doctor is supposed to make decisions and control the course of the consultation and of the treatment while the patient has to cooperate. These assumptions, which are mainly embedded in discourse, are a good example of naturalization of ideology (Fairclough 2001: 2).

Ideologies can be ‘naturalized’ to either a greater or lesser extent (Fairclough 1995: 35). If ideologies and beliefs become naturalized they become part of a ‘knowledge base’, which controls the orderliness of interaction. Such orderliness is a necessity as without it there would not be a way to make sense out of discourse. (Fairclough 1995: 35).

3. Political rhetoric:

The origin of rhetoric as a persuasive technique is closely related to the origin of democracy and can be dated back to the fifth century BC (Joseph 2006: 110). Rhetoric did not appear out of nothing but people have always been confronted with opponents who were not like-minded and who therefore had to be convinced and persuaded (Joseph 2006: 110).

The first teachers of rhetoric were called ‘Sophists’ by their philosophical enemies who thought that truth should not result from persuasive language but purely from argumentative superiority. Their most prominent critic was Socrates. While Socrates was training philosophers, Sophists were preparing lawyers and politicians (Joseph 2006: 110). In contrast to Socrates, Aristotle insisted that the persuasive aspect of language is only problematic when a speaker tries to persuade the discursive opponent by appealing to emotions and not to reason. He underlined the importance of studying the methods of emotional persuasive strategies to protect him/ herself from emotional rhetorical devices (Joseph 2006: 111).

3.1 What is Political Rhetoric?

Before discussing specific linguistic strategies in political rhetoric and their manipulative possibilities I will try to define what a ‘speech’ actually is.

> A speech is a structured verbal chain of coherent speech acts uttered on a special occasion for a specific purpose by a single person, and addressed to a more or less specific audience. (Reisigl 2008b: 243)

Generally, one can claim that a political speech consists of three macro-structural parts; a. introduction (exordium), b. main part (consisting of narration, and argumentation) and c. conclusion (peroration) (Reisigl 2008b: 253). Speeches often have a rather open organization and the individual parts mostly gear into each other.

Classical rhetoric distinguishes between three different forms of oratory; the judicial (genus iudiciale), the deliberative (genus deliberativum)

and the epideictic (genus demonstrativum) speech. This differentiation is abstract as speakers tend to mix the genres (Reisigl 2008b: 244).

Political speeches are related to the principles of 'clarity and understandability' (perspicuitas), 'grammatical correctness' (puritas), 'evidence or vividness' (evidential) and 'adequacy' (aptum) (Reisigl 2008a: 96). As speeches are always planned and never pure improvisations, politicians tend to produce longer and more complex sentences to explain certain problems in more depth and detail (Savoy 2009).

Persuasive language can be produced with the help of 'logos', 'ethos' or 'pathos'. 'Logos' is established through sound argumentation (probare), factual information (docere), reasonable admonition or exhortation (monere). 'Ethos' and 'pathos' are non-argumentative linguistic forces, such as 'emotionalization', propaganda or the use of threats. While 'ethos' creates a gentle and constant spirit and uses a soft tone and by that adverts ideas (conciliare) through the insertion of aesthetic linguistic devices (delectare), 'pathos' is used to evoke fierce or other intense emotional feelings (Reisigl 2008a: 97).[4]

After having described the objectives of rhetoric more precisely it becomes obvious that by analyzing political speeches from a critical angle one has to "analyze the employment and effect of linguistics (including nonverbal) and other semiotic means of persuasion in rhetorical terms" (Reisigl 2008a: 97). As this thesis investigates the difference between Obama's liberal and Bush's conservative language it will neither describe nonverbal rhetorical strategies, nor analyze the effect of speeches on the audience. Indeed, I will only discuss linguistic and structural choices and possible reasons why certain linguistic decisions were taken.

[4] It is interesting that the tone of speeches depends on current political conditions. For instance, whenever a society experiences restriction in freedom, plausible argumentation tends to decrease. On the other hand, when there are periods of strong democracy, argumentation becomes more important (Reisigl 2008a: 254).

3.2 A Politolinguistic Approach

Politolinguistic theory differentiates between three central terms; polity, policy and politics. That underlines that speeches can be ‘political’ in a threefold sense.

When investigating ‘polity’ one is concerned with the political frame, meaning, that the “formal and structural framework” (Reisigl 2008a: 98) of political actions are the major concern of investigation. Polity deals with “basic political norms, principles, rules and values of a political culture” (Reisigl 2008a: 98) as well as legal procedures, institutions and the system which executes political order. It is a precisely defined dimension and from a linguistic viewpoint ‘logos’ and ‘ethos’ are central objectives.

When discussing ‘policy’ and ‘politics’ one is concerned about political actions. Policy is the content-related dimension that shapes political life, therefore, it is bureaucratic and manifested in areas such as domestic affairs, foreign, economic and social policy. One could also describe ‘policy’ as an ideological dimension while, in contrast, politics is the enforcement of political decisions taken by political actors (Reisigl 2008a: 98).

Reisigl (2008a: 98f.) differentiates between different political fields where a politolinguistic approach would be of interest for a critical discourse analytical approach.

1. Law-making procedure
2. Formation of attitudes
3. Party-internal formation of attitudes
4. Inter-party formation of attitudes
5. Organization of internal and interstate relations
6. Political advertising
7. Poltical administration
8. Political control

The research questions raised in a politolinguistic study depend on the topic discussed in particular. Still, Reisigl suggests lead questions which are useful for the analysis of political speeches and are particularly helpful

for the examination of populist rhetoric, such as nationalist, anti-Semitic, racist, sexist rhetoric (2008a: 99).

1. Nomination: How are social actors named?
2. Predication: What negative or positive traits, qualities and features are attributed to the social actors?
3. What arguments and argumentation schemes are used to justify the
   statements and claims containing specific nominations and predications?
4. Perspectivation: From what perspective are nominations, predications and arguments expressed?
5. Are the respective utterances intensified or mitigated? If yes, through what rhetorical strategies? (Reisigl 2008a: 99)

These questions help to analyse a speech superficially while concrete linguistic theories provide more specific information about the rhetorical strategies. In particular question five seems to be of interest for my thesis as it concretely addresses the manipulative possibilities of language.

3.3 Pronouns

Generally, traditional linguists treat pronouns in the literal sense of replacing a noun. More recent attempts to define pronouns regard them not only as tools to replace nouns, but they are accounted for in terms of how to address speech participants. This view does not cover the entire complexity of pronouns and does not explain how pronouns can express different social relations.

One of the first attempts to show how a social hierarchy can be expressed with pronouns was made by Brown and Gilman (1960). They state that the relationship between listener and speaker influences deictic choices. That means that pronouns generate the identity of ‘self’ and ‘others’. This claim undermines the importance of a proper analysis of pronouns in political rhetoric. As the ideological dichotomy is a central part

of politics, a politolinguistic approach needs to discover how the “Us vs. Them” distinction is aroused by a speaker.

Pronouns are important for the analysis of two central concepts of CDA, namely for the investigation of the generation of ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’ (Brown and Gilman 1960: 253). This proves their manipulative possibilities and explains why a close investigation is necessary for politolinguists.

The following quote is taken from a pamphlet written by George Fox, a Quaker from the seventeenth century and shows how social dichotomy is created with the help of pronouns.

> Moreover when the Lord sent me forth into the world, He forbade me to put off my hat to any, high or low; and I was required to Thee and Thou all men and women, without any respect to rich or poor, great or small (George Fox quoted, in Brown and Gilman 1960: 265)

Pronominal choices influence the perception of the listener and the speaker as they, for instance, imply information about the social status of the discourse participants.

A historical perspective shows that in Latin basically ‘tu’ was used in the singular and ‘vos’ served in the plural. In the fourth century people started to use ‘vos’ when addressing the emperor. There are several explanations of how this may have come about but it is a widely spread assumption that as there were two emperors ruling at that time, one in Constantinople and one in Rome, this led to an implicit plurality (Brown and Gilman 1960: 253).

The usage of ‘we’ to refer to a single person – the royal ‘we’ - is still casually used by people in superior positions. Not only royal people speak of themselves in plural terms. For instance, when Margaret Thatcher announced that her son and his wife had had a baby she proclaimed “We are a grandmother” for which she was teased and criticised badly as people started to complain about her haughtiness (Wilson 1990: 46).

The analysis of pronouns in political speeches is of great importance as they influence people’s overall perception of the delivered message (Beard 2000: 44).

3.3.1 Pronouns in Political Speeches

Generally, there are five different ways of how politicians introduce new measures (Beard 2000: 44). Each way has a different effect and is used for different purposes.

1. First singular pronoun: 'I'
2. First person plural pronoun: 'We'
3. Their position: 'the government must raise taxes'
4. No agentive pronoun at all: 'It has been found necessary to raise taxes by 20 per cent'
5. Metonymy; by making what they have created an agent itself: 'This budget will help all those on low incomes' (Beard 2000: 44 f.)

The first two points listed above contain pronominal manipulation while the others do not. We realize that subjective pronouns can be inserted intentionally to create solidarity or power (Brown and Gilman 1960). The choice of pronouns has to be done consciously as they are indexical and it is taken for granted that certain knowledge is shared with both listener and speaker, meaning, the speaker has to decide how much knowledge can be presupposed (Widdowson 1992: 20). John Wilson (1990) made a precise theoretical investigation of pronominal choices in speeches and came to the conclusion that politicians have personal pronominal strategies. That means that pronouns are not only situation- but also person-dependent.

Moreover, the pronominal examination is important in politolinguistic analysis from a critical discourse analytical perspective as it affects but also reflects social factors of discourse participants. This is particularly important for politicians as their profession is to manipulate their audience and to use pronouns just as all other linguistic tools for manipulative purposes. Pronouns are powerful weapons as they do not directly alter the meaning or message but only influence the perception of the recipient. This is demonstrated with the help of an example given by Wilson (1990: 48);

1) Due to the rising balance of payment deficit ...

a) it has been found necessary to increase interest rates.
b) I have found it necessary to increase interest rates.
c) we have found it interesting to increase interest rates.

Each example causes a different perception and the involvement of the speaker is increased or decreased. For instance, in a) the speaker uses an agentless passive by which the actor remains unidentified, in b) there is a clear case of personal commitment caused by the first personal pronoun singular 'I', while the actor is less clear in c) and the listener has to guess the amount of personal responsibility of the speaker. We realize that the choice of reference clearly influences a listener's perception.

Generally, one has to consider three major aspects to gain reliable insights into the pronominal use of politicians;

1. Self-referencing: how does a speaker portray him/herself in relation to the topic in relation to the topic and addressee?
2. Relations of contrast: how does a speaker use pronouns in order to compare and contrast others on a negative/positive scale? E.g. instead of referring to others by name, you simply call them 'him' or 'her'
3. Other referencing: how does a speaker use pronouns in order to refer to individuals and groups outside the speaker/addressee relation? (Wilson 1990: 61)

3.3.1.1 'We' – First Person Plural

There have been many different linguistic studies on the manipulative usage of 'we' in different areas. Still, if one considers the great manipulative potential of the first person plural pronoun there is surprisingly little politolinguistic research on the topic. The strategical adoption of 'we' is reasonable when the speaker is not sure if a decision or a statement can cause a face-threatening situation or not as its interpretation is not obvious.

As mentioned above pronouns generally stand in for something or for someone (Widdowson 1992: 156). The problem with the understanding of 'we' is that one can never be sure to whom or what the pronoun actually

refers. It is only clear that the pronoun can indicate membership or express 'institutional identity' (Sacks 1992:1: 391 ff.), still, it is never clear what or who is included in the 'institutional identity' which makes the first person plural pronoun a powerful rhetorical device. If politicians decide to use 'we' they are aware of the exclusive/inclusive ambiguity (Wilson 1990: 52). While the exclusive usage of 'we' serves to include both the speaker plus one or more others, the inclusive appliance also involves the reader or listener (Fairclough 1989: 106). That means that the exclusive 'we' generally serves to create distance to the speaker (e.g.: doctor to a patient "shall we get started?") and decreases the degree of involvement (Wilson 1990: 48 f.), while the 'inclusive' usage tries to establish the impression of participated solidarity. The audience is put into a difficult situation as it has to decide whether it feels spoken to by the speaker and share responsibility or not. As already mentioned, the speaker may insert 'we' to distance or bind the speaker. Therefore, the choice between exclusive/inclusive 'we' (E-WE/I-WE) depends on a personal systematic scheme and on the topic (Wilson 1990: 55). For instance, one might use 'we' in order to highlight 'institutional solidarity'. Furthermore, politicians use 'we' to create an 'Us vs. Them' dichotomy and to separate themselves from another group or distance from a contrastive opinion. By that, the speaker promotes himself/herself or his/her group and justifies the party's causes. From the perspective of a critical discourse analyst 'we' and pronouns in general are a great source for linguistic manipulation.

Politicians often use the construction 'We have' as it entails group membership and collective involvement (Sacks 1992:1: 333ff.). The first person plural pronoun creates a fuzzy understanding of the speaker's and the listeners' personal involvement and there are many different ways how 'we' can be used and perceived.[5]

[5] For instance, it has been stated that Casper Weinberg, the former United States Secretary of Defence, had six different ways to use 'we' (Wilson 1990: 53). It has been noted that Weiberger used the I-WE considerably more often than the E-WE.

3.3.1.2 'I' – First Person Singular

In contrast to other pronouns 'I' cannot be used to refer to nouns but only in terms of self-reference. As Sacks (1992:1: 675) describes it;

> 'I' is the way I refer to myself in talk and not as a substitute for my name. So I would not say 'Harvey saw it,' 'Harvey did,' etc. demonstrating that 'I' does not substitute for 'Harvey'.' I' stands alone as marker of the speaker referring to himself/herself.

'I' has a number of functions. Sacks claims that 'I' indexes the speaker to the here and now (Sacks 1992: 1: 32). 'I' is also very useful as a rhetorical device. Wilson (1990) claims that politicians often use the first person singular pronoun in order to stress a personal position or opinion. When politicians use 'I' they try to stress involvement and responsibility and emphasize personal intentions. The speaker uses 'I' to present her/his role over an overhearing audience. One could sum up 'I' as a possibility to express identity or persona. It is of central concern for the presentation of 'self' and necessary to present oneself in a positive light. That means 'I' is used in a contrastive way to 'they' and is part of the 'self' vs. 'other' dichotomy.

Still, 'I' is not used as frequently as one might suppose as politicians tend to avoid taking full responsibility. It is a useful device for politicians when talking about future intentions as propositions and not already performed political actions cannot be criticised as easily by political opponents as the outcome of these actions is not yet clear (Wilson 1990: 52). That means that 'I' is a strong rhetorical device but only safe to use when discussing topics which do not cause face-threatening situations.

Therefore, one would suppose that Obama uses 'I' more intensively as he tries to create the image of being the personification of the beginning of a new political era and permanently discusses reformative and progressive political approaches, while Bush might prefer the exclusive/inclusive 'we' as he finds himself in a situation in which he has to defend a war which is not popular among the public.

3.3.1.3 'You' – Second Person Plural/ Singular

The grammatical understanding of the pronoun 'you' differs depending on if the linguist is a traditional grammarian or s/he treats 'you' as a social resource. Traditional linguists regard 'you' as a fixed grammatical category of reference or as a functional category (Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990). On the other hand, the ones which treat 'you' as a social resource also consider the interactive characteristics (Malon 1997, Watson 1987).

'You' offers a great range of possible interpretations as it can both refer to a second person plural or singular. Moreover, it can also bear a generic meaning. Consequently, for the purpose of multi-party conversations the interpretation of 'you' can be problematic as it is not automatically clear who is meant (Lerner 1996:281). Sacks claims that the ambiguity of 'you' is its strength, as the listener always has to feel her/himself addressed no matter if it is used in a singular or a plural sense, thereby tension is maintained permanently (1992:1: 163ff.). Sacks draws the conclusion that 'you' is useful for inclusive purposes as the hearer can never understand her/himself as excluded (1992:1: 163 ff.), unlike 'we' which, as already mentioned, has the potential to exclude the hearer from the intended membership.

Until now we have not paid any closer attention to the generic use of 'you'. The generic 'you' enables the speaker to talk about everyone (Sacks 1992:1: 163 ff.) and thereby, offers a way to talk impersonally about things. As 'you' can be used to speak about people in general it also creates the impression that an action or situation is typical. 'That is why 'you' is often used by politicians for the purpose of generalization (1992:1: 163ff.). By that the impression of affecting everyone is created and stressed. This is a characteristic of 'you' which cannot be ignored but turns the pronoun into a powerful rhetorical weapon.

'You' is often used when a speaker tries to accentuate personal experience and concern. Politicians often use 'you' in speeches in order to address members of the audience directly on an individual basis (Fairclough 1989: 106). In particular the generic 'you' is extensively used as

an indefinite pronoun as it suggests solidarity between listener and speaker. For instance, by using the frequently occurring ‘You know’ one indicates solidarity, understanding and knowledge of a situation but also deeper insight (Schiffrin 1987). Mrs. Thatcher claims in a speech

> you’ve got to be strong to your own people and other countries have to know that you stand by your word. (Mrs. Thatcher quoted, in Fairclough 1989: 107)

By that she creates a certain mood. She evokes a feeling of strength as she implicates that she is referring to herself. This quote might seem rather unambiguously descriptive of a state leader, still, this interpretation cannot be guaranteed and the audience might even so feel addressed as the statement can also be understood as a general proposition if PEOPLE and COUNTRIES would be understood as metaphors. That proves that ‘you’ can also be used for the “formulation of morals and truisms” which means that ‘you’ reflects upon conventional wisdoms opposed to actual experience (Wilson 1990: 57).

3.3.1.4 Referring to Opponents

When discussing manipulative pronominal strategies of reference it is important to take a closer look at how politicians refer not only to themselves but also to others. The most self-evident pronominal choice politicians have when referring to opponents is ‘they’ or ‘those’. Previous research on the use of ‘they’ in politics has been restricted to the study of Wilson (1990) which postulates that ‘they’ is the pronoun which creates most distant to ‘I’, which represents the individual ‘self’. Wilson’s approach is based on a pronominal distancing scale, suggested by Rees - a student of Wilson - in his diploma thesis and which was advanced by Maitland and Wilson (1987). It serves to visualize the personal pronominal system of people.

> The basic principle behind the scale is that in considering personal pronouns we begin from the most fundamental and subjective form, ‘I’ (and its variants ‘me’, ‘my’ or ‘mine’) and then progressively move outwards, or away, from this *deictic centre.* (Wilson 1990: 58).

Rees' distancing scale displays the generic position of each pronoun compared to the 'self'. Even though, it will not be used in my analysis, the distancing scale could be an interesting tool for further critical discourse analytical approaches with a sole focus on the pronominal analysis.

Wilson's approach is important to discuss as some of his findings were path-breaking and will be highly interesting for my purpose. His study goes further than the traditional grammatical approach even if it cannot explain how politicians use 'they' to construct the image of 'other'. During the last decades linguists have started to observe how 'they' is used interactively in talk-in interaction. Still, Wilson's findings seem to be more useful for my analysis as speeches are only interactional to a slight degree and therefore, the more up to date interactive approach would only be applicable to a limited extent.

Sacks claims (1992:1: 101ff.) that one can distinguish between three ways of how 'they' can be used; in an oppositional, affiliative and neutral tone. In an affiliative context the speaker connotates 'they' positively and the attempt is to create an affiliation between the 'self' and the group defined as 'they'. In contrast, in a disaffiliative context the speaker connotates 'they' negatively and establishes disaffiliation between the group referred to by 'they' and the 'self'. When one uses 'they' in a neutral context the speaker takes up a neutral position. These three contexts have to be understood as a continuum and not as three separate categories. The continuum represents a politician's willingness of affiliation with an 'other'. The amount of affiliation depends on different factors, such as the concrete topic of discussion.

Even if there are different interpretative possibilities, 'they' is most likely used to distinguish the 'self' from the 'other'. This distinction is discussed by Sacks (1992: 2: 291) who claims that 'they' usually does not imply 'I' nor 'we': for instance, "*We* watched TV … and *they* went out", means that 'I' did not *go out,* which causes a distinction between 'I' and 'they'. Malone (1997: 73 f.) claims that 'they' can be used to show us "who we are not".

By employing 'they' one creates ideological distance between oneself and an 'other' party or person. The 'self' and 'other' distinction is

intensified when a negative position towards the ‘other’ is taken up. Even though, it can be argued that ‘they’ is not automatically a strict ideological contrast to first person singular and plural, it is certainly not a form of reference with a neutral tone as it frequently evokes negative connotations among listeners. It is also often inserted when referring to only vaguely defined groups (Wilson 1990: 68).

Furthermore, also ‘those’ and ‘these’ is used when referring to someone or somewhat not belonging to the In-group. At a first glance one may assume certain similarities between ‘they’ and ‘those/these’ but I would suggest that there is a connotative difference between the pronouns. Even if ‘they’ does not imply a neutral tone and may evoke negative connotations, ‘those’ and ‘these’ are deictic markers which cause even further distance. ‘Those/These’ create a sinister image which is often intensified with negative lexical constructions like “’vicious’, ‘sinister’, ‘undermine’” (Wilson 1990: 68). Just as ‘they’, ‘those/these’ cause problems for the listener as it is not clear who is meant. All the just now discussed pronouns refer either to someone or something already mentioned or will be mentioned later on. As it refers to given or proceeding information these pronouns influence but also depend on general knowledge (Wilson 1990: 69).

As we assume that politicians tend to create their own pronominal system which depends on personal preferences but also topic, it will be interesting to investigate if there is a significant difference between Obama’s and Bush’s use of pronouns. In particular, how pronouns are used for distancing purposes. In contrast to Obama, Bush was confronted with a war which was criticised by the public. Obama might use a unifying pronominal system as he tries to refer to the future.

3.4 Lexical Choice

Lexical choice is of central concern for an analysis from a critical discourse analytical point of view. One might be surprised about the shortness of this chapter but the evaluation of lexical choice or frequency is a complex problem as a substantiated operational strategy or approach

does not exist (Savoy 2009). Still, it is self-explanatory that the repetitive choice of certain linguistic devices is of central concern and therefore has to be considered more precisely. It is interesting to at least be aware of how lexical choices influence the presentation of information.

For instance, Gay (2007) describes in a detailed way how lexical choice can be used to discuss the topic 'war'. He claims that in times of war the choice of words is of great importance as it is used in order to

> make the cruelty, inhumanity, and horror of war seem justifiable. Language becomes a tool employed by political and military officials to make people accept what ordinarily they would have repudiated if its true character were known. (Gay 2007: 497)

For example, one way to use the power of words in a manipulative way is to hush up certain facts which might be unpopular in order to retain the support of the population.

In *A Grammar of Motives* (1969) Burke claims that it is desirable to seek and use vocabulary which displays reality in a reliable way. Burke is aware that lexical choices are to some extent reductive selections of reality and he underlines that terminology elucidates human motives. Bernard Brock writes that "the act of selecting one symbol over another locks the speaker's attitude into the language" (Brock 1989: 184, quoted in DePalma et al. 2008: 314). The aim of a terminological analysis therefore is the unravelling of attitudes underlying the chosen terminologies (DePalma et al. 2008: 318).

Particularly, when analyzing war-discourse, the focus obviously also has to be put on lexical choice. For instance, one can realise the connotative difference between being called either 'freedom fighters' or 'guerrilla terrorists'. Such 'lexicalization' is called 'special pleading' and basically means that the same event can either be connotated in a positive or a negative way (Gay 2007: 504). This proves that word choice reflects attitudes.

When it comes to word choice in war-discourse, Gay distinguishes between two key concepts; first, 'negative peace' which is the temporary absence of war or the 'lull' between wars, secondly, 'positive peace' which refers to the presence of war but also the presence of justice (2007: 501).

The language of ‘negative peace’ serves to perpetuate injustice. Also official institutions such as the government use terms such as ‘villains’, ‘enemies’ or ‘the devil’ and thereby biased attitudes are divulged. These attitudes and associations can be manifested in the minds of the public and influence and foster attitudes (Gay 2007: 507). Gay warns against the language of ‘negative peace’;

> (…) in the language of negative peace, the absence of verbal assaults about ’the enemy’ merely marks a lull in reliance on warist discourse.

Gay claims that such a lull in reliance can easily turn into a more aggressive and pugnacious tone and the language of ‘positive peace’ is desirable.

The language of ‘positive peace’ “reflects the move from a lull in the occurrence of violence to its negation” (Gay 2007: 507). The language of ‘positive peace’ requires a re-thinking of the concept of war. For instance, it demands the creation of a critical vernacular that is accepted by the majority of people. Gay claims that those seeking a language of ‘positive peace’ are often silent after a war. For instance, Immanuel Kant suggests that after war a day of atonement would be appropriate as the ‘victor’ should apologise for the great sins caused against the human race, ”namely, the failure to establish a genuine and lasting peace” (Gay 2007: 508). Gay (2007: 508) states that

> language of positive peace is democratic rather than authoritarian, dialogical rather than monological, receptive rather than aggressive, meditative rather than calculative. The language of positive peace is not passive in the sense of avoiding engagement; it is pacific in the sense of seeking to actively build lasting peace and justice.

3.5 Repetition

Repetition is a central rhetorical strategy. Beard states that politicians use repetition to elicit approval (2000: 28). In particular, he mentions the ‘list of three’. According to Beard, the ‘list of three’ attracts the listener as in our culture a triplet repetition creates a sense of completeness and unity (e.g.: on your marks, set, go!). In political

discourse central words tend to be repeated. For instance, Beard (2000: 38) gives the example when Tony Blair shouted “Education, Education, Education” in 1997 and claimed that this topic would be his main concern. Another example would be Winston Churchill praising the British fighter pilots in 1940;

> Never in the fields of human conflicts has so much been owed by so many to so few. (Beard 2000: 39)

In this example, the word ‘so’ is repeated three times and a contrastive impression is created through the contrastive expressions ‘so much’, ‘so many’ and ‘so few’. A further example are the opening words of Nelson Mandela after his release from prison and the abolishment of apartheid in 1990 were he stated;

> Friends, comrades and fellow South Africans. I greet you all in the name of peace, democracy and freedom for all.

Repetition is of great importance as generally politicians need to make sure that their messages are understood and since some of their ideas are more important than others, some have to be re-emphasized or repeated in various ways as it increases the chance that as many people as possible get the message. There are cases when politicians repeat entire phrases or words (Zheng 1998) but that does not always have to be the case. Word-to-word repetition is not always necessary but instead ‘core ideas’ can be repeated (Wilson 1990: 125). By repeating ‘core ideas’, Wilson means the constant repetition of certain political issues.

Fairclough highlights that the constant repetition of certain words or phrases is “generated from divergent ideological positions” (Fairclough 1995: 34). In his view, lexicalization might become naturalized to the extent that its ‘ideological-discursive formation’ becomes dominant. Generally, Fairclough distinguishes between three different areas of lexical analysis, namely, a) Vocabulary, b) Grammar, c) Textual structure (Fairclough 2001: 91 ff.). Furthermore, he distinguishes between three types of values these formal features may have; experiential (experiential value tells about how the discourse producer’s natural or social world is constituted), relational

(the social relationships which are enacted in the discourse) and expressive (the producer's evaluation of the bit of reality one relates to).

In this diploma thesis the analysis of vocabulary will be a major concern while the analysis of grammar (question of agency, active vs. passive, modality, …) and textual structures (turn-taking, cohesion, …) (Fairclough 2001: 93) will be less important. According to Fairclough, the relevant lead questions for the analysis of word choice are;

1) What experiential values do words have?
    a) What classification schemes are drawn upon?
    b) Are there words which are ideologically contested?
    c) Is there 'rewording' or 'overwording'?
    d) What ideologically significant meaning relations (synonymy, hyponymy, antonymy) are there between words?
2) What relational values do words have?
    a) Are there euphemistic expressions?
    b) Are there markedly formal or informal words?
3) What expressive values do words have?
4) What metaphors are used?

Wilson (1990) states that a systematic metaphorical appliance can have a similar effect as repetition. He stresses that repetition of metaphors operates on two different, structural levels. First, there is the local and internal sequential level within a text, meaning the homogeneous use of metaphors within the frame of one text. Furthermore, the repetition of core ideas, topics, metaphors, phrases, etc... throughout many different texts. Both structural levels are interesting and relevant for a precise investigation of political rhetorical. In this thesis I will analyse four speeches, two of each politician. My research will hopefully provide interesting insights concerning the interplay between their rhetorical devices, ideology and historical-contextual situations.

3.6 Metaphors

Before discussing the importance of metaphors in politics I will try to describe metaphors and metonymy from a linguistic point of view. When skimming through linguistic theories on metaphors one realizes that the linguistic definition of metaphor has altered dramatically during the last twenty years. Generally, there is a distinction between a cognitive and a non-cognitive approach towards metaphors.

3.6.1 Non-Cognitive Approach on Metaphors

In my diploma thesis I will basically deal with Lakoff and Johnson's cognitive theory on metaphors which was introduced in 1980 in their ground-breaking book *Metaphors we live by*. The non-cognitive approaches will not be described in detail but only briefly to create an understanding of the development of the cognitive approach.

Generally, the non-cognitive approach to metaphors has been prevalent since antiquity. It was developed by Aristotle who claims that rhetorical devices, such as metaphors, may be used by politicians or poets but not in science as it could blur objectivity. From his point of view, metaphors are pure linguistic seducement (Pielenz 1993: 60). The non-cognitive analysis of metaphors is a purely semantic matter and it defines metaphors as a non-standard and non-normative use of language, a semantic and cognitive anomaly.

Even if there are several different theories, which all differ slightly on a large scale, one can basically distinguish between two different groups of non-cognitive approaches. First, there are the 'dualistic theories' where words carry both a normal and a second metaphorical meaning. That means that besides the original meaning metaphors gain an additional meaning which stands beyond the traditional meaning. On the other hand, there are 'monistic theories' which claim that metaphors are the result of the violation of selectional restrictions (Mooij 1976:31).

The two most prominent 'dualistic' theories are according to Pielenz (1993: 61 ff.) the 'Vergleichstheorie' (comparison theory) and the

‘Substitutionstheorie’ (substitution theory). The ‘comparison theory’ claims that there is an analogy or similarity between the original and the metaphorical meaning of an expression (Ungerer and Schmid 1997: 115f.). That means that ‘A=B’ simply reformulates the statement ‘A= like B’ (Pielenz 1993: 61). In the ‘substitution theory’ metaphors are regarded as substitutions, meaning ‘A=B’ is a substitution of the actually intended statement ‘A=C’. For instance, ‘Richard is a lion’ is nothing more than a translation of ‘Richard is brave, scary, fierce, etc…’. Both theories consider the metaphorical use of language as parasitic.

Black (1962: 41ff.) criticises both theories and claims that the meaning of a metaphor results from the interrelation of the expression itself and the context in which it appears. He highlights the importance of ‘similarity’. His concept of ‘associated commonplaces’ explains what he understands as a particularly strong similarity caused by the ‘blending of two spheres’. The radical difference between Back’s view and the one of traditional linguists is his proposition that metaphors create similarity and not only use already existing similarity. That means that metaphors have an explicit substantiality structuring value (Pielenz 1993: 63) which leads to the conclusion that metaphors construct reality (Pielenz 1993: 64). Hausman (1991: 25, quoted in Pielenz 1993: 63) claims “(…) that metaphors can be creative in the sense of generating new irreducible meaning.”

‘Monistic theories’ stress that metaphors do not create additional meanings but that referential capacity is lost in the metaphor. According to Mooij (1976: 35f.) meaning is a mixture of meaningful elements and the majority stop to be relevant in metaphor. One of the most prominent monistic theories was established by Matthews (1971). His theory was influenced by Chomsky and his claim that syntactic deviance creates metaphors. Matthews advanced the thesis and suggested that also semantic deviance causes metaphors.

3.6.2 Metaphors in Cognitive Linguistics

As already mentioned in chapter 3.6.1 the fundamental steps of the cognitive metaphorical approach were taken by Lakoff and Johnson and

presented in their book *Metaphors we live by* (1980). The book was a great success and has been titled an intellectually stimulating milestone.

Lakoff and Johnson cognitive metaphor theory is based on four premises and has been summarized by Pielenz (1993: 66);

1. Men are structured conceptually.
2. Men's conceptual system defines ones cognition and acting.
3. Men's conceptual system is primarily metaphorical.
4. Men's acting and cognition is primarily metaphorical.

These premises lead to the thesis that a "metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 3). They support the assumption that the cognitive system used in language is a crucial source of evidence for a conceptual system that governs people's thoughts and actions.

The premise that humans are conceptually structured provides us with the ability to understand certain metaphors in the first place. Moreover, it is the reason why a speech community does not only understand manifested and dead metaphors but also creates new ones. For instance, poetry invents new metaphors permanently and is still understood by the readership. That proves the validity of a cognitive metaphorical approach (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 129).

Lakoff and Johnson claim that people are permanently surrounded by metaphors without even noticing them. The metaphor +ARGUMENT IS WAR+ will be examined in more detail in order to show the impact of metaphors on the human conceptual system. First, I will give examples where the +ARGUMENT IS WAR+ metaphor appears without really striking our attention (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 4). The bold parts are called the 'focus' of a text while the remaining constituents are the 'frame' (Black 1962: 27 ff.). :

1. He **attacked every weak point** in my argument.
2. If you use that **strategy**, he'll **wipe you out**.
3. I've never **won** an argument with him

4. You disagree? Okay, **shoot**!

5. Your claims are **indefensible.**

6. He **shot down** all of my arguments.

The examples above exemplify the strength of metaphors. It shows that one can present different information with the help of a consistent pattern of thought. Furthermore, it also shows that people do not only talk but also think of ARGUMENTS in terms of WAR, meaning that interlocutors, for example, are regarded as enemies to some extent, positions are taken/attacked/defended, arguments can be lost or won. That shows that to a certain extent the +ARGUMENT IS WAR+ metaphor is actually taken literally by discourse participants (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 59) and thereby, creates reality.

Cognitive Linguists differ between 'type' and 'token'. 'Type' stands for the collection of metaphors which all refer to the analogy (e.g.: +ARGUMENT IS WAR+), while a particular metaphor is called 'token' (e.g.: he **attacks** her position). The examples below depict the difference between these two terms. The 'type' is always a general description of the metaphor and is put between plus notes, the 'token' is a concrete example written in bold letters.

1. +ARGUMENTATION IS JOURNEY+ (e.g.: we have **reached** so far, we will investigate the case **step by step**, it is their **goal** to show that arguments are reliable, if we would **continue** to the next point, …)
2. +ARGUMENTATION IS RECEPTACLE+ (I understand **the core** of the argument, the argument has **breaks**, your argument does not have **much substance**, …)
3. +ARGUMENT IS BUILDING+ (Your argument has **no fundament**, your argument **breaks in two**, your thesis needs a **solid soil** under its feet, the **construction** of your argument is odd, …)

(after Pielenz 1993: 70f.).

Metaphors are based on ‘categories’ and ‘cognitive models’ (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 122). ‘Category’ is a well-defined term and “the heart of cognitive linguistics” (Ungerer and Schmid 1996:2). They are the mental process of categorization and are frequently also called ‘concepts’. ‘Cognitive models’ are defined as “stored representations that belong to a certain field” (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 47). Lakoff and Turner claim that cognitive models are “unconscious and used effortlessly” (1989: 65 f.) and that they cannot be observed directly but that “they are inferred from their effects” (1989: 66). Moreover, they also claim that people’s cognitive models are abstractions and that they may vary but that they all share the following feature: people, animals, concrete and abstract objects are conceptualised in terms of properties that do not have to be essential to their nature; these models do not have to match one-to-one with the objective truth. This amplifies the importance of the term ‘cognitive’ as it shows that the models in question are non-scientific and non-objective. Scientific models often stand in contrast to common sense. For instance, the scientific and everyday attributes which are ascribed to wolves differ very much from each other. While, we understand wolves as dangerous, wild or vicious animals, biologists claim that wolves are afraid of people and try to avoid human contact entirely. There are ‘cultural models’ or clichés which are shared by the majority of the people of one cultural community (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 47).

3.6.2.1 Metaphorical Mapping

As already mentioned, the original thought of Lakoff and Johnson was that “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 5). In other words, features and characteristics of metaphor categories/models are superimposed on another. That means, knowledge of both models is necessary, for instance, the understanding of the metaphor +LIFE IS A JOURNEY+ demands common knowledge of JOURNEY. Lakoff and Turner state that

> [a]ll journeys involve travellers, paths travelled, places where we start, and places where we have been (…) To understand life as a journey is to have in mind, consciously or more likely unconsciously, a correspondence between a traveller and a person living the life (…) (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 60f)

Lakoff and Turner call the task of assigning characteristics from one cognitive model to another 'mapping' (1989: 63):

> We will speak of such a set of correspondences as a 'mapping' between conceptual domains.

Mapping requires a 'source domain' and a 'target domain' (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 63). Ungerer and Schmid prefer a different terminology and use terms such as 'category', 'cognitive model' or 'domain'. However, they agree that both a source and a target is necessary for a metaphorical understanding. Ungerer and Schmid present the following examples (1996: 121):

Target	**Source**
love	war
argument	journey
communication	sending
death	departure

Table 2: Mapping – Target and Source

The assumption that the use of metaphors is not a creative process is denied by both Black and Lakoff and Johnson even though they do not give any explicit suggestion how creativity happens. Liebert tries to explain the creative process and invents the term 'lexeme-metaphor'.

> Lexemmetapher ist also die Relation zwischen den beiden Lexemen zu verstehen: Ein Paar von Lexemen, dessen zweite Komponente als projiziert von der ersten Komponente identifiziert wird. (Liebert, quoted in Pielenz 1993: 11)

All conceptual metaphors are the result of conceptual 'mapping' which in the end may turn into dead, lexical metaphors (Pielenz 1993: 84). Pielenz

claims that the implementation and the invention of new metaphors is a creative process and only reapplication causes ‘dead metaphors’. A dead metaphor is metaphor which is entirely integrated in human’s everyday language and thereby, no longer perceived as a metaphor as it used without reflection. An example for a dead metaphor is ‘9/11’. We know that these numbers stand for a date, a date which evokes certain negative connotations among the American public and is understood by the majority without reflection because of permanent repetition.

Lakoff and Turner (1989: 61f.) also introduced the two terms ‘schema’ and ‘slot’. The following example will exemplify what these two terms mean; The metaphor +LIFE IS A JOURNEY+ can be viewed in different ways. As an example, life may be seen as a fast and effective way to go from point A to point B. Likewise, purposes can be seen as destinations. Each metaphor consists of certain attributes which are understood by most people, e.g. the source model JOURNEY includes elements such as traveller, companion, path, vehicle, etc... Some of these attributes are important for understanding the metaphor while others are not. This skeletal attributive knowledge is named ‘schema’ (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 61f.). ‘Slots’ are defined as the single elements filled into a schema. For example, the slot TRAVELLER of the schema JOURNEY can point to any person who is considered being on a journey.

3.6.2.2 The Power of Metaphors

Lakoff and Turner (1989: 62f.) state that metaphors have five great powers:

1. Power of structure
2. Power of options
3. Power of reasoning
4. Power of evaluation
5. Power of being there

Firstly, by means of metaphorical mapping the ‘power of structure’ gives the speaker lexical - primarily stylistic - options that would not exist if

it was not for the metaphor in question. This advantage is particularly important for politicians as they have to present similar topics as if they were new over and over again.

The ‘power of options’ means that metaphors provide the speaker with enough space for optional elements. These elements expand the basic metaphorical structure as it leads to an altered understanding of the target model.

Thirdly, the authors mention ‘power of reasoning’. They claim that certain patterns of inference influence how one reasons about the target model. That means for instance, if somebody defines life as a dead end it is obvious to use metaphors which fit with this conceptualisation; *stay put, find another road*.

The fourth power is called the ‘power of evaluation’ which simply means that not only structure is imported from the source model but also the way how these structures are interpreted is taken over by the recipient.

Finally, there is the ‘power of being there’, meaning, that metaphors can manipulate unconsciously. We are confronted with many metaphors which we do not realize. These metaphors are often called ‘dead metaphors’ and have already been discussed in chapter 3.6.2.1.

3.6.3 Different Types of Cognitive Metaphors

As already mentioned in chapter 3.6.2 Lakoff and Johnson suggest that “[m]en’s acting and cognition is primarily metaphorical” (Pielenz 1993: 66). That leads to the awareness that people think and act in metaphors. A closer observation shows that there are different types of cognitive metaphors. A more precise differentiation seems to be reasonable to gain more precise information for the upcoming analysis.

3.6.3.1 Generic and Specific Level Metaphors

‘Specific-level metaphors’ can be understood as the most conventional and frequently occurring cognitive metaphors. They can be described as metaphors where “a certain list of slots in the source domain

schema maps exactly one way onto a corresponding list of slots in the target domain schema" (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 80). The second group of metaphors is named 'generic-level metaphor'. They differ from 'specific-level metaphor' as they do not depend upon a list of corresponding slots but upon higher-order specifications which are operative on what is or what is not appropriate mapping. The differentiation of specific-level and generic-level metaphors is similar to the distinction of the biological terms 'genus' and 'species'. Species is the "lowest taxonomic and the most basic unit or category of biological classification".[6] A species belongs to one genus which is defined by only few properties at a high level. A genus is "a class or group with common attributes".[7]

A specific-level metaphor like +LIFE IS A JOURNEY+ has a fixed source/target and certain entities which are specified in the mapping. On the other hand, generic-level metaphors are not as specific and therefore harder to understand and decode. Lakoff and Turner (1989: 77) use the example of the metaphor +EVENTS ARE ACTIONS+ and claim that

> the source domain of actions is a subcategory of the target category of events; that is, every action is an event, though the converse is not true. (…) Second, each action consists of an event plus the agency which brings that event about.

That means, that the structure of EVENT has been added via mapping, whereby the event is the result of the action in question. A correct formula for this specific case would be 'action + agency = event'.

3.6.3.2 Structural and Orientational Metaphors

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 14) define 'structural metaphors' as cases where one concept is metaphorically "structured and expressed in terms of another"[8] concept. On the other hand, 'orientational metaphors' are metaphorical concepts which are "spatially related to each other".[9]

[6] (http://www.biology-online.org/dictionary/Species, 8 May 2011)
[7] (http://www.biology-online.org/dictionary/Genus, 8 May 2011)
[8] (http://www.sil.org/linguistics/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms/WhatIsAStructuralMetaphor.htm, 8 May 2011)

Mostly, orientational metaphors carry spatial connotations, meaning, that they often refer to pronouns (e.g.: down vs. up, out vs. in, (…), central vs. peripheral) (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14).

Up	Vs.	Down
In	Vs.	Out
Front	Vs.	Back
On	Vs.	Off
Deep	Vs.	Shallow
Central	Vs.	Peripheral

Table 3: Spatial reference in orientational metaphors (after Lakoff and Johnson 1980:14)

That does not mean that orientational metaphors only deal with physical experience. They also have a cultural dimension. For instance, we often use 'prepositions of place' when speaking about time; as an example, future can either lay in front or behind someone. How future is spoken about depends on the understanding of future in the respective cultural unity (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14).

The following examples are taken from Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 15) and we can observe how the vertical poles UP or DOWN express an emotional state as can be seen in the following example of +HAPPY IS UP; SAD IS DOWN+.

1. I'm feeling **up**.
2. My spirit **rose**.
3. I **fell** into depression.
4. My spirit **sank**.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 15) clearly show that orientational metaphors have a physical basis. As can be seen in the examples above, people use the metaphors +HAPPY IS UP; SAD IS DOWN+ unconsciously. The metaphor provides the listener with the impression that sadness is mostly

[9] (http://www.sil.org/linguistics/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms/WhatIsAnOrientationalMetaphor.htm, 8 May 2011)

associated with a sunken bearing while happiness or a positive emotional state is signalled with an upright posture. The influence of spatial metaphors in discourse is proven by Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 15) through further examples. For instance, +CONSCIOUS IS UP; UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN+ also shows the influence of spatial metaphors.

1. Wake **up**.
2. He **fell** asleep.

The +UP;DOWN+ relationship is obvious in these examples but there are orientational metaphors which might not be as easy to comprehend. For example, +FORSEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS ARE UP+ might be harder to reconstruct and examples will be necessary (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 16).

1. All **up**coming events are listed in paper.
2. What's coming **up** this week
3. I'm afraid of what's **up ahead** of us.

There are certain orientational metaphors which frequently occur in colloquial language and are considered being distinctively important by Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 16); +HEALTH AND LIFE ARE UP; SICKNESS AND DEATH ARE DOWN+, +HIGH STATUS IS UP; LOW STATUS IS DOWN+, +RATIONAL IS UP; EMOTIONAL IS DOWN+, +MORE IS UP; LESS IS DOWN+.

To sum up, orientational metaphors are the most fundamental cognitive concepts.

3.6.3.3 Ontological Metaphors: Entity and Substance Metaphors

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 25 ff.) identify further types of metaphors which are based on physical objects or substances. For instance, ontological metaphors are metaphors where certain abstract concepts, for instance, emotions, activities or ideas are compared with concrete objects,

substances, containers or people.[10] Thereby, 'ontological metaphors' are concerned with both physical and non-physical phenomena which lack clear-cut boundaries. These 'ontological metaphors' are subdivided into different groups. While entity metaphors are abstract concepts which are allegorised as concrete physical objects, in substance metaphors abstractions are compared with material.

There is a great range of different purposes ontological metaphors can serve. The following examples are taken from Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 26f.) and shall illustrate how ontological metaphors might vary.

1. The **honour of our country** is at stake in this war. - Referring
2. DuPont has **a lot of political power** in Delaware. - Quantifying
3. I can't keep up with the **pace of modern life**. – Identifying aspects and causes
4. The FBI will act quickly in the face of **a threat to national security**. – setting goals and motivating actions

It becomes obvious in these examples, that it is a characteristic of ontological metaphors that they are not easily identified as being metaphorical, compared to other conceptually rich metaphors such as +LIFE IS A JOURNEY+. The following examples display that ontological metaphors

> give us different metaphorical models for what the mind is and thereby allow us to focus on different aspects of mental experience. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 27f.).

1. He **broke down.**
2. He **cracked up.**

Both examples refer to the mind but they differ as the conception of what the mind stands for is different. While 1) stand for +THE MIND IS A MACHINE+, example 2) works according to the metaphor +THE MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT+. Both metaphors refer to mental experiences but

[10] (http://www.sil.org/linguistics/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms/WhatIsAnOntologicalMetaphor.htm, 8 May 2011)

different aspects are highlighted; while ‘broke down’ stresses the fact that the mind “simply ceases to function” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 28), the latter metaphor accentuates the psychological dimension of the mind’s state and the “possibly dangerous consequences” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 27ff.) when a brittle shatters.

3.6.3.4 Container Metaphors

A typical ontological metaphor is the ‘container metaphor’ which has a physical basis, namely, the surface of skin which separates a person from its environment. This results into an +IN; OUT+ distinction. For instance, when people ‘move out of’ a container, for instance a room, they automatically enter a new container. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 30) consider this territorial thinking, for instance the desire for imaginative borders (e.g. **in** Kansas), as a basic human instinct.

Moreover, also abstract non-physical objects can be depicted in this way. Events, actions, visual fields, activities or states use ontological container metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 30ff.).

1. I have him **in** sight. (visual field)
2. He’s **out of** the race. (event)
3. He’s **in** love. (state)

3.6.3.5 Image metaphors

Another ontological metaphor is the ‘image metaphor’ which is similar to the structural metaphor and works according to the principles of mapping described in chapter 3.6.2.1. The only difference is that ‘image metaphors’ use models/categories as mental images. The image structures consider both attributive structures, such as the colouring of an object or the intensity of light, and a prominent part-whole relation – for instance, ‘roof-house’ relationship. This following example given by Lakoff and Turner (1989: 90) shows how a relation between mental images and the structure of the target can be established:

1. my wife … whose waist is an **hourglass**.

The wife's waist is compared with the physical shape of an hourglass which means that the mental image of an hourglass is assigned onto a woman's waist. There is also a part-whole relation and even if there is no linguistic evidence which part of the hourglass is compared with the woman's waist, the human mind is capable to perform a reasonable mapping. This leads to the obvious conclusion of the existence of mental images (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 90).

According to Lakoff and Turner (1989: 90) image metaphors are rather seldom. Their power is particularly strong when they initiate or reinforce other metaphors.

3.6.3.6 Personification

According to Lakoff and Johnson 'personification' is a distinct linguistic phenomenon, even though it belongs to the group of ontological metaphors (1980: 33). To be more precise, in personification something non-human is spoken about as if being human. Lakoff and Turner try to explain the necessity of personification:

> (as) human beings we can best understand other things in our own terms. Personification permits us to use our knowledge of ourselves to maximal effects. (1989: 72)

Personification makes it easier for the speaker but also for the listener to localize and refer to these non-human objects.

1. **Life** has cheated on me.
2. **His religion** tells him that he cannot drink French wines.

Both examples show that non-human objects, in the first case LIFE, in the second example HIS RELIGION, are given human attributes. Both examples are rather obvious as the source category is a PERSON. That does not always have to be the case as illustrated in the following examples;

1. **Inflation** has attacked the foundations of our economy.
2. Our biggest **enemy** is inflation.

These examples show that +INFLATION IS A PERSON+ would be a too general description of the metaphorical scheme, a more precise description suggests to label the metaphor +INFLATION IS AN ADVERSARY+.

The study of personification is important for a critical analysis of political rhetoric as it displays how certain topics are thought about. For instance, the statement “government declares war on inflation” obviously proves that the speaker considers inflation as a harmful person which can be fought against, while ‘the government’ is a person or organisation of which the speaker belongs. It also illustrates that ‘personification’ enables politicians to create villain figures. For instance, George W. Bush uses Saddam Hussein as a personification for all evil in Iraq. Furthermore, personification makes new measures and complex matters more comprehensible as they receive human qualities.

3.6.4 Metonymy

Metonymy is a figure of speech which is frequently used when a thing is not called by its actual name, but by the name of something that is intimately associated with the thing discussed about. Mostly, a part of a thing stands for the whole. For instance, if politicians speak about ‘Washington’ they often refer to the government of the United States as Washington DC is the capital and the government is located there (Beard 2000: 19). Metonymy and metaphor differ as even if both figures involve the substitution of one term for another, in metaphor this substitution is based on similarity, while, in metonymy it is based on contiguity within one cognitive model.

George Lakoff (1987: 77) distinguishes between two different forms of metonymy; first, when one part represents the whole entity and secondly, when a part of an object is referred to by another part of the whole thing. One may realize that when using metaphors a transfer takes place between target and source, which both belong to different cognitive

models, metonymic mapping works on different levels which belong to the same model (Ungerer and Schmid 1997: 128f.). Still, metaphors and metonymy often overlap with each other as both rhetorical devices are closely related to each other. Both, rhetorical devices include the process of mapping, both have a conceptual nature, both can be turned into parts of the everyday conceptual system and by that be used effortlessly and, finally, both devices extend the linguistic resources of a language (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 103f.).

Most frequently metonymy appears in emotional categories. Lakoff identified +THE PHYSICAL EFFECTS OF AN EMOTION STANDS FOR THE EMOTION+ as the basic metonymic principle when it comes to emotional categories (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 131). One has to be careful with that proposition as it is not based on scientific observation but on daily experience and observation. Some metonymies might apply to many different emotions. The following examples should demonstrate the issue in a striking way (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 132).

Physiological effects	**Emotions (target)**	**Example**
Increase in body temperature	ANGER, LOVE, JOY	Don't get hot under the collar
Drop in body temperature	FEAR	I was chilled to the bone
Sweat	FEAR	There were sweat beads on his forehead
Jumping up and down	JOY	He was jumping for joy
General physical agitation	ANGER, DISGUST, FEAR, JOY, LOVE	She was quivering, excited, keyed up, overstimulated

Table 4: Metonymy in emotional categories

Metonymy is a strong rhetorical device as it gives the speaker the ability to describe something indirectly by referring to something closely related, either in time or space. Even if metonymy and metaphor are

similar linguistic devices it is reasonable to distinguish between these two concepts as it enables a more sophisticated analysis.

3.6.5 Metaphors in Politics

Metaphors are essential rhetorical weapons for politicians even if their insertion brings risks as comprehension can never be guaranteed. Wilson (1990: 115) emphasizes that the danger of metaphors is that the interpretations of the recipients may vary.

Still, the creative use of metaphors is a necessity as it is a possibility to present ideas as if they were new. This characteristic is of great value for politicians as they permanently are confronted and have to talk about recurring issues which makes it hard to create the impression of political creativity. Metaphors like +A NEW BREEZE IS BLOWING+ are frequently used by politicians when they create the impression of presenting reformative concepts (Wilson 1990: 127). Speeches which draw on these metaphors are named ‘wind-of-change’ speeches (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 150). For instance, the metaphor +A NEW BREEZE IS BLOWING+ was frequently inserted by George Bush senior;

1. a world **refreshed** with freedom
2. ideas **blown away** like leaves
3. new ground to be **broken**

According to Ungerer and Schmid (1996: 150), a further frequent source of metaphors in politics is ILLNESS, especially combined with the +PART/WHOLE+ metonymy. For instance, +THE COUNTRY IS A PERSON THAT IS ILL+ is a frequently occurring metaphor (Wilson 1990: 129). The following examples have been provided by Wilson (1990: 129) and they display the interplay with ILLNESS as a source combined with the +PART/WHOLE+ metonymy;

1. If limbs are severely damaged the whole body is disabled. If regions left to rot the whole country is weakened.

2. If the battered parts of Britain don't get noisy they will just get neglected; silent pain evokes no response.

A further central metaphorical source is WAR. It is very common in American politics and has, for instance, frequently been used by George Bush senior in order to legitimize the forthcoming Gulf war. George Lakoff published an open letter in 1991 in which he tried to decode the metaphorical system used by President Bush to justify the Gulf war. It turned out that Bush mainly used two central metaphors in his speeches, namely, +WAR IS POLITICS PERSUED BY OTHER MEANS+ and +THE STATE IS A PERSON+. With the help of these metaphors he tried to convince the American nation of the necessity of the war. His rhetorical devices turned out to be a major weapon and ensured him increasing support from the public. Lakoff wrote a similar open letter in 2003 and showed that the war in Iraq was legitimized with the same rhetorical devices as the Gulf war in 1991.

> As in his father's Iraq war, President Bush has floated two powerful storylines to effectively, and dangerously, frame America as both victim and hero. (Lakoff 2003)

The first of the two central metaphor is often named 'Clausewitz's metaphor' and depends on two other metaphors; +WAR IS POLITICS+ and +POLITICS IS BUSINESS+. These metaphors allow to define WAR as a legitimate way to achieve certain goals or solve certain problems. If one expands this train of thought, it leads to the metaphor +WAR IS POLITICS PERSUED BY OTHER MEANS+ which proposes that war is the best way to achieve a certain goal. If one draws the metaphor +POLITICS IS BUSINESS+ into consideration it becomes obvious that efficient business management and successful politics is closely related and often the decision of war is economically justified (Lakoff 1991). Lakoff claims (1991) that a decision on war craves the

> defining (of) beneficial 'objectives', tallying the 'costs', and deciding whether achieving the objectives is 'worth' the costs.

The second central metaphor that is popular among politicians is +THE STATE IS A PERSON+. This metaphor can be modified in various ways, for instance, +THE STATE IS A PERSON THAT IS ILL+. This personification is a highly important and manipulative metaphor as it can create a clear black/white demarcation between villain and hero. Lakoff (1991, 2003) found out that both Bush senior and junior used this metaphor in order to legitimize war. The usage of the metaphor becomes most obvious in the metonymy +THE STATE IS A SINGLE PERSON+ where, for instance, SADDAM HUSSEIN represents IRAQUE (Lakoff 1991) or OSAMA BIN LADIN stands for TERRORISM and THREAT. Politicians create the impression that bombs and war only harm single villain people, in our examples, either Saddam Hussein or Osama Bin Laden. The fact that thousands of innocent people are killed by political decisions is hidden.

Both texts written by Lakoff start with the sentence “Metaphors can kill.” (1991, 2003) and history has clearly shown how rhetorical power can affect the lives of millions of people. That fact displays the importance of CDA as it is a critical approach which enables us to develop analytical tools which gives us the chance to defend ourselves and to question political rhetoric.

3.6.6 Differentiation between Liberal and Conservative Metaphors

The main question of this diploma thesis is to discover, by means of CDA and with the help of linguistic theories, in how far ideology is manifested in rhetorical choices and to examine how Obama’s liberal and Bush’s conservative rhetoric differs. This chapter will serve as a description of the differentiation between liberal and conservative metaphors and as a theoretical basis to observe if the two politicians’ way to use metaphorical devices is really consistent with the political beliefs represented by them.

Metaphors express existing cognitive concepts and establish cultural beliefs and perceptions respectively. Ideology does not necessarily need to have an impact upon metaphorical choices as people with different ideologies in spite of everything share roughly the same cultural background and by that also the same cognitive knowledge. Still, George

Lakoff (1996) claims that metaphors are consistent with political ideology and that there has to be something like a ‘liberal or conservative usage of metaphors’.

George Lakoff’s concept of what I call ‘ideological usage of metaphors’ is based on Johnson’s assumption that metaphors play a crucial role in our cognitive model of ‘morality’ (Cienki 2005: 281). Based on that premise, Lakoff established the ‘moral accounting scheme’ and claims that conservatives and liberals reason about morality - as a result also about politics - “in terms of different cognitive models based on two types of idealized families” (Cienki 2005: 281). These idealized families will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.6.6.1 – 3.6.6.3. The way the ideal family is conceptualized determines how to think about morality (Cienki 2005: 281). The personification +THE NATION IS A FAMILY+ turns family-based morality into political morality. Lakoff’s point of departure was the following observation;

> Liberals don’t understand how anti-abortion ‘right-to-life’ activists can favour the death penalty and oppose reducing infant mortality through prenatal care programs. (…) They don’t understand why conservatives attack violence in the media while promoting the right to own machine guns. Liberals tend not to understand the logic of conservatism: (…) The reason at bottom is that liberals do not understand the form of metaphorical thought that unifies and makes sense of the full range of conservative values. (Lakoff 1995)

Lakoff (1996: 44) argues that there are metaphors which rule the understanding of morality. These metaphors do not control one’s understanding of justice or fairness but in combination with other metaphors they can formulate moral judgements. These metaphors are called ‘metamoral’ (Lakoff 1996: 44).

The most powerful metaphorical concept according to Lakoff (1996) is the +MORAL ACCOUNTING+ metaphor. This metaphorical concept compares moral action with financial transactions (Lakoff 1996: 56). Lakoff claims that to a certain extent it is the aim of each person to keep a neutral moral condition or to keep one’s books balanced which is achieved with the help of four basic moral schemes (Reciprocation, Retribution, Revenge and Altruism).

‘Reciprocation’ equals repayment, meaning, “(i)f you do something good for me, then I ‘owe’ you something” (Lakoff 1995). As a consequence B has to repay A to restore the balance of the accounts of morality. Lakoff suggests two principles of moral action; first, “moral action is giving something of positive value (,) immoral action is giving something of negative value” (1995). Furthermore, the second principle states that there is a “moral imperative to pay one’s debts” (Lakoff 1995). The failure to pay moral debt is immoral.

Secondly, ‘retribution’ stands for the transaction of negative values. The receiver is now put into a moral dilemma as according to the first principle it forces him/her to act immorally as s/he should repay a harmful deed with an equally harmful deed. On the other hand, only through acting immorally one can repay moral debts. It leads to the ambiguous situation that by avoiding doing harm, you act morally as doing harm is immoral, on the other hand, you act immorally as you have the moral duty to repay your debts (Lakoff 1995). You have to make a choice and give priority to one of the principles. Obviously, “different people and different subcultures have different solutions to this dilemma (…)” (Lakoff 1995).

Moreover, ‘revenge’ is an alternative for ‘retribution’. The great difference between ‘retribution’ and ‘revenge’ is that at the former, repayment is done by a legitimate authority while ‘revenge’, on the other hand, means the equalisation of moral accounts by a person who lacks such authority (Lakoff 1996: 49).

‘Restitution’ means that by doing something harmful one gives something of negative value, and consequently takes something of positive value. The adjustment of books can only be achieved by paying with something of equally positive value. Full restitution is impossible or at least hard to achieve. We are mostly dealing with ‘partial restitution’ (Lakoff 1995).

Finally, ‘altruism’ means that by doing something good one is in debt. If these debts are cancelled as nothing in return is asked for, a moral credit arises.

Both, conservative and liberal discourse partners use these accounting images, but different priorities are assigned to them. Lakoff

(1996) states that there are at least two different ways to reason about morality and that both models derive from different interpretations of an idealized family image.

> In each model, the way in which the ideal family is conceptualized determines which metaphorical ways of thinking about morality have priority (Cienki 2005: 281).

3.6.6.1 Conservative vs. Liberal Accounting Schemes

Lakoff underlines that most morality metaphors are used by both conservatives and liberals, still, the priority given to them differs (Lakoff 1995). For instance, in the conservative world view the metaphor +MORALITY IS STRENGTH+ has highest priority. It is a complex metaphor which implies that +BEING GOOD IS BEING UPRIGHT+, +BEING BAD IS BEING LOW+, +DOING EVIL IS FALLING+, +EVIL IS A FORCE+ and +MORALITY IS STRENGTH+ (Lakoff 1995). These metaphors lead to the conclusion that punishment is good as it protects people from becoming morally weak and increases moral strength. Therefore, courage and self-control are fostered and morally weak people are considered being a danger as they are easily seduced by immorality. Lakoff (1995) summarises the conservative views in a good way:

- The world is divided into good and evil.
- To remain good in the face of evil (to ‘stand up to’ evil), one must be morally strong.
- One becomes morally strong through self-discipline and self-denial.
- Someone who is morally weak cannot stand up to evil and so will eventually commit evil.
- Therefore, moral weakness is a form of immorality.
- Lack of self-control (the lack of self-discipline) and self-indulgence (the refusal to engage in self-denial) are therefore forms of immorality.

Much of the conservative moral worldview deals with internal evils and aims to create self-control over the own body and to reject passion, temptation and desire. Typical desires which tempt people are defined by Lakoff (1995); “money, sex, food, comfort, glory, and things other people have – are seen in this metaphor as ‘temptations’”.

One can realize that the division between ‘good and evil’ causes a strict differentiation between US and THEM. Moreover, conservatism does not only use the +MORALITY IS STRENGTH+ metaphor but also the metaphor of +MORAL SELF-INTEREST+ which is based on Adam Smith’s economical claim that each person should seek to maximize their own wealth as that would cause a growth of the wealth of all (Lakoff 1995).

Liberals use different metaphors and moral action is conceptualised as emphatic action. The leading metaphor of liberals is +MORALITY IS NURTURANCE+ therefore, morally acting agents are often compared with nurturing parents. This worldview implies that helping people is a moral obligation. Moreover, there is a focus on the concept of ‘happiness’ as people have to live happily to have the capacity for empathy and nurturance. Finally, liberals understand morality as fairness and therefore, a central metaphor would be +MORALITY IS FAIRNESS+.

3.6.6.2 The Conservative Strict-Father Model

> The Strict Father model takes as background the view that life is difficult and that the world is fundamentally dangerous. (Lakoff 1996: 65).

This leads to the view of a traditional nuclear-family which is hierarchically structured and where the father figure is considered being the main authority person (Lakoff 1995). The mother is supposed to uphold the father’s authority and to take charge of the household while children have the duty to respect their parents’ authority (Cienki 2005: 281).

The father figure is morally strong as he should teach his children his values and protect the family from both internal and external evils. He does so by being a good role model. The main aim of the father figure is to tell the family, in particular his children, what is right and what is wrong, to punish them if something wrong is done and to teach them to become self-

dependent and self-reliant members of society (Lakoff 1995). For the father this form of strictness is considered as a form of “nurturance and love – tough love” (Lakoff 1995). However, when the children are grown they are responsible for themselves and the father should no longer interfere in their lives. Despite the fact that the Strict Father model can be found in most cultures and countries, the last mentioned characteristic of the model, also known as the No-meddling Condition, appears to be uniquely American (Lakoff 1995).

The Strict-Father model explains the conservative attitude towards topics such as “feminism, abortion, homosexuality and gun control” (Lakoff 1995). Both homosexuality and feminism are considered to be a threat to a patriarchal system. The duty to protect one’s family leads to approval of a strong army and criminal justice system and animosity towards gun control. Moreover, the conservative position on abortion should not be mistaken as a reverence for life. According to conservatives, there are two classes of women who need abortion; either unmarried teenagers, where pregnancy is the result of carelessness and lust, or women who are attending a career. Both groups violate the principles of the Strict-Father model. The first group acts immorally as it has shown a lack of self-control while a woman striving for a career is a threat against male father dominance (Lakoff 1995).

3.6.6.3 The Liberal Nurturant Parent Model

> Though this model of the family seems to have begun as a woman’s model, it has now become widespread in America among both sexes (Lakoff 1996: 108).

The idealized family according to the Nurturant Parent model is described as

> (a) family of preferably two parents (…). The primal experience behind this model is one of being cared for and cared about, having one’s desires for loving interactions met, living as happily as possible, and deriving meaning from mutual interaction and care. (Lakoff 1996: 108)

One can clearly see that a family is regarded as a team, working together. For people with liberal views, metaphors of nurturance have the highest

priority while those of strength are considered being less important. Typical liberal metaphors are +MORALITY IS EMPATHY+, +MORAL ACTION IS NURTURANCE+, +MORAL GROWTH IS PHYSICAL GROWTH+ (Cienki 2005: 281 f.). Just as conservatives, liberals tend to believe that the world is a dangerous place and that one has to protect children from external dangers. However, their understanding of external dangers differs as they are not only seen in immorality but also in pollution, pesticides in food, diseases, economy, and less obvious dangers such as cigarettes, cars without seat belts or dangerous toys (Lakoff 1995).

> Children are taught self-discipline in the service of nurturance: to take care of themselves, to deal with existing hardship, to be responsible to others, and to realize their potential. Children are also taught self-nurturance: the intrinsic value of emotional connection with others, […] of being able to take care of oneself. […] it is important that children have a childhood, that they learn to develop their imaginations, and that they just plain have fun (Lakoff 1995).

Family is understood as a community which is based on empathy and obedience of children is a result of love and respect towards parents but not out of fear or punishment (Lakoff 1996: 13f.).

> When children do wrong, nurturant parents choose restitution over retribution whenever possible as a form of justice (Lakoff 1995).

Lakoff states that liberals often misinterpret or simply cannot understand the argumentation of conservatives. The latter in general have a better understanding of themselves and their ideological viewpoints. What Lakoff means is that liberals have not reached the same level of political sophistication (1995). He backs up his proposition with the suggestion that while conservatives understand themselves as one ideological unity, liberals

> understand their own political conceptual universe so badly that they still think of it in terms of coalitions of interest groups (Lakoff 1995)

, meaning, that they, in contrast to conservatives, define themselves not being primarily liberals but instead members of miscellaneous interest groups with different issues and concerns. For instance, one is not simply a

liberal but rather a feminist, a gay right activist, an environmentalist, a supporter of abortion rights, a person being concerned about health care, etc…. This failure to unify has actually strengthened conservatives. Lakoff claims;

> [n]one of this need be the case, since there is a worldview that underlies liberal thought that is every bit as unified as the conservative world view (Lakoff 1995)

3.6.6.4 The Nation-as-Family Metaphor

Lakoff claims that both family-based moralities are linked to politics with the +NATION AS FAMILY+ metaphor. This cognitive principle is made up of two metaphors, namely, +THE GOVERNMENT IS A PARENT+ and +THE CITIZENS ARE CHILDREN+ (Cienki 2005: 282). The way of thinking about these metaphors considering the Strict-Father model or the Nurturant Parent model causes contradictionary world views.

> For example, according to the (Nurturant Parent) view, social programs in which the government supplies food, shelter, etc., to the poor are seen as investments which will help build communities, while according to the (Strict Father) perspective such programs coddle people who should learn to fend for themselves. (Cienki 2005: 282)

Even though, one might get the impression that the distinction of these models sounds quite clear-cut, Lakoff underlines that not all liberals share exactly the same ideology, neither do conservatives, and that all metaphors are used by both groups but that different priorities are assigned to them (1995).

4. Analysis of Bush's and Obama's Rhetorical Devices

4.1 General Remarks on the Politicians

The Bush family is an influential Texan family which made its fortune by founding their own oil company. George W. Bush junior is the son of the former president George Herbert Walker Bush who was in office between 1989 and 1993. As the Republican candidate George Bush junior defeated the then-Vice President Al Gore in 2000 and served as the 43rd president of the United States. He was re-elected in a relatively close election in 2004 when he successfully ran against the Democratic Senator John Kerry. His term in office was strongly affected by the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 and as a consequence of the attacks on the World Trade Centre he announced a global War on Terrorism and commanded the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan as he suspected these countries to hide and support members of the militant Islamic terrorist group 'al Qaeda'. Clearly, this crusade against terrorism influenced Bush's policy and thereby also his rhetoric. Further topics promoted by Bush were health care, education and a social security reform. Although Bush was very popular in the States during his first presidential term, his popularity decreased noticeably during the second term as the promised progress in the War on Terrorism could not be fulfilled. His support among the public declined which caused the democratic takeover of both houses of Congress in 2006 (Simons 2007: 177).

Barack Obama started to work as a civil rights attorney before entering politics and he is the first African American to become President of the United States of America. During Bush's presidency he was very critical of many of the taken measures and decisions. Particularly, the War on Terrorism and the way it was carried out has been criticised by him. That is why for instance, the closing of Guantanamo Bay detention camp but also the withdrawal of troops from Iraq and Afghanistan as fast as possible were central concerns in his political program. In his election campaign, which started in 2007 when he won his party's nomination against Hillary Clinton, he constantly accentuated his modest origins which

are very contrastive to Bush's background. Obama's policy also differs very much from Bush's political concepts. For instance, War on Terrorism does not have the same central topicality any longer which is why it does not have the same significance in his policy. Other topics and issues have gained momentum such as the long overdue reformation of the American health care system, the growth of the American economy, which stagnated as a consequence of the global financial crisis which is today considered being the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. He was elected president in 2009. Obama was awarded the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize and is regarded as the prototype of a liberal politician.

4.2 Research Goals and Set Up

The aim of this thesis will be to explore the differences of the rhetorical devices of the two politicians and to explore in how far their rhetoric is influenced by ideological beliefs. The chosen speeches will be examined from the perspective of a critical discourse analyst. As CDA does not provide a consistent analysis approach, the former chapters have described the theoretical and linguistic approaches that I have adopted for the analysis of the most significant rhetorical differences. The aim of this analysis and moreover, also my main understanding of Critical Discourse Analysis, is to apply the chosen theories and draw subjective conclusions based on the data gained from the quantitative and qualitative analysis.

The analysis of rhetorical choices will be analysed with respect to ideological background and context. First, I will discuss the usage of pronouns. I will provide the reader with a quantitative analysis which I will later evaluate topic-specifically. Secondly, the analysis of the cognitive metaphorical choices will be topic-specific as well, meaning that for instance, I will examine the most prominent metaphors which are used on the topic ECONOMY in order to gain insights on the attitudes towards the topic and in how far ideology is manifested in language.

One main point of criticism concerning CDA is that a linguistic analysis from the perspective of CDA is only of relative value as it does not provide any objective, but only subjective interpretations (Wodak 2008:

17). Fairclough (1989), on the other hand, claims that this is the greatest strength of CDA as all scientific analytical evaluations are subjective to a certain degree and that supporters of CDA simply admit their ideological background from the beginning. In this light, it is important for me to unveil my political viewpoint. Like most adherents of CDA, I see myself rather on the political left. Therefore, Obama's more liberal and progressive policy is more appealing to me. Still, that does not mean that I entirely agree with Obama as many concepts of neo-liberalism, of which he is a supporter, are debatable. While, I am fully aware that my approach will be influenced by my political ideology I will still try to analyse and evaluate the data as objectively as possible.

While skimming through speeches, I came to the conclusion that the best speeches to analyse would be the 'State of the Union' addresses. The 'State of the Union' is an annual address in which the president of the United States reports on the condition and the development of the nation, but also outlines the national priorities to Congress and the American nation. The constitution does not require that the report takes the form of a speech, even if it is mostly performed in that way. Also the frequency of performance is not preassigned but traditionally these speeches are performed annually.[11] It is performed in the chamber of the House of Representatives at the United States Capitol. The reason why the 'State of the Union' addresses, which are all taken from the 'American Rhetoric' website[12], are appropriate speeches for comparison is because they are easy to compare as they share the same setting, audience and length. Furthermore, they are mostly not topic-specific but the politicians try to cover a wide range of topics which they regard most important for the development of the future of the nation. Both of Bush's speeches were given during his second term in office, respectively 2005 (B1) and 2008 (B2). On the other hand, only one of Obama's speeches is a 'State of the Union' speech (2010) (O1) while the other one was addressed to the Joint Session of Congress (2010) (O2). As Obama has only been president of the United States for one year, he has only given one 'State of the Union'

[11] The constitution simply demands that one is supposed to inform the Congress of the State of the Union "from time to time" (Article II, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution).
[12] (www.americanrhetoric.com, 8 May 2011)

speech. The reason why I choose the second speech is because it was held in front of the same audience and has about the same length. Therefore, all speeches share similar preconditions.

4.3 Analysis of the Pronominal Use of Bush and Obama

4.3.1 General Observations

The general aim in this section is to find out in how far the pronominal choices of the two politicians reflect systematic uses. Furthermore, the chapter will serve to examine the differences of the pronominal choices. It will be explored to what extent the pronominal system is indicative of their political ideology. My analysis will only examine the use of Subject-Pronouns but not of Object-Pronouns as this would go beyond the scope of the thesis.

The table below presents an overview and a quantitative evaluation of the pronominal use in the selected speeches. The pronominal frequency is expressed as a percentage. Since the total number of words differs in the speeches the comparison of the absolute number of pronouns would not be significant.

Pronouns	**Obama 1**	**Obama 2**	**Bush 1**	**Bush 2**
Number of total words	7 405	5 906	5 206	5 719
***1st pers. sing.* (I)**	1,46%	1,24 %	0,65%	0,66%
***1st pers.sing. poss.*(my, mine)**	0,13%	0,14%	0,17%	0,10%
***2nd pers. sing.* (you)**	0,35%	0,54%	0,94%	0,45%
***2nd pers. sing. poss.* (yours, your)**	0,03%	0,25%	0,10%	0,24%
***1st pers. pl.* (We)**	2,24%	2,2%	1,59%	2,4%
***1st pers. pl. poss.* (ours, our)**	1,77%	1, 88%	1,23%	2,01%
***3rd pers. pl.* (They)**	0,81%	0,32%	0,40%	0,39%
3rd pers. pl. poss	0,47%	0,44%	0,56%	

(their)				
***dem. p-noun.*These**	0,39%	0, 27%	0,23%	0,44%
***dem. p-noun.* Those**	0,24%	0,19%	0,13%	0,10%

Table 5: Pronominal frequency

A general observation of the politicians' pronominal use displays that Obama uses more pronouns (4, 04% vs. 3, 34% of all words are Subject-Pronouns), in particular first person singular and plural pronouns, than Bush. This leads to the assumption that he is more aware of the manipulative possibilities of these two pronouns than Bush. In contrast, Bush uses more second person singular pronouns. I will hang on to this insight when discussing the use of the first person singular pronoun in chapter 4.3.3.

The table reveals many major differences, still, one cannot deny that many characteristics of the systematic pronominal use of the two politicians are very similar. An interesting aspect is that both Obama and Bush use 'we' nearly twice as often as 'I'. This can easily be explained by the fact that 'we' can both be used for exclusive and inclusive purposes (Wilson 1990: 52ff.), meaning it has a double referential meaning as has already been mentioned in chapter 3.3.1.1.

It is important to keep in mind that the distinction between the exclusive and the inclusive 'we' is very vague. Often, it is not entirely clear if the audience is meant to be included or not. It is exactly this kind of ambiguity which turns 'we' into a powerful rhetorical pronoun as the listener can never be entirely sure to whom the speaker is actually referring. The way the first person plural is used by the two politicians will be discussed more precisely in the subsequent chapter.

4.3.2 'WE' – First Person Plural

The first investigation suggests that 'we' is the pronoun where most similarities between the pronominal systems of Bush and Obama can be seen. 'We' is the most frequently occurring pronoun, which as already

mentioned is due to the fact that ‘we’ serves for both exclusive and inclusive matters. A more precise look reveals that the choice between exclusive and inclusive ‘we’ depends on the topic.

Still, generally spoken, Obama uses the exclusive form more often than Bush as can be seen in the table below.

	Obama 1	**Obama 2**	**Bush 1**	**Bush 2**
Exclusive WE	38,6%	46,9%	29,6%	39,4%
Inclusive WE	61,4%	53,1%	70,4%	60,6%

Table 6: Comparison of the I-WE and the E-WE

Before trying to interpret this discrepancy, I regard it as important to discuss the already mentioned difficulties of the distinction between exclusive and inclusive use of the first person plural pronouns more precisely. Wilson (1990) claims that an exclusive use serves to distance the listener from the speaker and that it may decrease the degree of involvement while the inclusive usage creates solidarity. In order to precisely distinguish between exclusive and inclusive pronominal usage one needs a clear understanding of the audience. As we are dealing with ‘State of the Union’ speeches, there are two different audiences, namely the Congress and the American public sitting in front of the TV. It is a vague undertaking to decide who is actually meant to be included in the WE-form. This leads to the insight that the differentiation between exclusive and inclusive WE-forms has limitations as the definition of the audience is rather vague and often the analyst is forced to guess to whom the speaker refers.

A more precise critical analysis of Bush’s use of the E-WE shows that he mainly uses it when speaking about progress at war. This has several reasons; first, we have already heard that the E-WE is frequently used when referring to already conducted actions. When it comes to the topic of WAR he is under the pressure to act and he has to present results as he otherwise would lose public support. As the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq was criticised by many people he avoids the insertion of the first

person singular pronoun and tries to eliminate the impression of sole responsibility. With the use of the E-WE Bush creates solidarity but at the same time also avoids full responsibility.

(1) So **we** reviewed our strategy and changed course. **We** launched a surge of American forces into Iraq. **We** gave our troops a new mission: … (B1)
(2) **We** are dealing with these thugs in Iraq, just as surely as **we** dealt with Saddam Hussein's evil regime. (B2)
(3) **We**'re tracking al-Qaida around the world, and nearly two-thirds of their known leaders have now been captured or killed. (B1)

In particular, example (3) is a prototypical E-WE form. Bush tries to evoke the impression of success in the War on Terrorism but he knows that his popularity is decreasing as the public opinion on war changes.

Other topics where Bush uses the 'E-WE' are IMMIGRATION and EDUCATION. He tries to prove strength and strictness by keeping up the impression of being a hardliner and tries to gain support by presenting concepts to prevent illegal immigration. IMMIGRATION is a more central topic in Bush's policy than in Obama's and by using the E-WE Bush accentuates his opinion on both topics.

(4) **We** are regularly testing every child on the fundamentals. (B1)
(5) **We**'re increasing worksite enforcement, deploying fences and advanced technologies to stop illegal crossings. (B2)

In contrast, Obama uses the E-WE when he discusses ECONOMY, WAR, HEALTH-CARE or EDUCATION. All topics are of great importance and of central concern in his policy. It is particularly striking that he uses the E-WE when talking about ECONOMY as the economical situation he is confronted with does not suggest that one wants to be directly linked to it. Obama goes one step further and actually also uses first person singular pronouns and thereby, admits total responsibility when talking about the economy. He permanently accentuates that he is not happy with the situation himself but that he has to accept it and cannot only make popular decisions but what he regards to be best for the nation. He creates the impression of honesty and faithfulness and wants to stir emotions of sympathy among the public even when presenting bad news.

He has to discuss these measures as otherwise he might be considered passive. One might suggest that he gains more sympathy by committing himself to the problem.

(6) So the recovery plan **we** passed is the first step in getting our economy back on track. (O2)
(7) And as a result, the markets are now stabilized, and **we**'ve recovered most of the money **we** spent on the banks. (O1)

In fact it seems as if he does not need to distance himself from the negatively connotated topic ECONOMY by using the I-WE as he makes very clear that he is not responsible for the current situation but that he is still willing to take the blame and does everything to ameliorate the situation.

Example (7) illustrates the ambiguity of 'we'. The sentence can be interpreted in two different ways; one could claim that the money spent on the banks came from taxes which would legitimate an inclusive interpretation while an exclusive interpretation would underline the fact that the decision to spend money on banks was taken by the government and did not consider the opinion of the American public.

Obama's position on war is different to Bush's, still, he tries to make the best of the situation and again the E-WE is inserted to present his course of action.

(8) That's why **we** made the largest increase in investments for veterans in decades last year. (O1)
(9) (…) **we** will strengthen old alliances, forge new ones, and use all elements of our national power. (O2)

Both HEALTH-CARE and EDUCATION are typically democratic topics and it is not a surprise that Obama underlines his great personal commitment with the help of E-WE and the wish for a change when talking about these issues. In the next chapter we will see that he proves responsibility even stronger as the importance of HEALTH-CARE is emphasized by again inserting first person singular pronouns.

On the other hand, the inclusive 'we' is used by both politicians when

it comes to the topic of WAR. The most obvious reason is that both politicians try to avoid full responsibility and therefore try to incorporate the audience and establish a form of shared solidarity.

(10) **We** have no desire to dominate, no ambitions of empire. (B1)
(11) **We** find unity in **our** incredible diversity, drawing on the promise enshrined in **our** Constitution: the notion that **we**'re all created equal (…) (O1)

The 'I-WE' is also used in order to create the impression of 'pathos'. For instance, when they are honouring soldiers or when emotions are evoked without presenting any information of great value. This persuasive use of the 'I-WE' is frequently linked to a personal life story of an American citizen and serves to inspire the audience. Mostly only general information is given and there is lack of 'docere' which is why the 'I-WE' is foremost found in the 'exordium' and the 'peroration'.

(12) **We** will rebuild, **we** will recover, and the United States of America will emerge stronger than before. (O2)
(13) And so in all **we** do **we** must trust in the ability of free peoples to make wise decisions, and empower them to improve their lives for their future. (B2)

Both examples do not provide the listener with factual information but emotions are created and provoked. In particular, example (12) is interesting, as it also makes use of repetition. Obama repeats 'we will' twice and by that he does not act according to Beard's suggested 'list of three' (2000: 38). Still, the sentence has a highly aesthetic effect as the first person plural pronoun is used to refer to 'the United States of America'.

Generally, Obama uses the I-WE more often than Bush which allows the interpretation that he is more aware of how to use the pronoun for persuasive purposes when he aims to create corporate feelings. This mostly happens when he speaks more superficially about a topic and is not forced to belay his statements with facts. The creation of corporate feelings and the attempt to solicit cooperation among the public is actually a major

strategy of Obama and his famous slogan ‘Yes, we can’ may actually be traced back to that persuasive technique.

(14) **We** do not give up. **We** do not quit. **We** do not allow fear or division to break our spirit. (O1)
(15) And **we** must show them and all our people that **we** are equal to the task before use. (O2)

In example (14) Obama sticks to the ‘list of three’ by repeating the syntax thrice. Furthermore, ‘fear’, ‘division’ and ‘spirit’ is personalized and by that Obama accentuates the attempt to create ‘pathos’.

To sum up, it seems as if both politicians use the exclusive technique when they are referring to central issues where they have to take responsibility. On the other hand, the inclusive pronominal usage is preferred when solidarity is created through emotional persuasion.

4.3.3 ‘I’ – First Person Singular:

It is striking that Obama uses the first person singular pronoun almost twice as often as Bush. One can draw the conclusion that Obama tries to accentuate personal commitment more permanently than Bush, and a more precise look reveals that this might be the case.

Especially in the first speech (2005) Bush tries to omit the usage of ‘I’ entirely. ‘I’ is only used when speaking about WAR linked to KINDNESS. KINDNESS is a term introduced by me which stands for the attempt to highlight personal responsibility in achievements and the claim that decisions were taken out of purely altruistic motives. The fact that Bush uses ‘I’ when talking about WAR leads to the conclusion that he takes responsibility for his actions. A closer look shows that this is only half the truth. In fact, ‘I’ is used only once to explicitly prove commitment when talking about WAR.

(16) **I** gave to you and to all Americans my complete commitment to securing our country and defeating our enemies. (B1)

Bush also uses the first person singular pronoun when asking the Congress or the public for help and support.

(17) **I** will send you a proposal … (B1)
(18) **I** urge you … (B1)
(19) **I** will send you a budget … (B1)
(20) … **I** also ask you to … (B1)
(21) … **I** propose a grassroots campaign … (B1)
(22) … **I** ask you to support … (B2)
(23) **I** ask you to approve … (B2)
(24) **I** call on the Congress … (B2)

'I' is never used when talking about already taken decisions or his firm convictions. Therefore, it is hard to actually filter out Bush's personal opinions as personal commitment is avoided in a skilful way. By doing so a barrier between speaker and listener is retained.

As already mentioned Bush inserts the first person singular pronoun when talking about topics which predominantly cause positive associations, as in the case of KINDNESS where he talks about America's wish to help other countries or to protect the weakest of society. The same is also true for situations which are not face-threatening as the conservative attitude on the topics are predictable, for example, when talking about FAMILY VALUES, RELIGION or HEALTH CARE.

(25) This program strengthens democracy, transparency, and the rule of law in developing nations, and **I** ask you to fully fund this important initiative. (B2)
(26) By executive order, **I** have opened billions of dollars in grant money to competition that includes faith-based charities. (B1)

Obama uses a different strategy than Bush when it comes to the first person singular pronoun. He permanently maintains the impression of being personally committed and creates corporate feelings between him and the public. His strategy is more elaborate and skilful as it enables him to touch the audience on an emotional level.

A great difference between Bush's and Obama's use of 'I' is that the latter does not only indicate personal commitment with the first person

singular but also pronounces opinions more clearly with the help of 'I' as can be seen in example (28) below. Personal opinions are presented more openly by Obama than by Bush. One should not forget that Obama finds himself in a very different position than Bush. Obama managed to create confidence among the public and he established a belief in change and progress. On the other hand, Bush permanently has to defend himself and his decisions.

It is important to mention that personal involvement is not only found when intended courses of action are discussed, which would be harder to criticise as the outcome is yet unclear (Wilson 1990: 52), but also when Obama clearly pronounces already taken actions and personal beliefs. The listener gets the impression that Obama in convinced of what he says;

(27) So **I** know the anxieties that are out there right now. (…) These struggles are the reason **I** ran for President.(O1)
(28) … it's that we all hated the bank bailout. **I** hated it – **I** hated it – **I** hated it. You hated it. (O1)
(29) So **I** know how unpopular it is to be seen as helping banks right now, especially when everyone is suffering in part from their bad decisions. **I** promise you – **I** get it. (O2)
(30) **I**'m bringing together business and workers, doctors and health care providers. (O2)

As can clearly be seen in the examples above, Obama pronounces responsibility and the willingness to act even if these decisions are unpopular and by that he establishes trust among his audience. Finally, he inserts 'I' to create an inspiring mood and to create solidarity with the people as can be seen in the example below.

(31) **I** have never been more hopeful about America's future than **I** am tonight. (O1)

4.3.4 'YOU' – Second Person Plural/ Singular:

As mentioned in chapter 3.3.1.3 'you' is of great strategical value as it refers to an only vaguely defined addressee. That means that the listener can never be sure about whom the speaker is actually talking. Fairclough

states that ‘you’ creates tension between the audience and the speaker as the listener is addressed on a personal level (1989: 106).

It becomes clear that Bush’s and Obama’s use ‘you’ differently. As mentioned, they are speaking in front of two different types of recipients, namely, the Congress and the American public watching or reading the speeches at home but as it turns out, a more precise analysis shows that Bush is not aware of the presence of the American public as an audience. This assumption is undermined by the fact that he does not put as much weight on the attempt to create solidarity between him and the population. He regards it as more important to gain support from the Congress than from the nation itself. Bush uses ‘you’ almost exclusively when referring to the Congress but only rarely in reference to the American public.

(32) … just as **you**, as members of the Congress, can choose an insurance plan that meets **your** needs. (B1)
(33) And I call on **you** to double our initial commitment to fighting HIV/AIDS by approving an additional $30 billion over the next five years. (B2)

The only time Bush uses ‘you’ differently is when he tries to create an impression of personal relation between him and soldiers or between him and the Iranian government.

(34) In the past year, **you** have done everything we’ve asked of **you**, and more. (B2)
(35) We have no quarrel with **you**. We respect **your** traditions and **your** history. (B2)

Still, the strategy to use ‘you’ to create the illusion of intimacy is not used as often by him as by Obama, which proves that closeness to the American public is not as important to Bush as to Obama.

Only twice Bush uses ‘you’ to address the nation directly. In both cases he presumes to speak to a child. By that he intensifies the impression of a caring father.

(36) We love **you**, and we don’t want to lose **you**. (B1)

(37) And, Ashley, while **you** do **your** part, all of us here in this great chamber will do our best to keep **you** and the rest of America safe and free. (B1)

The great difference between Bush's and Obama's way of using 'you' can be traced back to Obama's overall rhetorical strategy; the aim to create a direct relationship between the public and himself as a person and by that gaining support and solidarity. Obama constantly tries to promote himself as a mouthpiece of the people. In the following chapters we will realize that he also uses other rhetorical devices, particularly metaphors and repetition, to create the impression of solidarity with the man on the street. In contrast to Bush, Obama more or less never uses 'you' when speaking to the Congress but only to address the American public.

(38) **You** don't need to hear another list of statistics to know that our economy is in crisis, because **you** live it every day. (O2)

Example (38) shows how Obama creates the impression of being an average guy by inserting phrases as 'our economy' and thereby claiming that the economical crisis has an impact on him as well. This can again be traced back to his attempt to create solidarity with the people and evoke the impression of trustability and by that expand his supporters. It becomes obvious that Obama is more aware of the strategical possibilities of 'you' and takes advantage of the American population as an audience and is more skilful in creating a personal level with the help of pronouns. This skill is demonstrated one last time in the example below.

(39) … if **your** family earns less than $250,000 a year, **you** will not see **your** taxes increased a single dime. (O2)

4.3.5 Referring to Opponents

When it comes to the pronominal analysis of how to refer to opponents, one needs to examine how 'they', 'those' and 'these' are inserted. As mentioned in chapter 3.3.1.4 'those' is generally used to create distance between speaker and the message, thereby responsibility

is not taken. On the other hand, ‘they’ has a more neutral tone even though, it still accentuates the distance between the speaker and the message.

On a first glance, both Bush and Obama use ‘they’ almost randomly, but a more precise analysis shows that Obama uses the pronoun in order to create solidarity with the nation as he frequently inserts ‘they’ when telling the Congress about the situation of the nation. This can be interpreted as an attempt to express solidarity with the people.

(40) **They** don’t understand why it seems like bad behaviour on Wall Street is rewarded, but hard work on Main Street isn’t; … (O1)

His use of ‘those’ is even more interesting as it depicts the superiority of Obama’s systematic pronominal use. Table 5 shows that Obama uses ‘THOSE’ about twice as often as Bush. The analysis of the following examples will give even deeper insights into Obama’s elaborate systematic pronominal patterns. Bush, on the other hand, does not seem to have any strategy at all when it comes to the use of ‘those’, ‘these’ and ‘they’.

Obama strictly inserts ‘those’ in face-threatening situations, topics which are negatively connotated or when he tries to distance himself from certain topics which he considers being harmful for the relationship between him and the audience.

(41) But at a time of record deficits, **we** will not continue tax cuts for oil companies, for investment fund managers, and for **those** making over 250,000 dollars a year. (O1)
(42) People bought homes **they** knew **they** couldn’t afford from banks and lenders who pushed **those** bad loans anyway. (O2)

Both examples show how Obama uses ‘those’ to accentuate the impression of fighting against a villain. He skilfully creates the feeling of being the defender of the weakest members of society and shows commitment with the financial situation of American families. In particular, example (42) shows how Obama uses ‘those’ when talking about negative topics, as in this case “bad loans”.

Compared to Obama's, Bush's pronominal strategy is less sophisticated as he follows no clear pattern and uses this great manipulative source almost randomly. The following example illustrates his confusing pronominal choices;

(43) I oppose amnesty, because it would encourage further illegal immigration, and unfairly reward **those** who break our laws. My temporary worker program will preserve the citizenship path for **those** who respect the law, … (B1)

He chooses the same form of address when speaking about negatively and positively associated people within one and the same passage. One can clearly see that Bush is less pedantic when it comes to a consistent usage of 'those' but also when it comes to the compliance of a pronominal pattern in general. Otherwise, he would have tried to paraphrase the second sentence to create an emotional referee-distinction which would be manifested in the rhetorical choice of pronouns. That clearly proves that Bush does not attach as much importance to the pronominal manipulative possibilities as Obama and lays his focus on other rhetorical strategies. For instance, by repeating 'those' he creates a repetitive impression which is an interesting rhetorical device as well. The way how repetition is used as a rhetorical device will be discussed more precisely in chapter 4.5.

4.3.6 Summary of the Pronominal Systems of Bush and Obama

To sum up, one can realize significant differences between Bush's and Obama's pronominal choices. These discrepancies are due to the respective political situation they see themselves in but also to their ideological viewpoints on certain topics.

For instance, the E-WE is used by Bush when speaking about progress in war in order to underline and prove strength and strictness. In contrast, Obama uses both the E-WE and the I-WE to accentuate personal commitment. In order to create pathos in his speeches and for the sake of emotional persuasion, Obama inserts I-WE almost twice as often as Bush. Moreover, Obama's aim to highlight personal commitment is also obvious

because of the fact that he uses the first person singular pronoun almost twice as often as Bush. The reason why Bush tries to avoid a pronominal system which emphasizes responsibility is because he is dealing with face-threatening topics such as war from which he tries to avoid being associated with.

Moreover, when observing the pronominal system of the two politicians one realizes that Obama is more skilled in making out the double audience of the 'State of the Union' speeches. In particular, the analysis of 'you' has proven that Bush was not aware of the American public as an audience. He rarely addresses the American public and only speaks to the Congress. Thereby, he does not use the opportunity to justify certain political decisions in front of the public. On the other hand, Obama's pronominal choices lead to the conclusion that he is conscious of the double listenership and tries to use the speeches in order to create the impression of solidarity and to promote his political concepts.

The analysis of the pronominal systems of both politicians proves that Obama is more aware of the persuasive potential of pronouns. In contrast to Bush, Obama tries to highlight personal involvement and he seems to be more alert of the plurality of the audience. This leads to the assumption that Obama is more skilled in creating a consistent pronominal system and that he is more aware of the manipulative possibilities of pronouns.

4.4 Metaphorical Analysis of Bush and Obama

It has frequently been mentioned that the overall aim of this diploma thesis is to find out, to what extent Bush's and Obama's rhetorics differ. The metaphorical analysis of George Bush and Barack Obama will expose in how far metaphors are responsible for the creation and illustration of contrastive ideologies.

At first, I will take a closer look at metaphors used by both politicians. The investigation will reveal differences in their systematic metaphorical pattern. The policy of the two politicians will be examined against the backdrop of Lakoff's (1995, 1996) findings on the nature of the

metaphorical frame that governs political thought. The last point mentioned will display how ideology and the choice of metaphors are interrelated.

It is important to mention that not all but only the most striking and interesting metaphors can be taken into account as the chosen speeches consist of between about 5000 and 7000 words and an analysis of the most frequently recurring and dominant metaphors will be enough to recognize metaphorical patterns.

4.4.1 Similarities in Bush's and Obama's Metaphorical Choices

Despite the many differences of George W. Bush's and Barack Obama's rhetorical strategies there are also obvious similarities. Both politicians predominantly use ontological metaphors, in particular, they exploit the potential of substance metaphors. Moreover, orientational but also structural metaphors and the concept of personification are used frequently as a rhetorical device by both politicians. NATIONAL PRIDE, NATIONAL UNITY, DEMOCRACY, SPORT, WAR, BUILDING are among the most frequently occurring cognitive sources. For instance;

(44) So we must come together, pass this agreement, and show our neighbours in the region that **democracy leads to a better life**. (B2)
(45) For **America** must always **stand on the side of freedom and human dignity**. (O1)

In both examples, democracy is conceptualised and personified. Moreover, the politicians use the premise that democracy is the superior political system. While the first example clearly expresses that 'democracy leads to a better life', the second example draws an analogy between 'America' and 'democracy' and thereby defines America as 'the' democratic role model representing freedom and human dignity. The politicians create the feeling of +AMERICAN SPIRIT+ which in its turn inspires the feeling of being one unit. This feeling is constantly evoked by both politicians. For instance;

(46) the **secret of our strength, the miracle of America**, is that **our greatness lies** not in our government, but **in the spirit and determination of our people.** (B2)
(47) These words and these stories tell us something about **the spirit of the people who sent us here.** (O2)

In example (47) Obama refers to the cognitive source of the +SPIRIT OF THE FOREFATHERS+. This metaphorical concept can also be found in George W. Bush's speeches, even if less frequently so. By referring to historical events he tries to shape the feeling of patriotism among the audience (Savoy 2009). Historical analogies have a great tradition in American speeches and are indispensable in American politics, regardless of which ideology one belongs to. An explanation why Obama uses historical metaphors more frequently than Bush can be traced back to the fact that during his election campaign the main promise was that he would bring 'change'. By appealing to the American history and to the concept of +NATIONAL PRIDE+ he creates the belief that the future can be as bright as the proudest moments of American history. He intensifies his message by constantly referring to the +NECESSITY OF CHANGE+ while Bush tries to preserve and defend already existing political achievements and therefore, does not insert the metaphorical source of +FRESH BREEZE+ as often as Obama.

Both politicians also frequently create a link between POLITICS and BUILDING. They try to establish the idea that the main idea behind leading a state is to build or to create it as can be seen in the examples (48) and (49).

(48) In the end it's our ideals, **our values that built America** – values that allowed us **to forge a nation**. (O1)
(49) The men and women of Afghanistan are **building a nation that is free**, and proud, and fighting terror – and America is honoured to be their friend. (B1)

Both politicians also create analogies between WAR and POLITICS. This is hardly surprising if one considers the fact that all speeches are performed in times of war. What seems to be more interesting is the fact that the metaphorical source of WAR is also used when discussing other

topics. For instance, the metaphor +POLITICS IS WAR+ can frequently be found;

(50) These institutions, these unseen pillars of civilization, must remain strong in America, and **we will defend them**. (B1)
(51) Third, we will act with **the full force of the federal government** to ensure that the major banks that Americans depend on have enough confidence and enough money to lend even in more difficult times. (O2)

It can be assumed that the metaphor +POLITICS IS WAR+ is an essential cognitive framework within politics as it allows politicians to evoke the impression of being hardliners without any compromise. Moreover, it also highlights the image of the serious and dangerous nature of politics. That is why both politicians frequently use words related to violence as can be seen the two following examples (52) and (53);

(52) America is leading **the fight against global poverty**, with strong education initiatives and humanitarian assistance. (B1)
(53) And -- And the lobbyists are trying to kill it. Well, we cannot let them **win this fight**. (O1)

While both politicians use the metaphorical concept of WAR frequently, a more detailed analysis reveals that they use it for different purposes. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4.4.2.1 and 4.4.2.2. Overall, the concept of WAR is of great importance for both politicians as it enables them to create a very strong self-manifestation, meaning that it creates the image of authority and strength.

A further common metaphor is also +POLITICS IS SPORT+ and +POLITICS IS A GAME+. These metaphors are constantly linked to the concept of WAR which creates the impression of WAR being a GAME or a SPORT. Both politicians use the metaphor frequently, for instance;

(54) These nations **aren't playing for second place**. (O1)
(55) And my Administration, and this Congress, will give you the resources you need to **fight and win the war on terror**. (B1)

Particularly, example (55) proves and displays how the concept of WAR and SPORT can be brought together when Bush claims that one can

win the war in the same way a competition or a game can be won. Moreover, in example (54) the business competition between nations is compared with the sportive rivalry between contestants. The metaphor of SPORT and GAME is important for two reasons. First, it provides one with the ability to create the impression of standing in a competition with concrete issues or people. Secondly, as war is a delicate and face-threatening topic and the use of SPORT and GAME metaphors evokes joyful connotations, severity is reduced. Again further investigation shows that both politicians use this cognitive source differently as can be seen in the chapters 4.4.2.1 and 4.4.2.2.

One of the most frequently occurring metaphor is certainly +POLITICS IS A JOURNEY+.

(56) The Iraqis still have **a distance to travel**. (B2)
(57) I will **not walk away** from these Americans, and neither should the people in this chamber. (O1)

JOURNEY is a vital cognitive framework within politics and therefore ideology cannot be linked directly to the metaphor. Nonetheless, if one combines the physical experience with our cultural understanding of the concept of time, things become more interesting. For instance, the future can be regarded being desirable or not. Here a comparison of the two politicians reveal clear differences. For instance;

(58) So I'll issue **an executive order** that will allow us **to go forward**, because I refuse to pass this problem on to another generation of Americans. (O1)
(59) In **the work ahead** we must be **guided** by the philosophy that made our nation great. (B2)

It can already be revealed that Obama permanently tries to highlight his belief in progress with the help of the metaphorical concept +POLITICS IS A JOURNEY+ while Bush uses the same metaphorical concept to promote a path of constancy and approved ideals as can be seen in example (59) where he uses the cognitive source of +SPIRIT OF THE FOREFATHERS+.

Moreover, orientational metaphors (spatial) are used repeatedly by both politicians.

(60) Productivity is **high**. (B1)
(61) Nor did all of our problems begin when the housing market collapsed or the stock market **sank**. (O2)

The metaphorical concept presented in example (60) announces the main idea +PRODUCTIVITY IS HIGH; UNPRODUCTIVNESS IS LOW+ while example (61) says +GOOD MARKET RISES; BAD MARKET SINKS+.

Finally, metaphors concerned about illnesses, for instance, +THE STATE IS ILL+ also occur in all of the speeches. This is hardly surprising as an analogy between the state's political condition and its health is drawn. The quintessence is that a sick state can only be cured by the respective politician or party.

(62) A **strong, healthy financial market** makes it possible for businesses to access credit and creates new jobs. (O1)

In sum, it should not be ignored that there are certain similarities between Bush's and Obama's use of metaphors. Above all, one reason is certainly the fact that both politicians are members of the same western culture in which political speeches are characterised by a limited cluster of metaphors. Still, in the proceeding chapters I will try to show that the two candidates represent entirely different world views and that their ideologies are manifested in their conscious and unconscious choices of rhetorical devices. It has to be considered that the metaphorical choices depend on the context in which they appear. One can assume that not only ideological background but also the notion of micro and macro context is necessary for a significant analysis of the language of Bush and Obama. The aim of the following chapters will not only be to pose the question which metaphorical concepts are utilised but also for what purpose, for what reasons and for what intended reactions. For the sake of lucidity, I will focus on one speaker at a time. Moreover, the analysis will be topic-specific as this reveals which metaphors are used for which contents.

4.4.2 Topic-Specific Analysis of the Metaphorical System

4.4.2.1 Obama on War

Bush is more skilled than Obama when it comes to the creation of violent images. This is certainly due to the fact that war has a more central weight in his policy. After the attacks on the World Trade Centre on September 11, 2001, Bush started his war on terror, joined by more than 20 other nations, among them the United Kingdom. First Afghanistan was invaded and in 2003 Bush launched the invasion of Iraq, which was dogmatized as a necessity as it would be part of the 'War on Terrorism'. Most Americans did not deny the necessity of this war but the way it was led. Bush was criticised constantly by European countries but there was also a strong American opposition against him. The war led to the overthrow of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and the defeat of Saddam Hussein in Iraq. On the other hand, it caused the deaths of many Iraqis but also American soldiers and further, the US troops did not succeed to kill or capture the al Qaeda leader, Osama bin Laden.

Obama has a very different policy when it comes to the topic of war and in contrast to Bush a cornerstone in his election campaign was the promise that combat operations would end in Iraq within 18 months. His policy on the topic changed when he became president. He decided to bolster up U.S. troop strengths in Afghanistan. At the same time, he withdrew American combat brigades from Iraq and took the decision to leave only "some 50,000 US troops until the end of 2011 to advise Iraqi forces and protect US interests" (Sykes 2010). These forces are not supposed to perform combat operations but they are trained in counter-terrorism and should establish, train and equip an Iraqi security force (Jones 2009). However, even if Obama adopted a more sober line after becoming president and his initial drawdown did not happen as fast as he had originally proposed, it is obvious that he has an entirely different approach to how to deal with terrorism than Bush. This is also manifested in his language.

As war is a less central topic in Obama's policy, he tries to create violent images less frequently than Bush. Still, there are other metaphorical similarities between Bush and Obama when it comes to the topic of war. Just like Bush, Obama uses the metaphorical frame +EVIL IS A FORCE+ and +AL QAEDA IS A FORCE+.

(63) For we know that America cannot meet **the threats of this century** alone, but the world cannot meet them without America. (O2)
(64) We've made substantial investments in our homeland security and disrupted plots that **threatened to take American lives**. (O1)

These metaphorical devices work according to the STRICT-FATHER model. The reason for Obama using prototypical conservative metaphors might be that it would have been hard for him to speak differently about terrorism. On the one hand, al Qaeda actually is a threat and on the other hand, Bush has imprinted and created dead metaphors which are perpetuated by Obama for several reasons. He can fall back on metaphors which people have got used to and it would be hard to induce new metaphorical concepts as they are so deeply manifested. For instance, the metaphor '9/11' is a good example of how certain phrases turn into dead metaphors after constant repetition and with the help of good media work. It becomes obvious that certain metaphors have become part of everyday language;

(65) Sadly, some of the unity we felt after **9/11** has dissipated. (O1)

As already mentioned, Obama relies on phrases and metaphors which were introduced by his political precursor.

When talking about war, Obama again uses metaphors which underline his keen wish of progress. The most prominent progress oriented metaphors when talking about the war is the specific-level metaphorical source JOURNEY but also the metaphorical concept of BUILDING. Bush also uses these metaphorical sources when talking about war, but for different aims. While Obama tries to create the impression of progress,

Bush uses JOURNEY, as already illustrated in chapter 4.4.1, in order to visualize ideological distance between America and its allies and terrorists and their protectors. BUILDING is used similarly by both politicians, namely to promote the idea of the American duty to rebuild and thereby reunite the world into a place without EVIL.

(66) We are instead called **to move forward** with the sense of confidence and candor that serious times demand. (O2)
(67) To **seek progress toward a secure and lasting peace between** Israel and her neighbours, we have appointed an envoy to sustain our efforts. (O2)
(68) Let's **leave behind the fear and division**, and do what it takes to defend our nation and **forge a more hopeful future** – for America and for the world. (O1)
(69) In the end, it's our ideals, **our values that built** *America* – values that allowed us to **forge a nation** made up of immigrants from every corner of the globe; (…) (O1)

Example (69) shows clearly how Obama uses the cognitive metaphor +AMERICA WAS BUILT+ for the persuasive purpose of 'pathos' (Reisigl 2008a: 96 f.) while examples (66) and (67) illustrate the idea +PROGRESS IS IN FRONT+ which Obama constantly tries to advert in his speeches. Example (68) illustrates in a convincing manner how on the one hand BUILDING is used to create a progress-oriented spirit and on the other hand, the orientational metaphor +FEAR AND DIVISION IS BEHIND+ amplifies this attempt.

4.4.2.2 Bush on War

Bush's policy on war and terrorism has already been discussed in chapter 4.4.2.1. It goes without saying that it is the most dominant topic in his speeches. He uses a broad range of metaphors to create a simple and comprehensible understanding of the concept of war. In order to justify the war, Bush tries to draw analogies with other 'good' historical events. For instance, the unusual bond between Bush and Gore is often compared with the Roosevelt-Churchill alliance or the liberation of Kabul or Baghdad is linked to the capture of Paris or Berlin (Hoogland 2004: 339).

His rhetorical main statement is that +TERRORISM IS AN EVIL FORCE+ and that +TERRORISM IS A PERSON+: The opposite of terror and terrorism is America which in its turn is conceptualized as GOOD with the help of the metaphor +AMERICA IS FREEDOM+. Moreover, he also uses the conceptual metaphor +NATION IS A PERSON+. With the help of the personification of both TERRORISM and NATION, Bush can simply create the abstract image of two people fighting against each other instead of nations or organizations.

Bush repeats the same metaphors constantly, for instance '9/11', 'war on terror' or 'axis of evil'. The Bush administration "discovered a ready-made body of wartime analogies" (Hoogland 2004: 341) from the first Gulf War, which was simply taken over. A study which analysed Bush's public appearances from June 6, 2002, to November 5, 2002, showed that Bush used virtually every speaking opportunity to remind the listeners of the horrors of 9/11 (Simon 2007: 178). By constantly repeating these phrases, dead metaphors were created and metaphorically burnt into people's minds. In particular, the expression 'axis of evil' is of great interest as one can clearly see how Bush used emotionally loaded concepts to convince and manipulate the public. The word 'axis' refers to the 'axis of power' of World War II[13] while 'evil' evokes theological connotations and also reminds people about the Cold War and Reagan's epithet for the Soviet Union, 'the evil empire' (Eubanks and Schaeffer 2004: 61 ff.). 'Axis of Evil' therefore, is an example for what Hoogland defines as 'social memory', meaning, a collective historical memory (2004: 341). Still, there are also other metaphors which are used repeatedly by Bush when talking about war.

When referring to terrorists or other opponents, Bush frequently uses so called 'purr words'. Purr words are defined as terms that make people feel good about the subject in question. In contrast, there are 'snarl words' which make people react negatively (Hoffmann 2005). The insertion of purr words is a great device for Bush as images of 'hope' and 'human freedom' eliminate 'despair', 'hatred', 'tyranny' and 'terror' (Hoffmann

[13] Germany, Italy and Japan. The term axis was first used by Mussolini in 1936 when he referd to the 'Berlin-Rome Axis'

2005). That means that Bush permanently speaks about the war as if it is indispensable. For instance, in order to sell war as a necessity Bush uses the metaphorical frame +WAR IS VITAL+.

(70) Defeating the Taliban and al Qaeda is critical to our security, and I thank the Congress for supporting America's **vital mission** in Afghanistan. (B2)
(71) We will stand by our allies, and we will defend our **vital interests** in the Persian Gulf. (B2)
(72) As we debate at home, we must never ignore the **vital contributions** of our international partners. (B1)

A further frequently occurring metaphor used by Bush is +AMERICA IS FREEDOM+. By that, he creates his major argument for the war, namely that terrorists are enemies and the antipode of FREEDOM. As terrorists are considered as the direct opposite of America, we can draw the conclusion that +TERRORISTS ARE BONDAGE+. Bush uses Saddam Hussein but also Osama Bin Laden to personalize the image of EVIL. By reducing the enemy to one single person it is easier to bundle hatred and arouse emotions among the public. This leads to a shrill and populist presentation of the war.

(73) We are engaged in the defining ideological struggle of the 21st century. The **terrorists oppose every principle** of humanity and decency that **we hold dear**. (B2)

One can clearly see that Bush tries to create the image of terrorists being the clear contrast to America. Bush's language matches with the STRICT-FATHER model and the +NATION IS A PARENT+ metaphor as he defines it as an American duty to defend the American public and all people who defend and believe in freedom. America is thereby compared with the head of a family which should be taken care of.

Furthermore, Bush uses a great range of orientational metaphors, thus creating the impression of superiority by promoting the main principle of +UP/ABOVE/IN FRONT IS GOOD; DOWN/ BELOW/ BEHIND IS BAD+. Metaphors which indicate progress are used when talking about America

and its allies while in contrast terrorism is permanently connotated with slow, backward striving words or phrases.

(74) (…) it is tempting to believe that **the danger is behind us**. (B1)

This example displays how the impression of a hunter and chaser is erected. The use of orientational metaphors is particularly interesting as even if these metaphors are primarily grounded in physical experience there is a cultural dimension which should be taken into account. For example, future can either be in front or behind someone, depending on the perception of future found in the particular culture (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14). Thereby, one can suggest that orientational metaphors are used to undermine the cultural and ideological differences between America and terrorists.

Moreover, the metaphorical concept of JOURNEY is used when talking about war. They support the attempt to create the impression of distance between America and the opponents. Bush accentuates superiority as America is on the move forward while other countries are fleeing or hiding.

(75) The **Iraqis** still have a **distance to travel**. (B2)
(76) Having **come so far** and achieved so much, we must not allow this to happen. (B2)

In particular, example (75) visualizes what is meant by ‘metaphorical creation of distance’. By the constant repetition of the metaphorical concept of DISTANCE and JOURNEY Bush declares America as the leading nation with the duty to save the world from evil.

The metaphorical source of BUILDING is applied intensively when speaking about war. It occurs in different forms but is based on the same main idea which is repeated over and over again. Bush promotes the impression that it is America’s duty to erect democracy, which is defined as the superior worldview.

(77) So America is using its influence to **build a freer, more hopeful, and more compassionate world**. (B2)

(78) Sir, America stands with you and the Iraqi people as you **build a free and peaceful nation.** (B1)
(79) Our aim is a democratic peace – a peace **founded upon the dignity and rights** of every man and woman. (B1)

The metaphorical concept of +AMERICA IS BUILDING PEACE+ is constantly repeated by Bush and legitimizes the idea of America being responsible for bringing peace and justifies the demand of leadership. In order to gain support among the public Bush tries to announce the idea of +AMERICA IS BUILDING DEMOCRACY AND PEACE+ with the help of the concept of NATIONAL PRIDE, which creates feelings of unity and solidarity. NATIONAL PRIDE is in turn created with the help of the personification +AMERICA IS A PERSON+.

(80) **America** is proud of you. (B1)

"America" amplifies the impression of unity and to act in concert for the sake of the nation.

4.4.2.3 Obama on Economy

For Obama, the economy is of more central value than for Bush. This can be explained by the fact that he is confronted with a financial crisis - caused during Bush's term in office - which was not as obvious during Bush's presidential period. The crisis, which is often defined being the worst since the Great Depression of the 1930s[14] and frequently referred to as the 'United States housing bubble', was caused when banks started selling A.R.M (adjustable rate mortgages) loans to people as they aimed to purchase expensive houses which they were not able to afford. This caused the breakdown of large financial institutions, the governmental rescue of banks and downturns of all the world's stock-markets. Moreover, the housing market suffered which resulted into numerous evictions and closings.[15] Export decreased dramatically which caused an increase of the

[14](http://www.reuters.com/article/pressRelease/idUS193520+27-Feb-2009+BW20090227, 8 May 2011)
[15](http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2009/01/pdf/text.pdf, 8 May 2011)

unemployment rate. By October 2009 the United States faced the highest unemployment rate since 1983 with 10, 1% people without work.[16] It had almost doubled compared to the pre-crisis rate (Herbst 2009). In order to pour oil on troubled water, Obama introduced the 'American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009' (Recovery Act) with the aim to strengthen and stabilise the economical situation (Bean 2007).

This was the situation Barack Obama saw himself confronted with when he took office and it explains people's dislike for banks and the economical situation. ILLNESS is a prominent metaphorical source Obama uses when talking about the financial situation. He tries to establish the impression of knowing the cure against a spreading disease. In the following examples one can also observe how he manages to undermine that although he is not responsible for the situation he is willing to take the burden and solve the problem. He inserts the 'I-WE' as he wants to create solidarity with the people.

(81) (…) it's that **we** all hated the bank bailout. **I** hated it – **I** hated it – **I** hated it. You hated it. It was about as **popular as a root canal**. (O1)
(82) Slowly, but surely, confidence will return, and our **economy will recover**. (O2)

In example (81) one can see how the financial crisis is compared with a ROOT CANAL. He uses the metaphorical frame +ECONOMY IS AN ILLNESS+ which he, as the representative of the nation, is supposed to cure. Here the impression of +ECONOMY IS A PATIENT+ is created which can only be cured with the help of his 'Recovery Act'.

In order to keep distance between himself and the economical situation Obama inserts the metaphor +ECONOMY IS A PLACE OR STREET+ or +ECONOMY IS AN INSTITUTION+ from which he can easily set himself apart. He repeatedly uses the sources WALL STREET, MAIN STREET but also WASHINGTON which he defines being the source of the financial crisis as they personify ECONOMY.

[16](http://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LNU04000000?years_option=all_years&periods_option=specific_periods&periods=Annual+Data, 8 May 2011)

(83) Now, I know **Wall Street** isn't keen on this idea, but if these firms can afford to hand out big bonuses again, they can afford a modest fee to pay back the taxpayers who rescued them in their time of need. (O1)

(84) They don't understand why it seems like bad behaviour on **Wall Street** is rewarded, but hard work on **Main Street** isn't; or why **Washington** has been unable to solve any of our problems. (O1)

(85) I understand that on any given day, **Wall Street** may be more comforted by an approach that gives bank bailouts with no strings attached, and that holds nobody accountable for their reckless decisions. (O2)

Through the use of these personifications it is easy to maintain the impression of supporting and serving the American average person and by that Obama creates the feeling of being a man of the people.

Obama states that he tries to protect the nation from consequences of the financial crisis. In the conservative worldview, poverty is regarded as the result of self-indulgence while wealth arrives from self-discipline. Thus, the better-off are to be rewarded as they have proven moral strength. The NURTURANT PARENTS model demands that the rich help the poor, just as in a nurturant family the older or stronger are supposed to help younger and weaker family members (Lakoff 1995). In this case, Obama has no choice but to save banks and thereby he cannot act according to the NURTURANT PARENTS model which is why he has to highlight his reluctance to act in the way he has to. This is, for instance, illustrated in example (81). By that he remains true to the NURTURANT PARENTS model to some extent. Still, in example (86) he uses a FATHER OF THE NATION metaphor when he claims that he is simply interested in finding a solution for the problem. It shows Obama's problem to stick to a purely liberal language when talking about economy as it is a rather conservative topic;

(86) Look, I am **not interested in punishing banks**. I'm **interested in protecting our economy**. (O1)

Moreover, Obama tries to demonstrate economical recovery and growth through the help of the cognitive concept of BUILDING. He tries to establish the feeling of creating or rebuilding the American economy.

(87) Next, we can put Americans to work today **building the infrastructure of tomorrow.** (O1)

Example (87) demonstrates clearly that the impression of progress is created with the help of the cognitive model +ECONOMY IS BEEING BUILT+. Orientational metaphors and the cognitive source of JOURNEY are frequently inserted for the same purpose. By the constant repetition of the core idea of progress, Obama creates a belief in a better future. This belief is skilfully expressed in his famous and catchy political slogan 'Yes, We Can'. He constantly promotes the belief in progress with the help of less evident metaphors. For instance,

(88) (…) we also took steps to get our **economy growing** again, (…) (O1)
(89) And **we're on track** to add another one and a half million jobs to this total by the end of the year. (O1)
(90) We do what is necessary **to move this country forward** (O2)
(91) We are instead **called to move forward** with the sense of confidence and candor that serious times demand. (O2)

In these examples one can clearly observe the way in which the cognitive model of +MOVING FORWARD IS PROGRESS+ is skilfully used. Obama knows how to use metaphors to create confidence among people as he clearly acts according to the NURTURANT PARENTS model and emphasizes that he is the protector of the nation. He also states that progress cannot be achieved by a single person but that all people have to work hard and have to act in concert.

(92) And right now, I know that there are many Americans who aren't sure if they still believe we can change – or that I can deliver it. But remember this – I never suggested that change would be easy, or that I could do it alone. (O1)

4.4.2.4 Bush on Economy

Next to the topic of war, the economy is the most important and prominent issue in Bush's speeches. When discussing the economical development he claims that people can be confident of the economic

growth in the long run and that therefore, tax rises will not be necessary. He uses the metaphor +STATE IS A FAMILY+ in a witty way and by that he creates the image of shared responsibility.

(93) **American families** have to balance their budgets; **so should their government**. (B2)

In this example, Bush obviously compares American families with the government.

Furthermore, he promotes humbleness and clearly supports the no-meddling condition of the Strict Father model when he claims that

(94) The best way to achieve that goal is by expanding consumer choice, not governmental control. (B2)

The most frequently appearing metaphors deal with the cognitive models of BUILDING and JOURNEY. By that Bush tries to provoke positive connotations of building and growth. Therefore, it is understandable that Bush inserts conceptual metaphors of JOURNEY as they also evoke feelings of leadership and progress as can be seen in the following example.

(95) And we should limit the burden of government on this economy by acting **as good stewards** of taxpayers' dollars. (B1)

Bush uses the +STATE IS A STEWARD+ metaphor. This metaphor causes the impression that responsibility has to be taken and that leadership is expected by the public.

Bush's main issue is that in 2005 and 2008 the United States were deeply involved in an expensive war, which devoured a massive amount of money. Therefore, only very vague economical measures were promoted by him as otherwise the public would have lost faith in him. As he is confronted with a situation in which the economy remains static, innovation and progress is not expected as there is no money left for investments into progressive ideas, he uses BUILDING and orientational metaphors as a

rhetorical device to at least create the linguistic impression of movement and progress.

(96) Younger workers should have the opportunity to **build a nest egg.** (B1)
(97) Americans took those dollars and put them to work, **driving this economy forward.** (B1)

In particular, example (97) creates the impression of progress as the metaphor +ECONOMICAL DEVELOPMENT IS FORWARD; ECONOMICAL STAGNATION IS BACKWARD+ is used. In his speeches Bush claims that the pace of economical growth is faster than over the last 20 years. Still, he conceals the fact that war automatically increases the economical expansion of certain markets such as the armaments, oil or automobile industry. On the other hand, branches such as education, health care or other welfare institutions suffer as there is simply no money left to invest in these fields. However, he cannot deny that there is a momentary aggravation of the economy and he tries to evoke a fighting spirit by claiming that the economy will certainly increase in the long run.

(98) In the long run, Americans can be **confident about our economic growth**. But in the short run we can all see that **growth is slowing**. (B2)
(99) This is a good agreement that will **keep our economy growing** and our people working. (B2)

We can clearly see that the metaphorical concept of GROWTH is of great importance for Bush's discourse on economy as it creates the impression of prosperity and that the financial situation is stable and secure.

4.4.2.5 Obama on Health Care

Again we are dealing with a central issue of Obama's policy. His views on health care are radical. He introduces an expansion of health insurance coverage from which uninsured could benefit. Moreover, he also installed premium increases and allowed people to keep health coverage

when they would quit their jobs and search for other employment.[17] He also introduced the 'public option, a government insurance plan, which should rival the corporate insurance sector. The 'public option' should make it impossible for insurers to drop sick people and requires that every American carries health coverage. On March 23, 2010, the health care reform, exclusively the 'public option' which was disapproved by the Senate on December 24, 2009, was signed by Obama (Scott 2009). Obama's plan is to insure 95% of all Americans with the help of his health care program, which would mean that it is history's largest tax cut for health care of the middle class.[18]

Obama's policy on health care works according to the liberal NURTURANT model. Still, when taking a closer look at his metaphorical choices one can clearly see that he does not entirely omit metaphors of strength. For instance, he frequently uses +HEALTH CARE IS BUSINESS+. As health care is an issue of controversy it seems to be reasonable to also use metaphors which appeal to conservative voters as well. In particular, Obama prefers the metaphorical concept of INVESTMENT.

(100) Let's **invest in our people** without leaving them a mountain of debt. (O1)

In a very skilful way he breaks down superficial topics to a more comprehensible level. Moreover, it is an interesting device to illustrate the amount of indebtedness as a 'mountain' as it accentuates the severity of the problem.

Moreover, Obama uses the +PLACES ARE INSTITUTIONS+ metaphor particularly often when talking about health care. By that he creates an antipathy against the former republican government. Still, it almost seems bizarre when Obama uses the personification of +WASHINGTON+ for criticism in order to gain support among the public while he himself is the most important and prominent representative of the

[17] (http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/healthcare, 8 May 2011)
[18] (http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/health-care, 8 May 2011)

American government. It is supposed to create the feeling of +US vs. THEM+. The following statements should illustrate the point in question:

(101) This can't be one of those **Washington** gimmicks that lets us pretend we solved a problem. (O1)
(102) Now that's what I came to **Washington** to do. (O1)
(103) But what frustrates the American people is a **Washington** where every day is "Election Day". (O1)

Furthermore, Obama also uses the metaphorical concept of +A NEW BREEZE IS BLOWING+ when emphasizing that his policy on health care stands in contrast to Bush's policy. Throughout his speeches, Obama underlines his progress oriented political approach with the help of different metaphors and when it comes to health care he makes no exception. He uses JOURNEY metaphors and orientational metaphors in order to promote progress and his strive to look ahead.

(104) All this was before I **walked in the door**. (O1)
(105) So I'll issue an executive order that will **allow us to go forward**, because I refuse to pass this problem on to another generation of Americans. (O1)
(106) **Don't walk away** from reform. (O1)

Even though Obama uses metaphors from the STRONG FATHER model, typical metaphors used by him when talking about the health reform are certainly +MORALITY IS EMPATHY+ and +MORAL ACTION IS NURTURANCE+ (Cienki 2005: 218f.). Obama's nurturant approach makes him choose restitution as he regards himself being the protector of the nation. As discussed above, the STRICT FATHER model uses the +MORALITY IS STRENGTH; IMMORALITY IS WEAKNESS+ metaphor. The use of these metaphors indicates that it is reasonable to reward rich people as their success is proof for their morality. The NURTURANT model claims that all people have the right to be helped and protected.

4.4.2.6 Bush on Health Care

Bush has a very different point of view on health care than Obama. In 2007, he vetoed the State Children's Health Insurance Program which would have increased federally funded health care for six to ten million children from low-income families. Bush's main argument against the legislation was that it would cause a governmental takeover of health care from which only families earning as much as 83 000 dollars would benefit. The State Children's Health Insurance Program was proposed by Democrats and was to be funded through a raise of the cigarette tax (Abramowitz and Weisman 2007). In his speeches, Bush promoted puritan principle, such as self-responsibility. In his opinion, there is no reason to help poorer families as +BEING GOOD IS BEING SUCCESSFUL+, consequently bad people are unsuccessful and poor.

Even if health care is of great importance as it is a corner stone in American politics and because it has become a major issue and central topic of criticism in the public, it is not discussed very intensively in Bush's selected speeches because of obvious reasons. As already mentioned, war is of exceptional importance in Bush's speeches. Hence, other topics such as health care do not have the same presence as they usually have. Still they are discussed briefly. One would assume that Bush, as he represents the conservative prototype of a politician, tries to avoid any form of governmental intervention. The more so, as we learn from Lakoff's moral accounting scheme (1996) that conservative politics rejects governmental meddling. It becomes even more interesting that when discussing health care in his first speech (1995) Bush uses the metaphorical concept of CHANGE.

(107) Our nation's health care system, like our economy, is also **in a time of change**. (B1)

This impression seems even more reliable as Bush speaks about the necessity to strengthen already existing models as his only concept seems to be to "(strengthen) Medicare and (to add) a prescription drug benefit

(…)" (B1). In his second speech he tries to evoke the image of CHANGE and PROGRESS when talking about health care;

(108) On matters of life and science, we must trust in the **innovative spirit of medical researchers** and empower them to **discover new treatments** while respecting moral boundaries. (B2)

Moreover, a frequently occurring cognitive frame when speaking about the American health care system is SPORT. For instance,

(109) And to help guarantee equal treatment of faith-based organizations, when they **compete for federal funds** (…) (B2)

This example uses the conceptual core idea that +FINANCIAL SUPPORT IS A COMPETITION+. However, it is obvious that health care is not Bush's most central topic as he does not use elaborate metaphorical concepts when speaking about it and the topic itself is only discussed briefly. Even though, the health care situation was in need of reform in 2005 and 2008, Bush tries to downplay the topic as he obviously has no policy on the issue or sees no necessity for change.

4.4.2.7 Obama on Education:

When it comes to education Obama and Bush have similar aims and while Bush signed the 'No Child Left Behind Act' in 2002, Obama deals with the issue of education in his 'Recovery Act'. Both politicians invest money to improve the quality of low-performing schools.[19]

When discussing education Obama again uses BUSINESS and INVESTMENT metaphors. He compares schools and other educational institutions with business companies. These rhetorical choices might be surprising as he does not have a background in economy as for example Bush has. A possible explanation for his metaphorical choices is that he uses his rhetorical devices to also increase support among conservative

[19] (http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education, 8 May 2011)

voters. For example, Obama frequently uses the metaphorical concept of +EDUCATION IS BUSINESS+.

(110) Fourth, we need to **invest in the skills and education** of our people. (O1)
(111) I know that the price of tuition is higher than ever, which is why if you are willing to volunteer in your neighbourhood or give back to your community or serve your country, we will make sure you can **afford a higher education**. (O2)

Both example (110) and (111) exemplify what is meant by using financial terms, in this case 'invest', to talk about social state basic principles like education. By that the already mentioned analogy between an educational institution and a profit-oriented business is made. The 'profit' of such an 'investment' is better trained pupils. Moreover, Obama uses NATIONAL PRIDE as a metaphor. This proves to be true in particular, when considering that Obama only two sentences above claims;

(112) It's not just quitting on yourself, it's quitting on your country – and this country needs and values the talents of every American. (O2)

We can see that in order to create the spirit of NATIONAL PRIDE and thereby also a sense of duty to the country, Obama uses +FAILING IS TREASON+ as a metaphorical concept. That particular metaphor does not correspond with the NURTURANT PARENTS model. +MORALITY IS STRENGTH+ and +DOING EVIL IS FALLING+ are metaphors which arrive from the STRICT FATHER model. Both +EDUCATION IS BUSINESS+ and +FAILING IS TREASON+ cannot be regarded as prototypical metaphors in a liberal worldview.

Obama again uses JOURNEY as a metaphorical source to create a spirit of hope, strive and belief in the future. In particular, +EDUCATION IS A PATH+ occurs frequently:

(113) In a global economy where the most valuable skill you can sell is your knowledge, a good **education is no longer just a pathway to opportunity** – it is pre-requisite. (O2)

(114) That's why I urge the Senate to follow the House and pass a bill that will revitalize our community colleges, which are **a career pathway** to the children of so many working families. (O1)

His permanent forward-looking and optimistic undertone creates a spirit of belief in the future. As he wants to establish the impression of a political re-start he constantly uses phrases and words, such as 'reform', indicating progress and belief as can be seen in the following example;

(115) Instead of funding the status quo, we only invest in **reform – reform** that raises student achievement (…)

4.4.2.8 Bush on Education

As already mentioned, Bush and Obama have similar views on education. Still, some few differences, for instance the handling of sex education, are obvious. For instance, Bush introduced sex education in which abstinence was promoted and denied funding for any other type of sexual health education. As already mentioned in chapter 3.6.6, this ideological approach is mentioned in particular by Lakoff (1995, 1996) and is prototypical of the STRICT FATHER model and the conservative worldview; the aim to foster self-control, as morally weak people are easily affected by nascent immorality. It would be proof of lack of self-control and self-indulgence if one gave in to 'temptations' and therefore, Bush's view on premarital sexual intercourse is self-evident. His opinions are clearly expressed;

(116) We will double federal funding for abstinence programs, so schools can teach this fact of life: Abstinence for young people is the only certain way to avoid sexually-transmitted diseases. (B1)

Generally speaking, Bush's educational policy is based on the 'No Child Left Behind Act', which demands the increased involvement of parents in educational questions. George W. Bush immediately proves typical conservative worldviews when he states that he considers the world

being a place of danger and that approved values prevent people from acting evil.

(117) We are living in a time of great change – in our world, in our economy, in science and medicine. Yet some things endure – courage and compassion, reverence and integrity, (…). **The values we try to live by never change.** (B1)

It becomes obvious that Bush is not too concerned about an elaborate metaphorical system when talking about education. This leads to the assumption that education is not a central issue in his policy which can be explained by the frequently mentioned fact that the USA was in the middle of a war and other topics were regarded being less important. However, in the short sections he is talking about education and family values, he predominantly uses orientational metaphors.

(118) Reading scores are **on the rise**. (B2)
(119) This program will provide extra help to middle and high school students **who fall behind** in reading and math, (…). (B1)

In these examples the metaphorical concept of +GOOD READING IS UP; BAD READING IS DOWN+ is operative. Another orientational metaphor used by Bush is +EXCELLENCE IS IN FRONT+.

(120) We are making **progress toward** excellence for every child in America. (B1)

Bush's policy and metaphorical choices go hand in hand with Lakoff's concept of the Strict-Father model, as he considers the state being a parent who is supposed to protect the family from internal and external evil and danger. The nation is protected with the help of tough love and therefore, control is promoted by Bush.

(121) We are providing more funding for our schools (…). We're requiring higher standards. We are regularly testing every child on the fundamentals. We are reporting results to parents (…). (B1)
(122) We must stand with our families to help them raise healthy, responsible children. (B1)

Example (121) contradicts with the no-meddling condition as Bush's educational policy depends on governmental interference. The statement given in example (122) is very contrastive. Bush tries to create the impression that control is still in the parents hands.

4.4.2.9 Obama on Energy

In contrast to Bush, who is not too concerned about environmental problems – for instance, he withdrew the American support of the Kyoto contract in 2001 - sustainable use of energy is a cornerstone in Obama's policy. During Bush's time in office, the White House was frequently subject to criticism because of their disregard of environmental issues. As an example, they denied to admit that there was clear evidence whether greenhouse gas emission was manmade or naturally caused (Bush 2001). Moreover, Bush did not support the Kyoto Protocol as he claimed that it was more lenient with developing countries, especially China and India. As environmental policy is a central political topic for Obama but not important for Bush, a rhetorical comparison between the politicians is not possible and only Obama's metaphorical choices will be investigated.

The difference in attitude towards environmental issues between the two politicians could not be more striking. In the conservative STRICT-FATHER model, every person has to defend him/herself against external threats. Protection from threats caused by pollution is not at the top of this list (Lakoff 1995). Furthermore, Bush rejects strict environmental protection laws, such as the Kyoto Protocol which in turn reveals the principle of no-meddling. Interference of United State's policy is an even stronger violation than environmental issues and therefore his rejection is allegeable. Furthermore, Bush seems to consider ecology and economy standing in contrast. This view is contrary to Obama's environmental philosophy. Obama tries to overthrow the contradiction between economy and ecology and claims that responsible environmental protection is a necessity for economical growth. Therefore, Obama tries to strengthen ecological awareness. For instance, on September 30, 2009, the Obama

administration proposed new regulations which should limit greenhouse gas emissions and decrease the pace of global warming (Broder 2009). So far we have discussed the ideological difference of the two politicians. The next step will be to see the metaphorical manifestation of Obama's ideals.

As already heard above, Obama uses the cognitive model of +ECOLOGY IS BUSINESS+ as he claims that environmental protection is necessary to strengthen the economy. He tries to promote the necessity of sustainable energy and disseminates the main principle +LEADERSHIP IN ECOLOGICAL INOVATION IS FINANCIAL SUCCESS+. For instance,

(123) We know the country that harnesses the power of clean, **renewable energy will lead the 21st century**. (O2)
(124) Here's the thing: Even if you doubt the evidence, providing incentives for energy efficiency and clean energy are the right thing to do for our future because the **nation that leads the clean energy economy will be the nation that leads the global economy**. And America must be that nation. (O1)

Example (124) illustrates how Obama uses the +ECOLOGY IS BUSINESS+ metaphor to convince conservative voters of its importance. Moreover, by inserting phrases such as "Here's the thing", which resemble colloquial language, Obama builds an impression of closeness to the listener. The listener gets the feeling that Obama is speaking from the bottom of his heart. By creating the impression of speaking spontaneously, Obama emphasizes that the environmental issue is of great personal importance and by that he aims to attract interest among the audience.[20]

Furthermore, Obama uses orientational metaphors and the cognitive model of JOURNEY when talking about the competition between nations on the ecological market. He constantly underlines the importance of AMERICAN LEADERSHIP in the future.

(125) We invented solar technology, but we'**ve fallen behind countries** like Germany and Japan in producing it. (O2)
(126) And I believe that the nation that invented the automobile **cannot walk away from it**. (O2)

[20] These 'spontaneous' phrases occur throughout his speeches. E.g. "Now – Now – just stating the facts." (O1), "I promise you – I get it." (O2), "I thought I'd get some applause on that one." (O1), "Michelle Obama (…) She gets embarrassed." (O1)

(127) We do what is necessary to **move this country forward**. (O2)

One can clearly see that his metaphorical choices lead to the conclusion that there is no alternative to the investment into ecological technology. Otherwise we would not be confronted with environmental and economical issues. These metaphorical choices both are meant to attract liberal and conservative voters.

4.4.2.10 Bush on Foreign Policy

Foreign policy does not have the same central significance in America as in Europe. Still, it has always been the political area most critically examined by allies. Therefore, even if the American public is not too concerned with foreign policy, the politicians have to apply a thoroughly consistent metaphorical system to convince foreign countries of the American policy and thereby, protect the American political reputation.

This chapter will primarily deal with border and homeland security as the metaphorical devices used when speaking about war have already been discussed thoroughly in chapter 4.4.2.1 and 4.4.2.2. Both issues are part of the 'USA PATRIOT ACT'. The basic idea of the act was to facilitate the work of law enforcement agencies' by reducing their restrictions and the control of the gathering of foreign intelligence living in the United States. In other words, it eases the control of foreign individuals and tightens laws against immigrants. The act was supported by Republicans and Democrats. Still, it has also been subject to criticism, for instance, it allows the FBI to search telephone, e-mail and financial records without a court order and thereby, clearly enables the state to engage in people's privacy.[21]

The aim of the 'USA PATRIOT Act' was to intensify the severity of immigration laws. For instance, funds were set aside to strengthen the control of the northern border. Moreover, it became easier to get access to criminal background information and final regulations were altered on how to take fingerprints and how this information may be used. Furthermore,

[21] (http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2005/nov/17/1117-111241-2085r, 8 May 2011)

various definitions relating to terrorism and terrorists were expanded. That means that the definition of 'terrorist activity' was specified and all kinds of union activities of foreigners were prohibited.[22] Under Bush's reign an antipathy against immigration and foreigners developed. This antipathy was based on fear of terrorism, which Bush took as a chance to reduce the number of immigrants significantly.

In contrast to Bush, Obama is not concerned about foreign policy except for war. His rhetorical preferences when talking about war have already been examined in chapter 4.4.2.1. Therefore, it is reasonable to only investigate Bush's rhetorical devices when speaking about foreign policy. Bush follows a clear policy:

(128) America needs to secure our borders and with your help, my administration is taking steps to do so. (B2)

Bush uses a set of metaphors which seem to be typical of his rhetoric. An especially powerful metaphor is +IMMIGRATION IS BUSINESS+ which can be explained by the fact that Bush is obviously deeply rooted in cognitive structures based in the fields of economics. For instance;

(129) Yet we also need to acknowledge that we will never fully secure our border until we create a lawful way for foreign **workers to come here and support our economy**. (B2)
(130) Yet building **a prosperous future for our citizens** also **depends on confronting enemies abroad** and advancing liberty in troubled regions of the world. (B2)
(131) This reform will be **good for our economy** because employers will find needed workers in an honest and orderly system. (B1)

Bush's policy is perfectly in line with the conservative STRICT-FATHER model. The conservative worldview suggests that only self-reliant, self-restrained people can succeed, meaning that only those who act strongly against intrinsic evil can survive (Lakoff 1995). Prosperity is the result of +MORAL STRENGTH+. If that metaphor is linked to the +STATE IS A PARENT+ personification it leads to the conclusion that 'economically

[22] http://origin.www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ56/pdf/PLAW-107publ56.pdf, 8 May 2011)

strong states' are per se by definition 'morally strong states'. In contrast, poor countries are responsible for their own misery and they do not deserve pity. The only reason for helping weak countries is if America benefits. This train of thought is indirectly enunciated in example (129) where only immigration of those who support the American economy is tolerated. Moreover, Bush also uses the metaphorical concept of +EVIL IS A FORCE+ when speaking about immigration and creates violent images. By that he justifies his aggressive and strict policy against immigration. For instance,

(132) This will take pressure of the border and allow law enforcement to concentrate on **those who mean us harm**. (B2)
(133) A temporary worker program will help protect our homeland, allowing Border Patrol and law enforcement to focus on **threats to our national security**. (B1)

Finally, Bush frequently creates the image of America as the nation responsible for the salvation of other countries, which goes hand in hand with the puritan tradition of the American nation being chosen by God.

(134) (…) while bringing millions of hardworking men and women **out from the shadows of American life.** (B1)
(135) **America is a force for hope in the world** because we are a compassionate people, and some of the most compassionate Americans are those who have stepped forward to protect us. (B2)

4.4.2.11 Bush on Family

Bush's conservative worldview on family values works prototypically according to the STRICT-FATHER model. He permanently repeats the importance of protecting the family, especially children, from threats harming their morality. In particular, drugs are defined as a dangerous temptation.

(136) One of the worst decisions our children can make is to **gamble their lives and futures on drugs.** (B1)

Here Bush uses the specific-level metaphor +LIFE IS A GAMBLE+ and drugs are described being evil forces which will make one lose the game.

Repeatedly, Bush speaks about moral values which he defines as being sacred. It is through the virtue of self-control he claims that children have to be defended against external temptations. For instance,

(137) The use of **performance-enhancing drugs** like steroids (…) is dangerous, and it sends the wrong message -- that there are shortcuts to accomplishments. (B1)
(138) … we must work together to counter the **negative influence of the culture,** and to send the right message to our children. (B1)

Still, there are instances when Bush's policy does not go hand in hand with the STRICT-FATHER model. He leans against the NURTURANT family model when he states;

(139) **America is** the **land of second chance**, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life. (B1)
(140) The aim is not to punish children, but to send them this message: **We love you, and we don't want to lose you**. (B1)

When taking a closer look, however, one realizes that Bush refers to strict and tough love which again correlates with the STRICT-FATHER model. Still, the intervention of the government into family matters stands in contrast to the no-meddling principle of the STRICT-FATHER model. That shows that the politicians do not stick to either the liberal or conservative metaphors. All metaphors are used but the priority given to them differs as we have already heard in chapter 3.6.6.1.

4.4.3 Summary of the Metaphorical Systems of Bush and Obama

The analysis of the metaphorical systems reveals that Bush and Obama tend to use similar metaphors but for different purposes. The metaphorical choice depends on the interplay between the topic and the contextual and historical embedding. The reason why both politicians have

to rely on similar metaphors is because they are members of the same western culture and thereby bound to a limited cluster of metaphors.

Still, it is a matter of fact that both politicians insert the most elaborate metaphorical devices when discussing their most central political viewpoints. For instance, Bush's most skilful metaphorical choices are used when discussing war. In contrast, Obama uses his most elaborate metaphorical devices when talking about the problematic economical situation. As an example, he frequently compares the economy with an illness which he is supposed to cure.

As it is a premise that ideology is manifested in language, one can draw the conclusion that rhetorical choices, such as metaphorical preferences, reflect viewpoints but also manipulative aims. The analysis displays that Bush's metaphorical approach represents basic conservative morality. For instance, he frequently uses metaphors which evoke violent images among the listener. As an example, the metaphorical concept of +EVIL IS A FORCE+ is used repeatedly but not only when speaking of war but in principle to promote the idea that the world is a place full of danger. Obama's rhetoric is a more complex matter. Even if he primarily uses language which corresponds with the NURTURANCE model, he also often inserts STRICT-FATHER metaphors. This could be regarded as proof for his rhetorical supremacy, as Obama is aware of how to address both liberal but also conservative voters. For example, when he discusses his viewpoints on alternative energy resources he uses economical arguments and metaphors. By that he manages to prove that there is no contradiction between business and environment. Thereby, he also gains support among conservative voters.

Moreover, the analysis proves that there is not only interdependency between metaphorical choices and ideology but that metaphors also create a prevailing mood among the audience and by that they have a manipulative purpose. Obama permanently inserts ontological metaphors and promotes the concept of progress and change. As the American politics found itself in a stagnating situation, Obama uses metaphorical devices such as PROGRESS or CHANGE in order to present

his idea of POLITICAL RETHINKING. This ensures him support among those who where unsatisfied with Bush's policy.

Furthermore, both politicians insert container metaphors. This has to be understood as a habitual, linguistic necessity and therefore a closer investigation is not purposeful. Both politicians have a vast repertoire of personification. For instance, frequently WASHINGTON is used to refer to the government and thereby an US vs. THEM impression is created. Personification is often useful to turn complex issues into more graspable matters. Still, frequently it is used without strategical purposes but only because avoiding it would make language sound artificial and long-winded.

4.5 Repetition

As Beard suggests, repetition is a rhetorical device of great manipulative strength (2000). The importance of repetition is also mentioned by Eidlhuber (2000) who states that

> (…) demagogic propaganda works by constant repetition (…).The readiness of the audience to accept a claim as true increases with the number of repetitions.

A precise examination on repetition could be a topic for a diploma thesis on its own and would therefore go beyond the scope of this thesis. Still, I will roughly discuss how repetition is used to convince the audience of certain political matters. It is obvious that the two politicians use this certain rhetorical device differently and thereby create a different tone in their speeches.

When analysing the speeches of the two politicians it was striking that apart from the ideological differences they also discerned significantly in comprehensibility. Both politicians try to use simple and clear language to make sure that their messages are clear, still, Obama's speeches are easier to follow, more harangue and spirited. Compared to Obama, Bush's speeches make a less aesthetic impression and they almost seem to contain an element of rambling. It is obvious that the degree of

comprehensibility is not caused by the political content but is due to the overall impression caused by structural devices. In particular, repetition is used frequently by Obama to erect the impression of 'pathos'. More precisely, Obama prefers the constant usage of anaphora which is the "repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of successive clauses" (Nordquist 2011). Bush also uses anaphora, but as a far less dominant rhetorical device, less skilfully and certainly not as elaborately as Obama.

(141) **unless you act**, the unfair tax on marriage will go back up. **Unless you act**, millions of families will be charged 300 dollars more in Federal taxes for every child. **Unless you act**, small businesses will pay higher taxes. **Unless you act,** the death tax will eventually come back to life. **Unless you act,** Americans face a tax increase. (B1)

While anaphora is inserted only from time to time by Bush, Obama uses it as a dominant rhetorical device. By that he maintains tensions and creates the impression of pace. To only present few examples;

(142) But if anyone from either party has a better approach that will bring down premiums, bring down the deficit, cover the uninsured, strengthen Medicare for seniors, and stop insurance company abuses**, let me know. Let me know. Let me know.** (O1)
(143) Let us find a way to come together and finish the job for the American people. **Let's get it done. Let's get it done.** (O1)
(144) **Not because I** believe in bigger government – I don't. **Not because I**'m not mindful of the massive debt we've inherited – I am. (O2)
(145) Now, let me repeat: **We cut taxes. We cut taxes** *for* 96% of working class families. **We cut taxes** *for* small businesses. **We cut taxes** *for* first-time homebuyers. **We cut taxes** for parents trying to care for their children. **We cut taxes** *for* eight million Americans paying for college. I thought I'd get some applause on that one. (O1)

These examples are interesting for two reasons. First, they demonstrate Obama's use of anaphora in an impressive way. Furthermore, they display his insertion of colloquial phrases which loosen up the dramatic atmosphere in his speeches.[23]

[23] E.g. ‚I thought I'd get some applause on that one'

As we have just seen there are cases where entire phrases are repeated (Zheng 1998) still that does not always have to be the case. As Wilson suggests, repetition does not have to be word by word repetitions but can also be what he calls the repetition of ‘core ideas’ (1990: 125). Considering the political focus of the politicians but also the political situation of the time of the speeches it is obvious, that terms like ‘terrorism’, ‘terror’ or ‘war’ are used more frequently by Bush.

In an exchange of ideas by letter between Eubanks and Schaeffer, the latter mentioned Bush’s disproportional use of the word ‘threat’ (Eubanks and Schaeffer 2004: 54). As a matter of fact also other war related terms and words are used far more often by Bush than by Obama as can be seen in the table below.

Term	War	Terror/ist/ism	Enemy/ies	Weapon/s	Change
Obama	13	5	0	4	11
Bush	16	43	16	9	4

Table 7: Comparison of frequently occurring words

The table clearly proves that Bush repeats terms related to violence far more often than Obama, The frequent repetition displays Bush’s attempt to evolve anaphora as all terms are metonymically related to ‘threat’ (Eubanks and Schaeffer 2004: 57). In contrast, Obama brings attention to his concept of change and progress by repeating the word.

A more precise lexical analysis would be interesting but also goes beyond the scope of this thesis. Still, one can clearly see that the political situation but also content influences and dictates lexical choice.

5. Conclusion

While comparing the rhetorical skills of the two politicians various interesting aspects became evident. The analysis not only proves that Bush and Obama use different rhetorical strategies but also that their choices depend on the emphasis of their policy and on their ideological background. A general impression, which the analysis provides ample evidence for in my analysis, is that Obama is more aware of the persuasive possibilities of lexical and grammatical choices.

This became particularly evident when parsing his systematic pronominal choices. His manipulative and skilful use of pronouns enables him to gain support among the public and the Congress at the same time. In contrast, Bush avoided addressing the American public and only seeked to speak to the Congress. The fact that he did not use the 'State of the Union' speeches to increase support in the American public leads to the conclusion that he was not aware of the double listenership. As I analyzed the speeches from a critical discourse analytical perspective it was striking that Bush only referred to the Congress but not to the public and thereby missed the chance to justify certain political decisions among the public. This means that Bush did not use 'State of the Union' speeches to promote political ideas among the public but to convince the Congress of his leadership. Bush could have used skilful rhetorical strategies in the 'State of the Union' speeches to calm down his castigators and gain support among the public and critics. The fact that he almost entirely omits first person singular pronouns, that he only addresses the Congress and avoids the inclusion of the American public (i.e. through a more frequent insertion of 'I-WE'), that a systematic pronominal approach cannot be identified, leads to the suggestion that in contrast to Obama he avoids personal involvement and is neither aware of the plurality of the audience, nor of the manipulative possibilities of 'State of the Union' speeches.

The pronominal analysis only provides little insights in how far political ideology influences rhetorical choices. The analysis of metaphors and Lakoff's theory on cognitive metaphors (1995, 1996) provides us with a linguistic tool to perceive ideologically influenced lexical and grammatical

choices. One cornerstone of Lakoff's theory is that conservatives have a more sophisticated and uniform understanding of themselves which is reflected in their homogeneous repertoire of linguistic weapons. With regard to Bush and Obama; Lakoff's theory is not always applicable because when it comes to a comparison of Bush's and Obama's conceptual metaphors, it becomes evident that Obama has a more elaborate understanding of metaphorical choices. The analysis proves that Obama uses metaphorical devices in an at least as skilful a manner as Bush. Moreover, it also becomes clear that they tend to use similar metaphors but for different purposes. Furthermore, the examination of conceptual metaphors proves that Obama consistently creates the image of PROGRESS while Bush cannot rely on such a uniform metaphorical systematic source. In this context, it is important to emphasize that Obama is regarded as being a very skilled speaker and has already been compared to famous rhetorical figures like John F. Kennedy. In contrast, as war is a more prominent topic in Bush's speeches than any topic in Obama's, it is obvious that Obama can use a wider register of stylistic devices as he has more political topics to cover while Bush has to repeat his political messages over and over again and thereby, uses his most elaborate metaphorical devices to avoid the feeling of being repetitive.

However considering the metaphorical concepts that govern the ideological framework, the rhetoric of the two politicians reveals interesting insights about the interdependence of ideology and cognitive, metaphorical choices. In Bush's speeches one can find many violent images and his metaphorical approach represents basic conservative morality. He constantly uses the prototypical conservative +MORAL STRENGTH+ metaphor. That becomes obvious when Bush argues against a reform of the private health care system as that would mean a too great intervention into people's private matters. A further frequently occurring metaphor is the concept of +EVIL IS A FORCE+ as Bush understands the world being a place of danger where only approved values can prevent people from falling. Lakoff (1996) proposes this sort of argumentation as a typical conservative viewpoint. For instance, when speaking about war or the danger of terrorism Bush highlights the importance of fighting evil. There is

no linguistic evidence to label Bush anything else but a conservative hard-liner.

In Obama's case, the situation is more difficult. His views largely correspond with the NURTURANCE model but he often uses metaphorical sources such as PROFITABILITY rather than EMPATHY which can be considered being prototypical for the STRICT-FATHER model. One suggestion would be that he does so as he is aware that not only liberals were disaffected with Bush's policy and therefore, he inserts rhetorical devices which respond to conservative voters as it ensures him support from the more traditional political camp. When it comes to the topic of war Obama also uses the concept of +EVIL IS A FORCE+ as the danger of terrorism is a fixed idea among the American population. Moreover, it becomes obvious that it is not reasonably to simply distinguish between liberal and conservative rhetoric as people tend to have liberal and conservative ideological overlaps and grey areas. Therefore, one can only seldom speak of purely democratic or liberal language.

The metaphorical concept occurring most prominently in Obama's speeches is PROGRESS. Most frequently he uses ontological metaphors of UP and FORWARD to accentuate this core idea. Obama knows how to make his policy palatable and he emphasizes the concept of CHANGE and POLITICAL RETHINKING. With regard to the structural elaboration of the metaphors used, the clash between the two politicians could not be more striking.

One realizes Obama's rhetorical supremacy when observing how repetition is used. In order to create the impression of pathos, Obama uses anaphora more frequently than Bush. His speeches create the feeling of spiritedness and Bush's speeches almost seem boring and impenetrable compared to them. That does not mean that Bush omits repetition entirely. When speaking about war terms like 'terrorism' or 'terror' are repeated constantly and he creates the impression of being confronted with a concrete enemy, an embodiment of evil. While Obama uses repetition as an aesthetical device Bush repeats certain terms and words for the purpose of shaping opinions.

Many people have tried to find answers why Obama gained such popularity both among liberals and conservatives while, in contrast Bush's popularity decreased during his time in office. From a linguistic point of view, this thesis suggests rhetoric as a reason. Obama knows how to use stylistic devices for persuasive purposes but also in order to inspire people. The analysis and comparison of the stylistic choices was very revealing as it proves that ideology is directly linked to language. Even though, Lakoff (1995) might be right when claiming that liberals lay behind in developing a unified language and ideology to gain strength, the analysis of rhetorical choices shows that at least when it comes to a comparison between Bush and Obama, Obama proves to be the more skilled rhetorician and knows how to persuade people to believe in him.

At the same time, this thesis does not cover the topic entirely but should rather be regarded as a thought-provoking impulse for further research. There are also basic questions which have to be solved. For instance, the chicken and egg principle should be discussed, in how far language and stylistic choices are opinion-leading or rather if ideology is responsible for the choice of linguistic devices.

Critics might claim that this thesis does not really prove that ideology is manifested in language but that it only reveals stylistic patterns of Bush and Obama. Their viewpoint and criticism is eligible and a long-termed research would be necessary to comb through the interrelation of language and ideology. It would be reasonable to analyse and compare more politicians and speeches as a more expanded quantitative and qualitative analysis of political language would give a more reliable picture of the manifestation of ideology within language. A further step would be to also analyse other areas of discourse as ideology does not only appear in politics but basically everywhere. The launching and development of a corpus for political language would be helpful. It would be time-saving and would enable the analysis of further rhetorical devices.

Further, CDA needs to develop more concrete guidelines for the analysis of political discourse. It would be a help for further observations as it would increase the pace of further examination and the applicability of the approach. Analysts otherwise see themselves confronted with an

interesting theoretical concept but no concrete suggestions of how this idea can be adopted on concrete problems.

A further important question which arises is in how far the rhetorical systems used in the four speeches actually have an impact on the audience in the first place? Further analysis should observe in how far the listener's ideology and opinion is actually influenced and shaped by rhetorical choices. For that purpose, one would also need to register the public voting behaviour. This would provide us with important information on rhetoric as it would be an empirical research on the actual effects of witty speakers.

To sum up, the research on the manifestation of ideology in rhetorical devices is of great importance as it helps us to understand to what degree people are manipulated by political language. CDA should serve people as a critical tool which helps to reveal manipulative language and gives us the possibility to look through stylistic devices and to question how politicians try to indoctrinate ideology and to gain support when it comes to important political decisions.

6. Bibliography

Abramowitz, Michael; Weisman, Jonathan. 2007. “Bush vetoes health measure. President says he’s willing to negotiate”. *The Washington Post Electronic Edition*, 4 October 2007, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/10/03/AR2007100300116_pf.html (8 May 2011)

Bean, Charles. 2007. “Is there a new Consensus in Monetary Policy”. http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/publications/other/monetary/bean070413.pdf (8 May 2011)

Beard, Adrian. 2000. *The Language of Politics.* London: Routledge.

Black, Max. 1962. *Models and Metaphors. Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press. 25-48.

Brock, Bernhard. 1989. “Rhetorical Criticism: A Burkean Approach Revisited”. In Brock, Bernhard; Scott, Robert; Chesebro, James (eds.). *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth Century Perspective.* 3rd ed. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 183-195.

Broder, John. 2009. “E.P.A. Moves to Curtail Greenhouse Gas Emissions”. *The New York Times Electronic Edition*, 30 September 2009, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/01/science/earth/01epa.html?_r=1&hp (8 May 2011)

Brown, Gillian; Yule, George. 1983. *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Brown, Roger; Gilman, Albert. 1960. „The pronouns of power and solidarity“. In Sebeok, Thomas (ed.). *Style in Language* (7th ed.). Cambridge: MIT-Press. 253–276.

Burke, Kenneth. 1969. *A Grammar of Motives.* Berkley: Univ. Of California Press.

Bush, George. 2001. “President Bush Discusses Global Climate Change”. *The White House*, 11 June 2001, http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives/gov/news/releases/2001/0611-2.html (8 May 2011)

Chilton, Paul. 2008. “Political Terminology”. In Wodak, Ruth; Koller, Veronika (eds.). *Handbook of Communication in the public Sphere.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 223-243.

Cienki, Alan. 2005. “Metaphor in the ‘Strict Father’ and ‘Nurturant Parent cognitive models: Theoretical issues raised in an empirical study”. *Cognitive Linguistics* 16. 279-312.

Cooper, Helen; Cowell, Alan. 2009. “Obama sets new tone for European allies”. *New York Times Electronic Edition*, 3 April 2009, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/04/world/europe/04nato.html?_r=1&hp (8 May 2011).

DePalma, Michael-John; Ringer, Jeffrey; Webber, Jim. 2008. “(Re)Charting the (Dis)Courses of Faith and Politics, or Rhetoric and Democracy in the Burkean Barnyard.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 38 (3), 311-334.

Eidlhuber, Mia. 2000.”Simple! Short! Threatening!” http://www.lermanet.com/cisar/survey/gq.htm (8 May 2011)

Eubanks, Philip; Schaeffer, John. 2004. “A dialogue between traditional and cognitive Rhetoric: Readings of figuration in George W. Bush’s “Axis of Evil” Address. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 34 (2), 53-70.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis. The critical study of language.* London and New York: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. 2001. *Language and Power (2nd ed.).* Harlow: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman; Wodak, Ruth. 1997. “Critical Discourse Analysis”. In Van Dijk, Teun (ed.). *Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction. Vol 2. Discourse as social interaction.* London: Sage Publ. 258 – 284.

Gay, William. 2007. “Language, war and peace”. In Hellinger, Marlis; Pauwels, Anne (eds.). *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 492-523.

“Genus”. 2008. *Biology Online.* http://www.biology-online.org/dictionary/Genus (8 May 2011)

Herbst, Moira. 2009. “Even the employed lose with hour and wage cuts”. *Bloomberg Businessweek Electronic Edition*, 10 July 2009, http://businessweek.com/bwdaily/dnflash/content/jul2009/db20090710_255918.htm (8 May2011)

Hoffmann, George. 2005. “Rhetoric of Bush speeches: purr words and snarl words”. http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Rhetoric+of+Bush+speeches%3a+purr+words+and+snarl+words.-a0132762540 (8 May 2011)

Hoogland, David. 2004. “Operation enduring analogy: World War II, the war on terror, and the huses of historical memory”. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7(3), 339-366.

Jones, Athena. 2009. „Obama announces Iraq plan“. *NBC News*, 27 February 2009, http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2009/02/27/4428005-obama-announces-iraq-plan (8 May 2011)

Joseph, John. 2006. *Language and politics*. Edingburgh: Edingburgh Univ. Press.

Koller, Veronika; Wodak, Ruth, 2008. ”Introduction: Shifting boundaries and emergent public spheres” In Koller, Veronika; Wodak, Ruth (eds.). *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1 – 21.

“Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey”. 2011. *United States Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics.* http://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LNU04000000?years_option=all_years&periods_option=specific_periods&periods=Annual+Data (8 May 2011)

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 1991. “Metaphor and War. The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf”. http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Texts/Scholarly/Lakoff_Gulf_Metaphor_1.html (8 May 2011)

Lakoff, George. 1995. “Metaphor, Morality, and Politics, Or, Why Conservatives Have left Liberals in the dust”. http://www.wwcd.org/issues/Lakoff.html (8 May2011)

Lakoff, George. 1996. *Moral Politics: What Conservatives know that Liberals don’t.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 2003. “Metaphor and War, Again” http://www.alternet.org/story/15414 (8 May 2011)

Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors we live by.* Chicage: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George; Turner, Mark. 1989. *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lerner, Gene. 1996. “On the Place of Linguistic Resources in the Organisation of Talk-in-Interaction: ‘Second person’ reference in multi-party conversation”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 6 (3). 281 – 294.

Lukes, Steven. 1974. *Power: A radical view.* London: Macmillan.

Maitland, Karen; Wilson, John. 1987. “Ideological Conflict and Pronominal resolution”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11 (4). 495 – 512.

Malone, Martin. 1997. *Worlds of Talk: The presentation of self in everyday conversation.* Oxford: Polity Press.

Matthews, Robert. 1971.”Concerning a ‘Linguistic Theory’ of Metaphor”. *Foundations of Language* 7, 413 – 425.

Mayr, Andrea. 2008. “Introduction: Power, discourse and institutions”. In Mayr, Andrea (ed.). *Language and Power. An introduction to institutional discourse.* London: Continuum, 1-26.

Meyer, Michael. 2001. “Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA”. In Wodak, Ruth; Meyer, Michael (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage Publications. 14-32.

Mooij, Jahn. 1976. *A study of metaphor: on the nature of metaphorical expressions with special reference to their reference*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publication.

Mülhäusler, Peter; Harré, Rom. 1990. *Pronouns and People: The linguistic construction of social and personal identity.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Nordquist, Richard. 2011. “Anaphora (Rhetoric)”. About.com. *Grammar and Composition.* http://grammar.about.com/od/ab/g/anaphora.htm (8 May 2011)

Oberhuber, Florian. 2008. “Dissemination and implementation of political concepts”. In Wodak, Ruth; Koller, Veronika (eds.). *Handbook of Communication in the public Sphere.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 271-291.

“Patriot Act renewal resisted by bipartisan group”. 2005. *The Washington Times Electronic Edition*, 17 November 2005, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2005/nov/17/20051117-111241-2085r/ (8 May 2011)

Pielenz, Michael. 1993. *Argumentation und Metapher.* Tübingen: Narr.

“Public Law 107–56—OCT. 26, 2001. Uniting and strengthening America by providing appropriate tools required to intercept and obstruct terrorism (USA Patriot Act) Act of 2001”. 2001. *Authenticated U.S. Government Information GPO,* http://origin.www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ56/pdf/PLAW-107publ56.pdf (8 May 2011)

Reisigl, Martin. 2008a. “Analyzing Political Rhetoric”. In Wodak, Ruth; Kryzanowski, Michal (eds.). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 96-121.

Reisigl, Martin. 2008b. “Rhetoric of political speeches”. In Wodak, Ruth; Koller, Veronika (eds.). *Handbook of Communication in the public Sphere.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 243-271.

Richardson, John. 2007. *Analysing newspapers. An approach from critical discourse analysis.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversations Vol. 1*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversations Vol.2*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Savoy, Jaques. 2009. “Lexical Analysis of Obama's and McCain's Speeches”. http://members.unine.ch/jacques.savoy/Papers/USspeeches.pdf_(8 May 2011)

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Scott, Hensley, 2009. “Senate says yes to landmark health bill”. *NPR Electronic Edition*, 24 December 2009, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=121854289 (8 May 2011)

Simons, Herbert. 2007. “Introduction”. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2). 177-182.

“Species”. 2008. *Biology Online.* http://www.biology-online.org/dictionary/Species (8 May 2011)

Stubbs, Michael. 1983. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistc Analysis of Natural Language.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Sykes, Hugh. 2010. “Last US combat brigade exits Iraq”. *BBC Mobile*, 19 August 2010, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-11020270 (8 May 2011)

“Three Top Economists Agree 2009 Worst Financial Crisis Since Great Depression; Risks Increase if Right Steps are Not Taken”. 2009. *Reuters Electronic Edition*, 27 February 2009, http://www.reuters.com/article/pressRelease/idUS193520+27-Feb-2009+BW20090227 (8 May 2011)

Ungerer, Friedrich; Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 1996. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics.* London and New York: Longman.

Ungerer, Friedrich; Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 1997. *Understanding Cognitive Linguistics.* London: Longman.

Van Dijk, Teun. 1998. “Critical Discourse Analysis” http://www.mfsd.org/debate/vandijk.pdf (8 May 2011)

Van Dijk, Teun. 2004. “Macro Contexts” http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Macro%20contexts.htm (8 May 2011)

Van Dijk, Teun. 2008. *Discourse and Context. A Sociocognitive Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Watson, Rodney. 1987. “Interdisciplinary Considerations in the Analysis of Proterms”. In Button, Graham (ed.). *Talk and social organisation.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

„What is a structural metaphor?“. 2004. *SIL International.* http://www.sil.org/linguistics/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms/WhatIsAStructuralMetaphor.htm (8 May 2011)

"What is an orientational metaphor?". 2004. *SIL International.* http://www.sil.org/linguistics/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms/WhatIsAnOrientationalMetaphor.htm (8 May 2011)

Widdowson, Henry. 1992. *Practical Stylistics. An approach to poetry.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Wilson, John. 1990. *Politically Speaking*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wodak, Ruth. (ed.). 1989. *Language, power and ideology. Studies in political Discourse.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "What CDA is about-a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments". In Wodak, Ruth; Meyer, Michael (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage Publications. 1-14.

Wodak, Ruth. 2008. "The contribution of critical linguistics to the analysis of discriminatory prejudices and stereotypes in the language of politics" In Koller, Veronika; Wodak, Ruth (eds.). *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 291 – 317.

"World Economic Outlook April 2009. Crisis and Recovery". 2009. *International Monetary Fund.* http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2009/01/pdf/text.pdf (8 May 2011)

Zheng, Tongtao. 1998. "Characteristics of Australian Political Language Rhetoric:Tactics of gaining public support and shirking responsibility". http://www.immi.se/jicc/index.php/jicc/article/view/147/114 (8 May 2011)

7. Appendix

(1) George W. Bush 2005 State of the Union Address **(B1)**

Thank you all.

Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, members of Congress, fellow citizens:

As a new Congress gathers, all of us in the elected branches of government share a great privilege: We've been placed in office by the votes of the people we serve. And tonight that is a privilege we share with newly elected leaders of Afghanistan, the Palestinian territories, Ukraine, and a free and sovereign Iraq.

Two weeks ago, I stood on the steps of this Capitol and renewed the commitment of our nation to the guiding ideal of liberty for all. This evening I will set forth policies to advance that ideal at home and around the world.

Tonight, with a healthy, growing economy, with more Americans going back to work, with our nation an active force for good in the world, the state of our union is confident and strong. Our generation has been blessed by the expansion of opportunity, by advances in medicine, by the security purchased by our parents' sacrifice. Now, as we see a little gray in the mirror -- or a lot of gray -- and we watch our children moving into adulthood, we ask the question: What will be the state of their union?

Members of Congress, the choices we make together will answer that question. Over the next several months, on issue after issue, let us do what Americans have always done and build a better world for our children and our grandchildren.

First, we must be good stewards of this economy and renew the great institutions on which millions of our fellow citizens rely. America's economy is the fastest growing of any major industrialized nation. In the past four years, we've provided tax relief to every person who pays income taxes, overcome a recession, opened up new markets abroad, prosecuted corporate criminals, raised homeownership to its highest level in history. And in the last year alone, the United States has added 2.3 million new jobs.

When action was needed, the Congress delivered, and the nation is grateful. Now we must add to these achievements. By making our economy more flexible, more innovative and more competitive, we will keep America the economic leader of the world.

America's prosperity requires restraining the spending appetite of the federal government. I welcome the bipartisan enthusiasm for spending discipline. I will send you a budget that holds the growth of discretionary spending below inflation, makes tax relief permanent, and stays on track to cut the deficit in half by 2009. My budget substantially reduces or eliminates more than 150 government programs that are not getting results, or duplicate current efforts, or do not fulfill essential priorities. The principle here is clear: Taxpayer dollars must be spent wisely or not at all.

To make our economy stronger and more dynamic, we must prepare a rising generation to fill the jobs of the 21st century. Under the *No Child Left Behind Act*, standards are higher, test scores are on the rise, and we're closing the achievement gap for minority students. Now we must demand better results from our high schools so every high school diploma is a ticket to success. We will help additional -- an additional 200,000 workers to get training for a better career by reforming our job-training system and strengthening America's community colleges. And we will make it easier for Americans to afford a college education by increasing the size of Pell Grants.

To make our economy stronger and more competitive, America must reward, not punish, the efforts and dreams of entrepreneurs. Small business is the path of advancement, especially for women and minorities. So we must free small businesses from needless regulation and protect honest job creators from junk lawsuits.

Justice is distorted and our economy is held back by irresponsible class actions and frivolous asbestos claims. And I urge Congress to pass legal reforms this year.

To make our economy stronger and more productive, we must make health care more affordable and give families greater access to good coverage and more control over their health decisions.

I -- I ask Congress to move forward on a comprehensive health-care agenda with tax credits to help low-income workers buy insurance; a community health center in every poor county; improved information technology to prevent medical error and needless costs; association health plans for small businesses and their employees, expanded health savings accounts, and medical liability reform that will reduce health-care costs and make sure patients have the doctors and care they need.

To keep our economy growing, we also need reliable supplies of affordable, environmentally responsible energy. Nearly four years ago, I submitted a comprehensive energy strategy that encourages conservation, alternative sources, a modernized electricity grid and more production here at home, including safe, clean nuclear energy.

My *Clear Skies* legislation will cut power-plant pollution and improve the health of our citizens. And my budget provides strong funding for leading-edge technology, from hydrogen-fueled cars to clean coal to renewable sources such as ethanol. Four years of debate is enough. I urge Congress to pass legislation that makes America more secure and less dependent on foreign energy.

All these proposals are essential to expand this economy and add new jobs, but they are just the beginning of our duty. To build the prosperity of future generations, we must update institutions that were created to meet the needs of an earlier time. Year after year, Americans are burdened by an archaic, incoherent federal tax code. I've appointed a bipartisan panel to examine the tax code from top to bottom. And when their recommendations are delivered, you and I will work together to give this nation a tax code that is pro-growth, easy to understand, and fair to all.

America's immigration system is also outdated -- unsuited to the needs of our economy and to the values of our country. We should not be content with laws that punish hardworking people who want only to provide for their families, and deny businesses willing workers, and invite chaos at our border. It is time for an immigration policy that permits temporary guest workers to fill jobs Americans will not take, that rejects amnesty, that tells us who is entering and leaving our country, and that closes the border to drug dealers and terrorists.

One of America's most important institutions -- a symbol of the trust between generations -- is also in need of wise and effective reform. Social Security was a great moral success of the 20th century, and we must honor its great purposes in this new century. The system, however, on its current path, is headed toward bankruptcy. And so we must join together to strengthen and save Social Security. Today, more than 45 million Americans receive Social Security benefits, and millions more are nearing retirement. And for them, the system is sound and fiscally strong.

I have a message for every American who is 55 or older: Do not let anyone mislead you. For you, the Social Security system will not change in any way.

For younger workers, the Social Security system has serious problems that will grow worse with time. Social Security was created decades ago, for a very different era. In those days,

people did not live as long, benefits were much lower than they are today, and a half century ago, about 16 workers paid into the system for each person drawing benefits.

Our society has changed in ways the founders of Social Security could not have foreseen. In today's world, people are living longer and therefore drawing benefits longer. And those benefits are scheduled to rise dramatically over the next few decades. And instead of 16 workers paying in for every beneficiary, right now it's only about three workers. And over the next few decades, that number will fall to just two workers per beneficiary. With each passing year, fewer workers are paying ever- higher benefits to an ever-larger number of retirees.

So here is the result: Thirteen years from now, in 2018, Social Security will be paying out more than it takes in. And every year afterward will bring a new shortfall, bigger than the year before. For example, in the year 2027, the government will somehow have to come up with an extra 200 billion dollars to keep the system afloat. And by 2033, the annual shortfall would be more than 300 billion dollars. By the year 2042, the entire system would be exhausted and bankrupt. If steps are not taken to avert that outcome, the only solutions would be dramatically higher taxes, massive new borrowing, or sudden and severe cuts in Social Security benefits or other government programs.

I recognize that 2018 and 2042 may seem a long way off. But those dates aren't so distant, as any parent will tell you. If you have a 5-year-old, you're already concerned about how you'll pay for college tuition 13 years down the road. If you've got children in their 20s, as some of us do, the idea of Social Security collapsing before they retire does not seem like a small matter. And it should not be a small matter to the United States Congress.

You and I share a responsibility. We must pass reforms that solve the financial problems of Social Security once and for all. Fixing Social Security permanently will require an open, candid review of the options. Some have suggested limiting benefits for wealthy retirees. Former Congressman Tim Penny has raised the possibility of indexing benefits to prices rather than wages. During the 1990s, my predecessor, President Clinton, spoke of increasing the retirement age. Former Senator John Breaux suggested discouraging early collection of Social Security benefits. The late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan recommended changing the way benefits are calculated.

All these ideas are on the table.

I know that none of these reforms would be easy. But we have to move ahead with courage and honesty, because our children's retirement security is more important than partisan politics.

I will work with members of Congress to find the most effective combination of reforms. I will listen to anyone who has a good idea to offer.

We must, however, be guided by some basic principles:

- We must make Social Security permanently sound, not leave that task for another day.

- We must not jeopardize our economic strength by increasing payroll taxes.

- We must ensure that lower-income Americans get the help they need to have dignity and peace of mind in their retirement.

- We must guarantee that there is no change for those now retired or nearing retirement.

- And we must take care that any changes in the system are gradual, so younger workers have years to prepare and plan for their future.

As we fix Social Security, we also have the responsibility to make the system a better deal for younger workers. And the best way to reach that goal is through voluntary personal retirement accounts.

Here is how the idea works: Right now, a set portion of the money you earn is taken out of your paycheck to pay for the Social Security benefits of today's retirees. If you're a younger worker, I believe you should be able to set aside part of that money in your own retirement account, so you can build a nest egg for your own future.

Here is why the personal accounts are a better deal: Your money will grow, over time, at a greater rate than anything the current system can deliver. And your account will provide money for retirement over and above the check you will receive from Social Security. In addition, you'll be able to pass along the money that accumulates in your personal account, if you wish, to your children and -- or grandchildren. And best of all, the money in the account is yours, and the government can never take it away.

The goal here is greater security in retirement, so we will set careful guidelines for personal accounts: We'll make sure the money can only go into a conservative mix of bonds and stock funds. We'll make sure that your earnings are not eaten up by hidden Wall Street fees. We'll make sure there are good options to protect your investments from sudden market swings on the eve of your retirement.

We'll make sure a personal account cannot be emptied out all at once, but rather paid out over time, as an addition to traditional Social Security benefits. And we'll make sure this plan is fiscally responsible by starting personal retirement accounts gradually and raising the yearly limits on contributions over time, eventually permitting all workers to set aside 4 percentage points of their payroll taxes in their accounts. Personal retirement accounts should be familiar to federal employees, because you already have something similar, called the Thrift Savings Plan, which lets workers deposit a portion of their paychecks into any of five different broadly based investment funds.

It's time to extend the same security and choice and ownership to young Americans.

Our second great responsibility to our children and grandchildren is to honor and to pass along the values that sustain a free society. So many of my generation, after a long journey, have come home to family and faith, and are determined to bring up responsible, moral children. Government is not the source of these values, but government should never undermine them.

Because marriage is a sacred institution and the foundation of society, it should not be redefined by activist judges. For the good of families, children and society, I support a constitutional amendment to protect the institution of marriage.

Because a society is measured by how it treats the weak and vulnerable, we must strive to build a culture of life. Medical research can help us reach that goal, by developing treatments and cures that save lives and help people overcome disabilities. And I thank the Congress for doubling the funding of the National Institutes of Health. To build a culture of life, we must also ensure that scientific advances always serve human dignity, not take advantage of some lives for the benefit of others.

We should all be able to agree -- We should all be able to agree on some clear standards. I will work with Congress to ensure that human embryos are not created for experimentation or grown for body parts and that human life is never bought or sold as a commodity. America will continue to lead the world in medical research that is ambitious, aggressive, and always ethical.

Because courts must always deliver impartial justice, judges have a duty to faithfully interpret the law, not legislate from the bench. As President, I have a constitutional

responsibility to nominate men and women who understand the role of courts in our democracy and are well-qualified to serve on the bench, and I have done so.

The Constitution also gives the Senate a responsibility: Every judicial nominee deserves an up-or-down vote.

Because one of the deepest values of our country is compassion, we must never turn away from any citizen who feels isolated from the opportunities of America. Our government will continue to support faith-based and community groups that bring hope to harsh places. Now we need to focus on giving young people, especially young men in our cities, better options than apathy or gangs or jail.

Tonight I propose a three-year initiative to help organizations keep young people out of gangs and show young men an ideal of manhood that respects women and rejects violence. Taking on gang life will be one part of a broader outreach to at-risk youth, which involves parents and pastors, coaches and community leaders, in programs ranging from literacy to sports. And I am proud that the leader of this nationwide effort will be our First Lady, Laura Bush.

Because HIV/AIDS brings suffering and fear into so many lives, I ask you to reauthorize the *Ryan White Act* to encourage prevention and provide care and treatment to the victims of that disease. And as we update this important law, we must focus our efforts on fellow citizens with the highest rates of new cases: African-American men and women.

Because one of the main sources of our national unity is our belief in equal justice, we need to make sure Americans of all races and backgrounds have confidence in the system that provides justice. In America we must make doubly sure no person is held to account for a crime he or she did not commit. So we are dramatically expanding the use of DNA evidence to prevent wrongful conviction. Soon I will send to Congress a proposal to fund special training for defense counsel in capital cases, because people on trial for their lives must have competent lawyers by their side.

Our third responsibility to future generations is to leave them an America that is safe from danger and protected by peace. We will pass along to our children all the freedoms we enjoy. And chief among them is freedom from fear. In the three and a half years since September the 11th, 2001, we've taken unprecedented actions to protect Americans. We've created a new department of government to defend our homeland, focused the FBI on preventing terrorism, begun to reform our intelligence agencies, broken up terror cells across the country, expanded research on defenses against biological and chemical attack, improved border security, and trained more than a half million first responders. Police and firefighters, air marshals, researchers and so many others are working every day to make our homeland safer, and we thank them all.

Our nation, working with allies and friends, has also confronted the enemy abroad with measures that are determined, successful, and continuing. The Al Qaida terror network that attacked our country still has leaders, but many of its top commanders have been removed. There are still governments that sponsor and harbor terrorists, but their number has declined. There are still regimes seeking weapons of mass destruction, but no longer without attention and without consequence. Our country is still the target of terrorists who want to kill many and intimidate us all. And we will stay on the offensive against them until the fight is won.

Pursuing our enemies is a vital commitment of the war on terror. And I thank the Congress for providing our service men and women with the resources they have needed. During this time of war, we must continue to support our military and give them the tools for victory.

Other nations around the globe have stood with us. In Afghanistan, an international force is helping provide security. In Iraq, 28 countries have troops on the ground. The United

Nations and the European Union provided technical assistance for the elections. And NATO is leading a mission to help train Iraqi officers.

We're cooperating with 60 governments in the Proliferation Security Initiative to detect and stop the transit of dangerous materials. We're working closely with the governments in Asia to convince North Korea to abandon its nuclear ambitions. Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and nine other countries have captured or detained Al Qaida terrorists.

In the next four years, my Administration will continue to build the coalitions that will defeat the dangers of our time. In the long term, the peace we seek will only be achieved by eliminating the conditions that feed radicalism and ideologies of murder. If whole regions of the world remain in despair and grow in hatred, they will be the recruiting grounds for terror, and that terror will stalk America and other free nations for decades. The only force powerful enough to stop the rise of tyranny and terror and replace hatred with hope is the force of human freedom.

Our enemies know this, and that is why the terrorist Zarqawi recently declared war on what he called the "evil principle" of democracy. And we've declared our own intention: America will stand with the allies of freedom to support democratic movements in the Middle East and beyond, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.

The United States has no right, no desire, and no intention to impose our form of government on anyone else.

That is one -- That is one of the main differences between us and our enemies. They seek to impose and expand an empire of oppression, in which a tiny group of brutal, self-appointed rulers control every aspect of every life. Our aim is to build and preserve a community of free and independent nations, with governments that answer to their citizens and reflect their own cultures.

And because democracies respect their own people and their neighbors, the advance of freedom will lead to peace. That advance has great momentum in our time, shown by women voting in Afghanistan, and Palestinians choosing a new direction, and the people of Ukraine asserting their democratic rights and electing a president. We are witnessing landmark events in the history of liberty. And in the coming years, we will add to that story. The beginnings of reform and democracy in the Palestinian territories are now showing the power of freedom to break old patterns of violence and failure.

Tomorrow morning, Secretary of State Rice departs on a trip that will take her to Israel and the West Bank for meetings with Prime Minister Sharon and President Abbas. She will discuss with them how we and our friends can help the Palestinian people end terror and build the institutions of a peaceful, independent, democratic state. To promote this democracy, I will ask Congress for 350 million dollars to support Palestinian political, economic and security reforms. The goal of two democratic states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace is within reach, and America will help them achieve that goal.

To promote peace and stability in the broader Middle East, the United States will work with our friends in the region to fight the common threat of terror, while we encourage a higher standard of freedom. Hopeful reform is already taking hold in an arc from Morocco to Jordan to Bahrain. The government of Saudi Arabia can demonstrate its leadership in the region by expanding the role of its people in determining their future. And the great and proud nation of Egypt, which showed the way toward peace in the Middle East, can now show the way toward democracy in the Middle East.

To promote peace in the broader Middle East, we must confront regimes that continue to harbor terrorists and pursue weapons of mass murder. Syria still allows its territory and parts of Lebanon to be used by terrorists who seek to destroy every chance of peace in the region.You have passed, and we are applying, the *Syrian Accountability Act*. And we expect the Syrian government to end all support for terror and open the door to freedom.

Today, Iran remains the world's primary state sponsor of terror -- pursuing nuclear weapons while depriving its people of the freedom they seek and deserve. We are working with European allies to make clear to the Iranian regime that it must give up its uranium enrichment program and any plutonium reprocessing and end its support for terror. And to the Iranian people, I say tonight: As you stand for your own liberty, America stands with you.

Our generational commitment to the advance of freedom, especially in the Middle East, is now being tested and honored in Iraq. That country is a vital front in the war on terror, which is why the terrorists have chosen to make a stand there. Our men and women in uniform are fighting terrorists in Iraq so we do not have to face them here at home.

The victory of freedom in Iraq will strengthen a new ally in the war on terror, inspire democratic reformers from Damascus to Tehran, bring more hope and progress to a troubled region, and thereby lift a terrible threat from the lives of our children and grandchildren. We will succeed because the Iraqi people value their own liberty, as they showed the world last Sunday. Across Iraq, often at great risk, millions of citizens went to the polls and elected 275 men and women to represent them in a new transitional national assembly. A young woman in Baghdad told of waking to the sound of mortar fire on election day and wondering if it might be too dangerous to vote. She said, "Hearing those explosions, it occurred to me, the insurgents are weak; they are afraid of democracy; they are losing. So I got my husband, and I got my parents, and we all came out and voted together."

Americans recognize that spirit of liberty, because we share it. In any nation, casting your vote is an act of civic responsibility. For millions of Iraqis, it was also an act of personal courage, and they have earned the respect of us all.

One of Iraq's leading democracy and human rights advocates is Safia Taleb al-Suhail. She says of her country, "We were occupied for 35 years by Saddam Hussein. That was the real occupation. Thank you to the American people who paid the cost, but most of all to the soldiers." Eleven years ago, Safia's father was assassinated by Saddam's intelligence service. Three days ago in Baghdad, Safia was finally able to vote for the leaders of her country. And we are honored that she is with us tonight.

The terrorists and insurgents are violently opposed to democracy and will continue to attack it. Yet the terrorists' most powerful myth is being destroyed. The whole world is seeing that the car bombers and assassins are not only fighting coalition forces, they are trying to destroy the hopes of Iraqis, expressed in free elections. And the whole world now knows that a small group of extremists will not overturn the will of the Iraqi people.

We will succeed in Iraq because Iraqis are determined to fight for their own freedom and to write their own history. As Prime Minister Allawi said in his speech to Congress last September, "Ordinary Iraqis are anxious to shoulder all the security burdens of our country as quickly as possible." That is the natural desire of an independent nation, and it also is the stated mission of our coalition in Iraq.

The new political situation in Iraq opens a new phase of our work in that country. At the recommendation of our commanders on the ground and in consultation with the Iraqi government, we will increasingly focus our efforts on helping prepare more capable Iraqi security forces -- forces with skilled officers and an effective command structure.

As those forces become more self-reliant and take on greater security responsibilities, America and its coalition partners will increasingly be in a supporting role. In the end, Iraqis must be able to defend their own country, and we will help that proud, new nation secure its liberty. Recently an Iraqi interpreter said to a reporter, "Tell America not to abandon us." He and all Iraqis can be certain: While our military strategy is adapting to circumstances, our commitment remains firm and unchanging. We are standing for the freedom of our Iraqi friends, and freedom in Iraq will make America safer for generations to come.

We will not set an artificial timetable for leaving Iraq, because that would embolden the terrorists and make them believe they can wait us out. We are in Iraq to achieve a result: a country that is democratic, representative of all its people, at peace with its neighbors and able to defend itself. And when that result is achieved, our men and women serving in Iraq will return home with the honor they have earned.

Right now, Americans in uniform are serving at posts across the world, often taking great risks on my orders. We have given them training and equipment. And they have given us an example of idealism and character that makes every American proud.

The volunteers of our military are unrelenting in battle, unwavering in loyalty, unmatched in honor and decency, and every day they are making our nation more secure.

Some of our service men and women have survived terrible injuries, and this grateful nation will do everything we can to help them recover.

And we have said farewell to some very good men and women who died for our freedom and whose memory this nation will honor forever.

One name we honor is Marine Corps Sergeant Byron Norwood of Pflugerville, Texas, who was killed during the assault on Fallujah. His mom, Janet, sent me a letter and told me how much Byron loved being a Marine and how proud he was to be on the front line against terror. She wrote, "When Byron was home the last time, I said that I wanted to protect him like I had since he was born. He just hugged me and said, 'You've done your job, Mom. Now it is my turn to protect you.'" Ladies and gentlemen, with grateful hearts, we honor freedom's defenders and our military families, represented here this evening by Sergeant Norwood's mom and dad, Janet and Bill Norwood.

In these four years, Americans have seen the unfolding of large events. We have known times of sorrow and hours of uncertainty and days of victory. In all this history, even when we have disagreed, we have seen threads of purpose that unite us.

The attack on freedom in our world has reaffirmed our confidence in freedom's power to change the world. We're all part of a great venture: to extend the promise of freedom in our country, to renew the values that sustain our liberty and to spread the peace that freedom brings.

As Franklin Roosevelt once reminded Americans, "Each age is a dream that is dying or one that is coming to birth."

And we live in the country where the biggest dreams are born.

The abolition of slavery was only a dream -- until it was fulfilled.

The liberation of Europe from fascism was only a dream -- until it was achieved.

The fall of imperial communism was only a dream -- until, one day, it was accomplished.

Our generation has dreams of its own, and we also go forward with confidence. The road of providence is uneven and unpredictable, yet we know where it leads: It leads to freedom.

Thank you. And may God bless America.

(2) George W. Bush 2008 State of the Union Address **(B2)**

Madam Speaker, Vice President Cheney, members of Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens: Seven years have passed since I first stood before you at this rostrum. In that time, our country has been tested in ways none of us could have imagined. We faced hard decisions about peace and war, rising competition in the world economy, and the health and welfare of our citizens. These issues call for vigorous debate, and I think it's fair to say we've answered the call. Yet history will record that amid our differences, we acted with purpose. And together, we showed the world the power and resilience of American self-government.

All of us were sent to Washington to carry out the people's business. That is the purpose of this body. It is the meaning of our oath. It remains our charge to keep.

The actions of the 110th Congress will affect the security and prosperity of our nation long after this session has ended. In this election year, let us show our fellow Americans that we recognize our responsibilities and are determined to meet them. Let us show them that Republicans and Democrats can compete for votes and cooperate for results at the same time.

From expanding opportunity to protecting our country, we've made good progress. Yet we have unfinished business before us, and the American people expect us to get it done.

In the work ahead, we must be guided by the philosophy that made our nation great. As Americans, we believe in the power of individuals to determine their destiny and shape the course of history. We believe that the most reliable guide for our country is the collective wisdom of ordinary citizens. And so in all we do, we must trust in the ability of free peoples to make wise decisions, and empower them to improve their lives for their futures.

To build a prosperous future, we must trust people with their own money and empower them to grow our economy. As we meet tonight, our economy is undergoing a period of uncertainty. America has added jobs for a record 52 straight months, but jobs are now growing at a slower pace. Wages are up, but so are prices for food and gas. Exports are rising, but the housing market has declined. At kitchen tables across our country, there is a concern about our economic future.

In the long run, Americans can be confident about our economic growth. But in the short run, we can all see that that growth is slowing. So last week, my administration reached agreement with Speaker Pelosi and Republican Leader Boehner on a robust growth package that includes tax relief for individuals and families and incentives for business investment. The temptation will be to load up the bill. That would delay it or derail it, and neither option is acceptable. This is a good agreement that will keep our economy growing and our people working. And this Congress must pass it as soon as possible.

We have other work to do on taxes. Unless Congress acts, most of the tax relief we've delivered over the past seven years will be taken away. Some in Washington argue that letting tax relief expire is not a tax increase. Try explaining that to 116 million American taxpayers who would see their taxes rise by an average of $1,800. Others have said they would personally be happy to pay higher taxes. I welcome their enthusiasm. I'm pleased to report that the IRS accepts both checks and money orders.

Most Americans think their taxes are high enough. With all the other pressures on their finances, American families should not have to worry about their federal government taking a bigger bite out of their paychecks. There's only one way to eliminate this uncertainty: Make the tax relief permanent. And members of Congress should know: If any bill raises taxes reaches my desk, I will veto it.

Just as we trust Americans with their own money, we need to earn their trust by spending their tax dollars wisely. Next week, I'll send you a budget that terminates or substantially reduces 151 wasteful or bloated programs, totaling more than $18 billion. The budget that I will submit will keep America on track for a surplus in 2012. American families have to balance their budgets; so should their government.

The people's trust in their government is undermined by congressional earmarks -- special interest projects that are often snuck in at the last minute, without discussion or debate. Last year, I asked you to voluntarily cut the number and cost of earmarks in half. I also asked you to stop slipping earmarks into committee reports that never even come to a vote. Unfortunately, neither goal was met. So this time, if you send me an appropriations bill that does not cut the number and cost of earmarks in half, I'll send it back to you with my veto.

And tomorrow, I will issue an executive order that directs federal agencies to ignore any future earmark that is not voted on by Congress. If these items are truly worth funding, Congress should debate them in the open and hold a public vote.

Our shared responsibilities extend beyond matters of taxes and spending. On housing, we must trust Americans with the responsibility of homeownership and empower them to weather turbulent times in the housing market. My administration brought together the HOPE NOW alliance, which is helping many struggling homeowners avoid foreclosure. And Congress can help even more. Tonight I ask you to pass legislation to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, modernize the Federal Housing Administration, and allow state housing agencies to issue tax-free bonds to help homeowners refinance their mortgages. These are difficult times for many American families, and by taking these steps, we can help more of them keep their homes.

To build a future of quality health care, we must trust patients and doctors to make medical decisions and empower them with better information and better options. We share a common goal: making health care more affordable and accessible for all Americans. The best way to achieve that goal is by expanding consumer choice, not government control. So I have proposed ending the bias in the tax code against those who do not get their health insurance through their employer. This one reform would put private coverage within reach for millions, and I call on the Congress to pass it this year.

The Congress must also expand health savings accounts, create Association Health Plans for small businesses, promote health information technology, and confront the epidemic of junk medical lawsuits. With all these steps, we will help ensure that decisions about your medical care are made in the privacy of your doctor's office -- not in the halls of Congress.

On education, we must trust students to learn if given the chance, and empower parents to demand results from our schools. In neighborhoods across our country, there are boys and girls with dreams -- and a decent education is their only hope of achieving them.

Six years ago, we came together to pass the No Child Left Behind Act, and today no one can deny its results. Last year, fourth and eighth graders achieved the highest math scores on record. Reading scores are on the rise. African American and Hispanic students posted all-time highs. Now we must work together to increase accountability, add flexibility for states and districts, reduce the number of high school dropouts, provide extra help for struggling schools.

Members of Congress: The No Child Left Behind Act is a bipartisan achievement. It is succeeding. And we owe it to America's children, their parents, and their teachers to strengthen this good law.

We must also do more to help children when their schools do not measure up. Thanks to the D.C. Opportunity Scholarships you approved, more than 2,600 of the poorest children in our Nation's Capital have found new hope at a faith-based or other non-public school.

Sadly, these schools are disappearing at an alarming rate in many of America's inner cities. So I will convene a White House summit aimed at strengthening these lifelines of learning. And to open the doors of these schools to more children, I ask you to support a new $300 million program called Pell Grants for Kids. We have seen how Pell Grants help low-income college students realize their full potential. Together, we've expanded the size and reach of these grants. Now let us apply that same spirit to help liberate poor children trapped in failing public schools.

On trade, we must trust American workers to compete with anyone in the world and empower them by opening up new markets overseas. Today, our economic growth increasingly depends on our ability to sell American goods and crops and services all over the world. So we're working to break down barriers to trade and investment wherever we can. We're working for a successful Doha Round of trade talks, and we must complete a good agreement this year. At the same time, we're pursuing opportunities to open up new markets by passing free trade agreements.

I thank the Congress for approving a good agreement with Peru. And now I ask you to approve agreements with Colombia and Panama and South Korea. Many products from these nations now enter America duty-free, yet many of our products face steep tariffs in their markets. These agreements will level the playing field. They will give us better access to nearly 100 million customers. They will support good jobs for the finest workers in the world: those whose products say "Made in the USA."

These agreements also promote America's strategic interests. The first agreement that will come before you is with Colombia, a friend of America that is confronting violence and terror, and fighting drug traffickers. If we fail to pass this agreement, we will embolden the purveyors of false populism in our hemisphere. So we must come together, pass this agreement, and show our neighbors in the region that democracy leads to a better life.

Trade brings better jobs and better choices and better prices. Yet for some Americans, trade can mean losing a job, and the federal government has a responsibility to help. I ask Congress to reauthorize and reform trade adjustment assistance, so we can help these displaced workers learn new skills and find new jobs.

To build a future of energy security, we must trust in the creative genius of American researchers and entrepreneurs and empower them to pioneer a new generation of clean energy technology. Our security, our prosperity, and our environment all require reducing our dependence on oil. Last year, I asked you to pass legislation to reduce oil consumption over the next decade, and you responded. Together we should take the next steps: Let us fund new technologies that can generate coal power while capturing carbon emissions. Let us increase the use of renewable power and emissions-free nuclear power. Let us continue investing in advanced battery technology and renewable fuels to power the cars and trucks of the future. Let us create a new international clean technology fund, which will help developing nations like India and China make greater use of clean energy sources. And let us complete an international agreement that has the potential to slow, stop, and eventually reverse the growth of greenhouse gases.

This agreement will be effective only if it includes commitments by every major economy and gives none a free ride. The United States is committed to strengthening our energy security and confronting global climate change. And the best way to meet these goals is for America to continue leading the way toward the development of cleaner and more energy-efficient technology.

To keep America competitive into the future, we must trust in the skill of our scientists and engineers and empower them to pursue the breakthroughs of tomorrow. Last year, Congress passed legislation supporting the American Competitiveness Initiative, but never followed through with the funding. This funding is essential to keeping our scientific edge. So I ask Congress to double federal support for critical basic research in the physical sciences and ensure America remains the most dynamic nation on Earth.

On matters of life and science, we must trust in the innovative spirit of medical researchers and empower them to discover new treatments while respecting moral boundaries. In November, we witnessed a landmark achievement when scientists discovered a way to reprogram adult skin cells to act like embryonic stem cells. This breakthrough has the potential to move us beyond the divisive debates of the past by extending the frontiers of medicine without the destruction of human life.

So we're expanding funding for this type of ethical medical research. And as we explore promising avenues of research, we must also ensure that all life is treated with the dignity it deserves. And so I call on Congress to pass legislation that bans unethical practices such as the buying, selling, patenting, or cloning of human life.

On matters of justice, we must trust in the wisdom of our founders and empower judges who understand that the Constitution means what it says. I've submitted judicial nominees who will rule by the letter of the law, not the whim of the gavel. Many of these nominees are being unfairly delayed. They are worthy of confirmation, and the Senate should give each of them a prompt up-or-down vote.

In communities across our land, we must trust in the good heart of the American people and empower them to serve their neighbors in need. Over the past seven years, more of our fellow citizens have discovered that the pursuit of happiness leads to the path of service. Americans have volunteered in record numbers. Charitable donations are higher than ever. Faith-based groups are bringing hope to pockets of despair, with newfound support from the federal government. And to help guarantee equal treatment of faith-based organizations when they compete for federal funds, I ask you to permanently extend Charitable Choice.

Tonight the armies of compassion continue the march to a new day in the Gulf Coast. America honors the strength and resilience of the people of this region. We reaffirm our pledge to help them build stronger and better than before. And tonight I'm pleased to announce that in April we will host this year's North American Summit of Canada, Mexico, and the United States in the great city of New Orleans.

There are two other pressing challenges that I've raised repeatedly before this body, and that this body has failed to address: entitlement spending and immigration. Every member in this chamber knows that spending on entitlement programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid is growing faster than we can afford. We all know the painful choices ahead if America stays on this path: massive tax increases, sudden and drastic cuts in benefits, or crippling deficits. I've laid out proposals to reform these programs. Now I ask members of Congress to offer your proposals and come up with a bipartisan solution to save these vital programs for our children and our grandchildren.

The other pressing challenge is immigration. America needs to secure our borders -- and with your help, my administration is taking steps to do so. We're increasing worksite enforcement, deploying fences and advanced technologies to stop illegal crossings. We've effectively ended the policy of "catch and release" at the border, and by the end of this year, we will have doubled the number of border patrol agents. Yet we also need to acknowledge that we will never fully secure our border until we create a lawful way for foreign workers to come here and support our economy. This will take pressure off the border and allow law enforcement to concentrate on those who mean us harm. We must also find a sensible and humane way to deal with people here illegally. Illegal immigration is complicated, but it can be resolved. And it must be resolved in a way that upholds both our laws and our highest ideals.

This is the business of our nation here at home. Yet building a prosperous future for our citizens also depends on confronting enemies abroad and advancing liberty in troubled regions of the world.

Our foreign policy is based on a clear premise: We trust that people, when given the chance, will choose a future of freedom and peace. In the last seven years, we have witnessed stirring moments in the history of liberty. We've seen citizens in Georgia and Ukraine stand up for their right to free and fair elections. We've seen people in Lebanon take to the streets to demand their independence. We've seen Afghans emerge from the tyranny of the Taliban and choose a new president and a new parliament. We've seen jubilant Iraqis holding up ink-stained fingers and celebrating their freedom. These images of liberty have inspired us.

In the past seven years, we've also seen images that have sobered us. We've watched throngs of mourners in Lebanon and Pakistan carrying the caskets of beloved leaders taken by the assassin's hand. We've seen wedding guests in blood-soaked finery staggering from a hotel in Jordan, Afghans and Iraqis blown up in mosques and markets, and trains in London and Madrid ripped apart by bombs. On a clear September day, we saw thousands of our fellow citizens taken from us in an instant. These horrific images serve as a grim reminder: The advance of liberty is opposed by terrorists and extremists -- evil men who despise freedom, despise America, and aim to subject millions to their violent rule.

Since 9/11, we have taken the fight to these terrorists and extremists. We will stay on the offense, we will keep up the pressure, and we will deliver justice to our enemies.

We are engaged in the defining ideological struggle of the 21st century. The terrorists oppose every principle of humanity and decency that we hold dear. Yet in this war on terror, there is one thing we and our enemies agree on: In the long run, men and women who are free to determine their own destinies will reject terror and refuse to live in tyranny. And that is why the terrorists are fighting to deny this choice to the people in Lebanon, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Palestinian Territories. And that is why, for the security of America and the peace of the world, we are spreading the hope of freedom.

In Afghanistan, America, our 25 NATO allies, and 15 partner nations are helping the Afghan people defend their freedom and rebuild their country. Thanks to the courage of these military and civilian personnel, a nation that was once a safe haven for al Qaeda is now a young democracy where boys and girls are going to school, new roads and hospitals are being built, and people are looking to the future with new hope. These successes must continue, so we're adding 3,200 Marines to our forces in Afghanistan, where they will fight the terrorists and train the Afghan Army and police. Defeating the Taliban and al Qaeda is critical to our security, and I thank the Congress for supporting America's vital mission in Afghanistan.

In Iraq, the terrorists and extremists are fighting to deny a proud people their liberty, and fighting to establish safe havens for attacks across the world. One year ago, our enemies were succeeding in their efforts to plunge Iraq into chaos. So we reviewed our strategy and changed course. We launched a surge of American forces into Iraq. We gave our troops a new mission: Work with the Iraqi forces to protect the Iraqi people, pursue the enemy in its strongholds, and deny the terrorists sanctuary anywhere in the country.

The Iraqi people quickly realized that something dramatic had happened. Those who had worried that America was preparing to abandon them instead saw tens of thousands of American forces flowing into their country. They saw our forces moving into neighborhoods, clearing out the terrorists, and staying behind to ensure the enemy did not return. And they saw our troops, along with Provincial Reconstruction Teams that include Foreign Service officers and other skilled public servants, coming in to ensure that improved security was followed by improvements in daily life. Our military and civilians in Iraq are performing with courage and distinction, and they have the gratitude of our whole nation.

The Iraqis launched a surge of their own. In the fall of 2006, Sunni tribal leaders grew tired of al Qaeda's brutality and started a popular uprising called "The Anbar Awakening." Over the past year, similar movements have spread across the country. And today, the

grassroots surge includes more than 80,000 Iraqi citizens who are fighting the terrorists. The government in Baghdad has stepped forward, as well -- adding more than 100,000 new Iraqi soldiers and police during the past year.

While the enemy is still dangerous and more work remains, the American and Iraqi surges have achieved results few of us could have imagined just one year ago. When we met last year, many said that containing the violence was impossible. A year later, high profile terrorist attacks are down, civilian deaths are down, sectarian killings are down.

When we met last year, militia extremists -- some armed and trained by Iran -- were wreaking havoc in large areas of Iraq. A year later, coalition and Iraqi forces have killed or captured hundreds of militia fighters. And Iraqis of all backgrounds increasingly realize that defeating these militia fighters is critical to the future of their country.

When we met last year, al Qaeda had sanctuaries in many areas of Iraq, and their leaders had just offered American forces safe passage out of the country. Today, it is al Qaeda that is searching for safe passage. They have been driven from many of the strongholds they once held, and over the past year, we've captured or killed thousands of extremists in Iraq, including hundreds of key al Qaeda leaders and operatives.

Last month, Osama bin Laden released a tape in which he railed against Iraqi tribal leaders who have turned on al Qaeda and admitted that coalition forces are growing stronger in Iraq. Ladies and gentlemen, some may deny the surge is working, but among the terrorists there is no doubt. Al Qaeda is on the run in Iraq, and this enemy will be defeated.

When we met last year, our troop levels in Iraq were on the rise. Today, because of the progress just described, we are implementing a policy of "return on success," and the surge forces we sent to Iraq are beginning to come home.

This progress is a credit to the valor of our troops and the brilliance of their commanders. This evening, I want to speak directly to our men and women on the front lines. Soldiers and sailors, airmen, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen: In the past year, you have done everything we've asked of you, and more. Our nation is grateful for your courage. We are proud of your accomplishments. And tonight in this hallowed chamber, with the American people as our witness, we make you a solemn pledge: In the fight ahead, you will have all you need to protect our nation. And I ask Congress to meet its responsibilities to these brave men and women by fully funding our troops.

Our enemies in Iraq have been hit hard. They are not yet defeated, and we can still expect tough fighting ahead. Our objective in the coming year is to sustain and build on the gains we made in 2007, while transitioning to the next phase of our strategy. American troops are shifting from leading operations, to partnering with Iraqi forces, and, eventually, to a protective over watch mission. As part of this transition, one Army brigade combat team and one Marine Expeditionary Unit have already come home and will not be replaced. In the coming months, four additional brigades and two Marine battalions will follow suit. Taken together, this means more than 20,000 of our troops are coming home.

Any further drawdown of U.S. troops will be based on conditions in Iraq and the recommendations of our commanders. General Petraeus has warned that too fast a drawdown could result in the "disintegration of the Iraqi security forces, al Qaeda-Iraq regaining lost ground, [and] a marked increase in violence." Members of Congress: Having come so far and achieved so much, we must not allow this to happen.

In the coming year, we will work with Iraqi leaders as they build on the progress they're making toward political reconciliation. At the local level, Sunnis, Shia, and Kurds are beginning to come together to reclaim their communities and rebuild their lives. Progress in the provinces must be matched by progress in Baghdad. We're seeing some encouraging signs. The national government is sharing oil revenues with the provinces. The parliament

recently passed both a pension law and de-Baathification reform. They're now debating a provincial powers law. The Iraqis still have a distance to travel. But after decades of dictatorship and the pain of sectarian violence, reconciliation is taking place -- and the Iraqi people are taking control of their future.

The mission in Iraq has been difficult and trying for our nation. But it is in the vital interest of the United States that we succeed. A free Iraq will deny al Qaeda a safe haven. A free Iraq will show millions across the Middle East that a future of liberty is possible. A free Iraq will be a friend of America, a partner in fighting terror, and a source of stability in a dangerous part of the world.

By contrast, a failed Iraq would embolden the extremists, strengthen Iran, and give terrorists a base from which to launch new attacks on our friends, our allies, and our homeland. The enemy has made its intentions clear. At a time when the momentum seemed to favor them, al Qaida's top commander in Iraq declared that they will not rest until they have attacked us here in Washington. My fellow Americans: We will not rest either. We will not rest until this enemy has been defeated. We must do the difficult work today, so that years from now people will look back and say that this generation rose to the moment, prevailed in a tough fight, and left behind a more hopeful region and a safer America.

We're also standing against the forces of extremism in the Holy Land, where we have new cause for hope. Palestinians have elected a president who recognizes that confronting terror is essential to achieving a state where his people can live in dignity and at peace with Israel. Israelis have leaders who recognize that a peaceful, democratic Palestinian state will be a source of lasting security. This month in Ramallah and Jerusalem, I assured leaders from both sides that America will do, and I will do, everything we can to help them achieve a peace agreement that defines a Palestinian state by the end of this year. The time has come for a Holy Land where a democratic Israel and a democratic Palestine live side-by-side in peace.

We're also standing against the forces of extremism embodied by the regime in Tehran. Iran's rulers oppress a good and talented people. And wherever freedom advances in the Middle East, it seems the Iranian regime is there to oppose it. Iran is funding and training militia groups in Iraq, supporting Hezbollah terrorists in Lebanon, and backing Hamas' efforts to undermine peace in the Holy Land. Tehran is also developing ballistic missiles of increasing range, and continues to develop its capability to enrich uranium, which could be used to create a nuclear weapon.

Our message to the people of Iran is clear: We have no quarrel with you. We respect your traditions and your history. We look forward to the day when you have your freedom. Our message to the leaders of Iran is also clear: Verifiably suspend your nuclear enrichment, so negotiations can begin. And to rejoin the community of nations, come clean about your nuclear intentions and past actions, stop your oppression at home, cease your support for terror abroad. But above all, know this: America will confront those who threaten our troops. We will stand by our allies, and we will defend our vital interests in the Persian Gulf.

On the home front, we will continue to take every lawful and effective measure to protect our country. This is our most solemn duty. We are grateful that there has not been another attack on our soil since 9/11. This is not for the lack of desire or effort on the part of the enemy. In the past six years, we've stopped numerous attacks, including a plot to fly a plane into the tallest building in Los Angeles and another to blow up passenger jets bound for America over the Atlantic. Dedicated men and women in our government toil day and night to stop the terrorists from carrying out their plans. These good citizens are saving American lives, and everyone in this chamber owes them our thanks.

And we owe them something more: We owe them the tools they need to keep our people safe. And one of the most important tools we can give them is the ability to monitor terrorist communications. To protect America, we need to know who the terrorists are talking to, what they are saying, and what they're planning. Last year, Congress passed legislation to

help us do that. Unfortunately, Congress set the legislation to expire on February the 1st. That means if you don't act by Friday, our ability to track terrorist threats would be weakened and our citizens will be in greater danger. Congress must ensure the flow of vital intelligence is not disrupted. Congress must pass liability protection for companies believed to have assisted in the efforts to defend America. We've had ample time for debate. The time to act is now.

Protecting our nation from the dangers of a new century requires more than good intelligence and a strong military. It also requires changing the conditions that breed resentment and allow extremists to prey on despair. So America is using its influence to build a freer, more hopeful, and more compassionate world. This is a reflection of our national interest; it is the calling of our conscience.

America opposes genocide in Sudan.We support freedom in countries from Cuba and Zimbabwe to Belarus and Burma.

America is leading the fight against global poverty, with strong education initiatives and humanitarian assistance. We've also changed the way we deliver aid by launching the Millennium Challenge Account. This program strengthens democracy, transparency, and the rule of law in developing nations, and I ask you to fully fund this important initiative.

America is leading the fight against global hunger. Today, more than half the world's food aid comes from the United States. And tonight, I ask Congress to support an innovative proposal to provide food assistance by purchasing crops directly from farmers in the developing world, so we can build up local agriculture and help break the cycle of famine.

America is leading the fight against disease. With your help, we're working to cut by half the number of malaria-related deaths in 15 African nations. And our Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief is treating 1.4 million people. We can bring healing and hope to many more. So I ask you to maintain the principles that have changed behavior and made this program a success. And I call on you to double our initial commitment to fighting HIV/AIDS by approving an additional $30 billion over the next five years.

America is a force for hope in the world because we are a compassionate people, and some of the most compassionate Americans are those who have stepped forward to protect us. We must keep faith with all who have risked life and limb so that we might live in freedom and peace. Over the past seven years, we've increased funding for veterans by more than 95 percent. And as we increase funding -- And as increase funding we must also reform our veterans system to meet the needs of a new war and a new generation. I call on the Congress to enact the reforms recommended by Senator Bob Dole and Secretary Donna Shalala, so we can improve the system of care for our wounded warriors and help them build lives of hope and promise and dignity.

Our military families also sacrifice for America. They endure sleepless nights and the daily struggle of providing for children while a loved one is serving far from home. We have a responsibility to provide for them. So I ask you to join me in expanding their access to child care, creating new hiring preferences for military spouses across the federal government, and allowing our troops to transfer their unused education benefits to their spouses or children. Our military families serve our nation, they inspire our nation, and tonight our nation honors them.

The strength -- the secret of our strength, the miracle of America, is that our greatness lies not in our government, but in the spirit and determination of our people. When the Federal Convention met in Philadelphia in 1787, our nation was bound by the Articles of Confederation, which began with the words, "We the undersigned delegates." When Governor Morris was asked to draft a preamble to our new Constitution, he offered an important revision and opened with words that changed the course of our nation and the history of the world: "We the people."

By trusting the people, our Founders wagered that a great and noble nation could be built on the liberty that resides in the hearts of all men and women. By trusting the people, succeeding generations transformed our fragile young democracy into the most powerful nation on Earth and a beacon of hope for millions. And so long as we continue to trust the people, our nation will prosper, our liberty will be secure, and the state of our Union will remain strong.

So tonight, with confidence in freedom's power, and trust in the people, let us set forth to do their business. God bless America.

(3) Barack Obama 2010 First Presidential State of the Union Address **(O1)**

Madame Speaker, Vice President Biden, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans:

Our Constitution declares that from time to time, the President shall give to Congress information about the state of our union. For two hundred and twenty years, our leaders [have] fulfilled this duty. They've done so during periods of prosperity and tranquility. And they've done so in the midst of war and depression -- at moments of great strife and great struggle.

It's tempting to look back on these moments and assume that our progress was inevitable -- that America was always destined to succeed. But when the Union was turned back at Bull Run and the Allies first landed at Omaha Beach, victory was very much in doubt. When the market crashed on Black Tuesday and civil rights marchers were beaten on Bloody Sunday, the future was anything but certain. These were the times that tested the courage of our convictions, and the strength of our union. And despite all our divisions and disagreements, our hesitations and our fears, America prevailed because we chose to move forward as one nation, and one people.

Again, we are tested. And again, we must answer history's call.

One year ago, I took office amid two wars, an economy rocked by a severe recession, a financial system on the verge of collapse, and a government deeply in debt. Experts from across the political spectrum warned that if we did not act, we might face a second depression. So we acted -- immediately and aggressively. And one year later, the worst of the storm has passed.

But the devastation remains. One in ten Americans still cannot find work. Many businesses have shuttered. Home values have declined. Small towns and rural communities have been hit especially hard. And for those who had already known poverty, life's become that much harder.

And this recession has also compounded the burdens that America's families have been dealing with for decades: the burden of working harder and longer for less, of being unable to save enough to retire, or help kids with college.

So I know the anxieties that are out there right now. They're not new. These struggles are the reason I ran for President. These struggles are what I've witnessed for years in places like Elkhart, Indiana; Galesburg, Illinois. I hear about them in the letters that I read each night. The toughest to read are those written by children, asking why they have to move from their home, asking or when their mom or dad will be able to go back to work.

For these Americans and so many others, change has not come fast enough. Some are frustrated; some are angry. They don't understand why it seems like bad behavior on Wall Street is rewarded but hard work on Main Street isn't; or why Washington has been unable or unwilling to solve any of our problems. They're tired of the partisanship and the shouting and the pettiness. They know we can't afford it. Not now.

So we face big and difficult challenges. And what the American people hope -- what they deserve -- is for all of us, Democrats and Republicans, to work through our differences; to overcome the numbing weight of our politics. For while the people who sent us here have different backgrounds, different stories, different beliefs, the anxieties they face are the same. The aspirations they hold are shared: a job that pays the bills; a chance to get ahead. Most of all, the ability to give their children a better life.

And you know what else they share? They share a stubborn resilience in the face of adversity. After one of the most difficult years in our history, they remain busy building cars and teaching kids, starting businesses, and going back to school. They're coaching little league and helping their neighbors. One woman wrote to me and said, "We are strained but hopeful, struggling but encouraged."

It's because of this spirit -- this great decency and great strength -- that I have never been more hopeful about America's future than I am tonight.

Despite -- Despite our hardships, our union is strong. We do not give up. We do not quit. We do not allow fear or division to break our spirit. In this new decade, it's time the American people get a government that matches their decency, that embodies their strength. And tonight -- tonight I'd like to talk about how, together, we can deliver on that promise.

It begins with our economy. Our most urgent -- Our most urgent task upon taking office was to shore up the same banks that helped cause this crisis. It was not easy to do. And if there's one thing that has unified Democrats and Republicans -- and everybody in between -- it's that we all hated the bank bailout. I hated it -- I hated it -- I hated it. You hated it. It was about as popular as a root canal.

But when I ran for President, I promised I wouldn't just do what was popular -- I would do what was necessary. And if we had allowed the meltdown of the financial system, unemployment might be double what it is today. More businesses would certainly have closed. More homes would have surely been lost. So I supported the last Administration's efforts to create the financial rescue program. And when we took the program over, we made it more transparent and more accountable. And as a result, the markets are now stabilized, and we've recovered most of the money we spent on the banks.

Most, but not all. To recover the rest, I've proposed a fee on the biggest banks.

Now -- Now, I know Wall Street isn't keen on this idea, but if these firms can afford to hand out big bonuses again, they can afford a modest fee to pay back the taxpayers who rescued them in their time of need.

Now, as we stabilized the financial system, we also took steps to get our economy growing again, save as many jobs as possible, and help Americans who had become unemployed. That's why we extended or increased unemployment benefits for more than 18 million Americans, made health insurance 65% cheaper for families who get their coverage through COBRA, and passed 25 different tax cuts.

Now, let me repeat: We cut taxes.

We cut taxes for 95% of working families.

We cut taxes for small businesses.

We cut taxes for first-time homebuyers.

We cut taxes for parents trying to care for their children.

We cut taxes for eight million Americans paying for college.

(I thought I'd get some applause on that one.)

As a result -- As a result, millions of Americans had more to spend on gas, and food, and other necessities -- all of which helped businesses keep more workers. And we haven't raised income taxes by a single dime on a single person. Not a single dime.

Now, because of the steps we took, there are about two million Americans working right now who would otherwise be unemployed. 200,000 work in construction and clean energy. 300,000 are teachers and other education workers. Tens of thousands are cops, firefighters, correctional officers, first responders. And we're on track to add another one and a half million jobs to this total by the end of the year.

The plan that has made all of this possible, from the tax cuts to the jobs, is the Recovery Act. That's right: the Recovery Act, also known as the Stimulus Bill. Economists on the left and the right say this bill has helped saved jobs and avert disaster. But you don't have to take their word for it: Talk to the small business in Phoenix that will triple its workforce because of the Recovery Act. Talk to the window manufacturer in Philadelphia who said he used to be skeptical about the Recovery Act, until he had to add two more work shifts just because of the business it created. Talk to the single teacher raising two kids who was told by her principal in the last week of school that because of the Recovery Act, she wouldn't be laid off after all.

There are stories like this all across America. And after two years of recession, the economy is growing again. Retirement funds have started to gain back some of their value. Businesses are beginning to invest again, and slowly [some] are starting to hire again.

But I realize that for every success story, there are other stories -- of men and women who wake up with the anguish of not knowing where their next paycheck will come from; who send out resumes week after week and hear nothing in response. That is why jobs must be our number one focus in 2010. And that's why I'm calling for a new jobs bill tonight!

Now, the true engine of job creation in this country will always be America's businesses. (I agree. Absolutely). But government can create the conditions necessary for businesses to expand and hire more workers. We should start where most new jobs do -- in small businesses, companies that begin when -- companies that begin when an entrepreneur -- when an entrepreneur takes a chance on a dream, or a worker decides its time she became her own boss.

Through sheer grit and determination, these companies have weathered the recession and they're ready to grow. But when you talk to small business owners in places like Allentown, Pennsylvania or Elyria, Ohio, you find out that even though banks on Wall Street are lending again, they're mostly lending to bigger companies. Financing remains difficult for small business owners across the country -- even those that are making a profit.

So tonight, I'm proposing that we take 30 billion dollars of the money Wall Street banks have repaid and use it to help community banks give small businesses the credit they need to stay afloat. I'm also proposing a new small business tax credit -- one that will go to over one million small businesses who hire new workers or raise wages. While we're at it, let's also eliminate all capital gains taxes on small business investment, and provide a tax

incentive for all large businesses and all small businesses to invest in new plants and equipment.

Next, we can put Americans to work today building the infrastructure of tomorrow. From -- From the first railroads to the interstate highway system, our nation has always been built to compete. There's no reason Europe or China should have the fastest trains, or the new factories that manufacture clean energy products.

Tomorrow, I'll visit Tampa, Florida, where workers will soon break ground on a new high-speed railroad funded by the Recovery Act. There are projects like that all across this country that will create jobs and help our move our nation's goods, services, and information. We should put more Americans to work building clean energy facilities, and give -- and give rebates to Americans who make their homes more energy efficient, which supports clean energy jobs. And to encourage these and other businesses to stay within our borders, it is time to finally slash the tax breaks for companies that ship our jobs overseas and give those tax breaks to companies that create jobs right here in the United States of America.

Now, the House has passed a jobs bill that includes some of these steps. As the first order of business this year, I urge the Senate to do the same -- and I know they will. They will. People are out of work. They're hurting. And they need our help. And I want a jobs bill on my desk without delay.

But -- But the truth is, these steps still won't make up for the seven million jobs that we've lost over the last two years. The only way to move to full employment is to lay a new foundation for long-term economic growth, and finally address the problems that America's families have confronted for years.

We can't afford another so-called economic "expansion" like the one from the last decade -- what some call the "lost decade" -- where jobs grew more slowly than during any prior expansion; where the income of the average American household declined while the cost of health care and tuition reached record highs; where prosperity was built on a housing bubble and financial speculation.

From the day I took office, I've been told that addressing our larger challenges is too ambitious. Such an effort would be too contentious. I've been told that our political system is too gridlocked, and that we should just put things on hold for awhile. For those who make these claims, I have one simple question: How long should we wait? How long should America put its future on hold?

You see -- You see, Washington has been telling us to wait for decades, even as the problems have grown worse. Meanwhile, China's not waiting to revamp its economy. Germany's not waiting. India's not waiting. These nations are -- they're not standing still. These nations aren't playing for second place. They're putting more emphasis on math and science. They're rebuilding their infrastructure. They're making serious investments in clean energy because they want those jobs.

Well, I do not accept second-place for the United States of America.

As hard as it may be, as uncomfortable and contentious as the debates may become, it's time to get serious about fixing the problems that are hampering our growth. Now, one place to start is serious financial reform. Look, I am not interested in punishing banks. I'm interested in protecting our economy. A strong, healthy financial market makes it possible for businesses to access credit and create new jobs. It channels the savings of families into investments that raise incomes. But that can only happen if we guard against the same recklessness that nearly brought down our entire economy.

We need to make sure consumers and middle-class families have the information they need to make financial decisions. We can't allow financial institutions, including those that

take your deposits, to take risks that threaten the whole economy. Now, the House has already passed financial reform with many of these changes. And -- And the lobbyists are trying to kill it. Well, we cannot let them win this fight. And if the bill that ends up on my desk does not meet the test of real reform, I will send it back until we get it right. We've got to get it right.

Next, we need to encourage American innovation. Last year, we made the largest investment in basic research funding in history, an investment -- an investment that could lead to the world's cheapest solar cells or treatment that kills cancer cells but leaves healthy ones untouched. And no area is more ripe for such innovation than energy. You can see the results of last year's investment in clean energy in the North Carolina company that will create 1200 jobs nationwide helping to make advanced batteries, or, in the California business that will put a thousand people to work making solar panels.

But to create more of these clean energy jobs, we need more production, more efficiency, more incentives. And that means building a new generation of safe, clean nuclear power plants in this country. It means making tough decisions about opening new offshore areas for oil and gas development. It means continued investment in advanced biofuels and clean coal technologies. And yes, it means passing a comprehensive energy and climate bill with incentives that will finally make clean energy the profitable kind of energy in America.

I am grateful to the House for passing such a bill last year. And this year -- this year, I am eager to help advance the bipartisan effort in the Senate. I know there have been questions about whether we can afford such changes in a tough economy. I know that there are those who disagree with the overwhelming scientific evidence on climate change. But -- But -- Here -- Here's the thing: Even if you doubt the evidence, providing incentives for energy efficiency and clean energy are the right thing to do for our future because the nation that leads the clean energy economy will be the nation that leads the global economy. And America must be that nation.

Third, we need to export more of our goods -- because the more products we make and sell to other countries, the more jobs we support right here in America. So -- So tonight, we set a new goal: We will double our exports over the next five years, an increase that will support two million jobs in America. To help meet this goal, we're launching a National Export Initiative that will help farmers and small businesses increase their exports, and reform export controls consistent with national security.

We have to seek new markets aggressively, just as our competitors are. If America sits on the sidelines while other nations sign trade deals, we will lose the chance to create jobs on our shores. But realizing those benefits also means enforcing those agreements so our trading partners play by the rules. And that's why we'll continue to shape a Doha trade agreement that opens global markets, and why we will strengthen our trade relations in Asia and with key partners like South Korea and Panama and Colombia.

Fourth, we need to invest in the skills and education of our people.

Now, this year -- this year we've broken through the stalemate between left and right by launching a national competition to improve our schools. And the idea here is simple: instead of rewarding failure, we only reward success. Instead of funding the status quo, we only invest in reform -- reform that raises student achievement, inspires students to excel in math and science, and turns around failing schools that steal the future of too many young Americans, from rural communities to the inner city. In the 21st century, the best anti-poverty program around is a world-class education. And in this country, the success of our children cannot depend more on where they live than on their potential.

When we renew the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we will work with Congress to expand these reforms to all 50 states. Still, in this economy, a high school diploma no longer guarantees a good job. That's why I urge the Senate to follow the House and pass a

bill that will revitalize our community colleges, which are a career pathway to the children of so many working families.

To make college more affordable, this bill will finally end the unwarranted taxpayer subsidies that go to banks for student loans. Instead, let's take that money and give families a 10,000 dollar tax credit for four years of college and increase Pell Grants. And let's tell another one million students that when they graduate, they will be required to pay only 10 percent of their income on student loans, and all of their debt will be forgiven after 20 years -- and forgiven after 10 years if they choose a career in public service, because in the United States of America, no one should go broke because they chose to go to college.

And by the way, it's time for colleges and universities to get serious about cutting their own costs -- because they, too, have a responsibility to help solve this problem.

Now, the price of college tuition is just one of the burdens facing the middle-class. That's why last year I asked Vice President Biden to chair a task force on Middle-Class Families. That's why we're nearly doubling the child care tax credit, and making it easier to save for retirement by giving access to every worker a retirement account and expanding the tax credit for those who start a nest egg. That's why we're working to lift the value of a family's single largest investment -- their home. The steps we took last year to shore up the housing market have allowed millions of Americans to take out new loans and save an average of 1500 dollars on mortgage payments. This year, we will step up re-financing so that homeowners can move into more affordable mortgages. And -- And it is precisely to relieve the burden on middle-class families that we still need health insurance reform. Yes, we do.

Now, let's clear a few things up. I didn't choose to tackle this issue to get some legislative victory under my belt. And by now it should be fairly obvious that I didn't take on health care because it was good politics. I took on health care because [of] the stories I've heard from Americans with preexisting conditions whose lives depend on getting coverage; patients who've been denied coverage; families -- even those with insurance -- who are just one illness away from financial ruin.

After nearly a century of trying -- Democratic Administrations, Republican Administrations -- we are closer than ever to bringing more security to the lives of so many Americans. The approach we've taken would protect every American from the worst practices of the insurance industry. It would give small businesses and uninsured Americans a chance to choose an affordable health care plan in a competitive market. It would require every insurance plan to cover preventive care. And by the way, I want to acknowledge our First Lady, Michelle Obama, who this year is creating a national movement to tackle the epidemic of childhood obesity and make kids healthier. Thank you. She gets embarrassed.

Our approach would preserve the right of Americans who have insurance to keep their doctor and their plan. It would reduce costs and premiums for millions of families and businesses. And according to the Congressional Budget Office -- the independent organization that both parties have cited as the official scorekeeper for Congress -- our approach would bring down the deficit by as much as one trillion dollars over the next two decades.

Still, this is a complexed issue, and the longer it was debated, the more skeptical people became. I take my share of the blame for not explaining it more clearly to the American people. And I know that with all the lobbying and horse-trading, the process left most Americans wondering, "What's in it for me?" But I also know this problem is not going away. By the time I'm finished speaking tonight, more Americans will have lost their health insurance. Millions will lose it this year. Our deficit will grow. Premiums will go up. Patients will be denied the care they need. Small business owners will continue to drop coverage altogether. I will not walk away from these Americans, and neither should the people in this chamber.

So, as temperatures cool, I want everyone to take another look at the plan we've proposed. There's a reason why many doctors, nurses, and health care experts who know our system best consider this approach a vast improvement over the status quo. But if anyone from either party has a better approach that will bring down premiums, bring down the deficit, cover the uninsured, strengthen Medicare for seniors, and stop insurance company abuses, let me know. Let me know. Let me know. I'm eager to see it.

Here's what I ask Congress, though: Don't walk away from reform. Not now. Not when we are so close. Let us find a way to come together and finish the job for the American people. Let's get it done. Let's get it done.

Now, even as health care reform would reduce our deficit, it's not enough to dig us out of a massive fiscal hole in which we find ourselves. It's a challenge that makes all others that much harder to solve, and one that's been subject to a lot of political posturing. So let me start the discussion of government spending by setting the record straight.

At the beginning of the last decade, the year 2000, America had a budget surplus of over 200 billion dollars. By -- By the time I took office, we had a one-year deficit of over one trillion dollars and projected deficits of eight trillion dollars over the next decade. Most of this was the result of not paying for two wars, two tax cuts, and an expensive prescription drug program. On top of that, the effects of the recession put a three trillion dollar hole in our budget. All this was before I walked in the door.

Now -- Now -- just stating the facts. Now, if we had taken office in ordinary times, I would have liked nothing more than to start bringing down the deficit. But we took office amid a crisis. And our efforts to prevent a second depression have added another one trillion dollars to our national debt. That, too, is a fact.

I'm absolutely convinced that was the right thing to do. But families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The federal government should do the same. So tonight, I'm proposing specific steps to pay for the trillion dollars that it took to rescue the economy last year. Starting in 2011, we are prepared to freeze government spending for three years. Spending related to our national security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security will not be affected. But all other discretionary government programs will. Like any cash-strapped family, we will work within a budget to invest in what we need and sacrifice what we don't. And if I have to enforce this discipline by veto, I will.

We will continue to go through the budget, line by line, page by page, to eliminate programs that we can't afford and don't work. We've already identified 20 billion dollars in savings for next year. To help working families, we'll extend our middle-class tax cuts. But at a time of record deficits, we will not continue tax cuts for oil companies, for investment fund managers, and for those making over 250,000 dollars a year. We just can't afford it.

Now, even after paying for what we spent on my watch, we'll still face the massive deficit we had when I took office. More importantly, the cost of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security will continue to skyrocket. That's why I've called for a bipartisan fiscal commission, modeled on a proposal by Republican Judd Gregg and Democrat Kent Conrad. This can't be one of those Washington gimmicks that lets us pretend we solved a problem. The commission will have to provide a specific set of solutions by a certain deadline.

Now, yesterday the Senate blocked a bill that would have created this commission. So I'll issue an executive order that will allow us to go forward, because I refuse to pass this problem on to another generation of Americans. And when the vote comes tomorrow, the Senate should restore the pay-as-you-go law that was a big reason for why we had record surpluses in the 1990s.

Now, I know that some in my own party will argue that we can't address the deficit or freeze government spending when so many are still hurting. And I agree -- which is why this freeze won't take effect until next year -- when the economy is stronger. That's how

budgeting works. But understand -- understand if we don't take meaningful steps to rein in our debt, it could damage our markets, increase the cost of borrowing, and jeopardize our recovery -- all of which would have an even worse effect on our job growth and family incomes.

From some on the right, I expect we'll hear a different argument -- that if we just make fewer investments in our people, extend tax cuts including those for the wealthier Americans, eliminate more regulations, maintain the status quo on health care, our deficits will go away. The problem is that's what we did for eight years. That's what helped us into this crisis. It's what helped lead to these deficits. We can't do it again.

Rather than fight the same tired battles that have dominated Washington for decades, it's time to try something new. Let's invest in our people without leaving them a mountain of debt. Let's meet our responsibility to the citizens who sent us here. Let's try common sense -- a novel concept.

Now, to do that we have to recognize that we face more than a deficit of dollars right now. We face a deficit of trust -- deep and corrosive doubts about how Washington works that have been growing for years. To close that credibility gap we have to take action on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue -- to end the outsized influence of lobbyists; to do our work openly; to give our people the government they deserve.

Now, that's what I came to Washington to do. That's why, for the first time in history, my Administration posts on our White House visitors online. That's why we've excluded lobbyists from policymaking jobs, or seats on federal boards and commissions. But we can't stop there. It's time to require lobbyists to disclose each contact they make on behalf of a client with my Administration or with Congress. It's time to put strict limits on the contributions that lobbyists give to candidates for federal office.

With all due deference to separation of powers, last week the Supreme Court reversed a century of law that I believe will open the floodgates for special interests -- including foreign corporations -- to spend without limit in our elections. I don't think American elections should be bankrolled by America's most powerful interests -- or worse, by foreign entities. They should be decided by the American people. And I'd urge Democrats and Republicans to pass a bill that helps to correct some of these problems.

I'm also calling on Congress to continue down the path of earmark reform -- Democrats and Republicans, Democrats and Republicans. Look...you've trimmed some of this spending; you've embraced some meaningful change. But restoring the public trust demands more. For example, some members of Congress post some earmark requests online. Tonight, I'm calling on Congress to publish all earmark requests on a single Web site before there's a vote, so that the American people can see how their money is being spent.

Of course, none of these reforms will even happen if we don't also reform how we work with one another. Now, I'm not naïve. I never thought that the mere fact of my election would usher in peace and harmony, and some post-partisan era. I knew that both parties have fed divisions that are deeply entrenched. And on some issues, there are simply philosophical differences that will always cause us to part ways. These disagreements, about the role of government in our lives, about our national priorities and our national security, they've been taking place for over 200 years. They're the very essence of our democracy.

But what frustrates the American people is a Washington where every day is "Election Day." We can't wage a perpetual campaign where the only goal is to see who can get the most embarrassing headlines about the other side -- a belief that if you lose, I win.[1] Neither party should delay or obstruct every single bill just because they can. The confirmation of -- I'm speaking to both parties now -- the confirmation of well-qualified public servants shouldn't be held hostage to the pet projects or grudges of a few individual senators.

Washington may think that saying anything about the other side, no matter how false, no matter how malicious, is just part of the game. But it's precisely such politics that has stopped either party from helping the American people. Worse yet -- Worse yet, it's sowing further division among our citizens, further distrust in our government.

So, no, I will not give up on trying to change the tone of our politics. I know it's an election year. And after last week, it's clear that campaign fever has come even earlier than usual. But we still need to govern.

To Democrats, I would remind you that we still have the largest majority in decades, and the people expect us to solve problems, not run for the hills. And if the Republican leadership is going to insist that -- that 60 votes in the Senate are required to do any business at all in this town -- a supermajority -- then the responsibility to govern is now yours as well. Just saying no to everything may be good short-term politics, but it's not leadership. We were sent here to serve our citizens, not our ambitions. So let's show the American people that we can do it together.

This week -- This week, I'll be meet -- addressing a meeting of the House Republicans. I'd like to begin monthly meetings with both Democratic and Republican leadership. I know you can't wait.

Now, throughout our history, no issue has united this country more than our security. Sadly, some of the unity we felt after 9/11 has dissipated. Now, we can argue all we want about who's to blame for this, but I'm not interested in re-litigating the past. I know that all of us love this country. All of us are committed to its defense. So let's put aside the schoolyard taunts about who is tough. Let's reject the false choice between protecting our people and upholding our values. Let's leave behind the fear and division, and do what it takes to defend our nation and forge a more hopeful future -- for America and for the world.

That's the work we began last year. Since the day I took office, we've renewed our focus on the terrorists who threaten our nation. We've made substantial investments in our homeland security and disrupted plots that threatened to take American lives. We are filling unacceptable gaps revealed by the failed Christmas attack, with better airline security and swifter action on our intelligence. We've prohibited torture and strengthened partnerships from the Pacific to South Asia to the Arabian Peninsula. And in the last year, hundreds of al Qaeda's fighters and affiliates, including many senior leaders, have been captured or killed -- far more than in 2008.

And in Afghanistan, we're increasing our troops and training Afghan security forces so they can begin to take the lead in July of 2011, and our troops can begin to come home. We will reward good governance, work to reduce corruption, and support the rights of all Afghans -- men and women alike. We're joined by allies and partners who have increased their own commitments, and who will come together tomorrow in London to reaffirm our common purpose. There will be difficult days ahead. But I am absolutely confident we will succeed.

As we take the fight to al Qaeda, we are responsibly leaving Iraq to its people. As a candidate, I promised that I would end this war, and that is what I am doing as President. We will have all of our combat troops out of Iraq by the end of this August. We will support -- We will support the Iraqi government -- We will support the Iraqi government as they hold elections, and we will continue to partner with the Iraqi people to promote regional peace and prosperity. But make no mistake: This war is ending, and all of our troops are coming home.

Tonight, all of our men and women in uniform -- in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and around the world -- they have to know that we -- that...they have our respect, our gratitude, our full support. And just as they must have the resources they need in war, we all have a responsibility to support them when they come home. That's why we made the largest increase in investments for veterans in decades last year. That's why we're building a 21st

century VA. And that's why Michelle has joined with Jill Biden to forge a national commitment to support military families.

Now, even as we prosecute two wars, we're also confronting perhaps the greatest danger to the American people -- the threat of nuclear weapons. I've embraced the vision of John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan through a strategy that reverses the spread of these weapons and seeks a world without them. To reduce our stockpiles and launchers, while ensuring our deterrent, the United States and Russia are completing negotiations on the farthest-reachings arms control treaty in nearly two decades. And at April's Nuclear Security Summit, we will bring 44 nations together here in Washington, D.C. behind a clear goal: securing all vulnerable nuclear materials around the world in four years, so that they never fall into the hands of terrorists.

Now, these diplomatic efforts have also strengthened our hand in dealing with those nations that insist on violating international agreements in pursuit of nuclear weapons. That's why North Korea now faces increased isolation and stronger sanctions -- sanctions that are being vigorously enforced. That's why the international community is more united and the Islamic Republic of Iran is more isolated. And as Iran's leaders continue to ignore their obligations, there should be no doubt: They, too, will face growing consequences. That is a promise.

That's the leadership that we are providing -- engagement that advances the common security and prosperity of all people. We're working through the G20 to sustain a lasting global recovery. We're working with Muslim communities around the world to promote science and education and innovation. We have gone from a bystander to a leader in the fight against climate change. We're helping developing countries to feed themselves, and continuing the fight against HIV/AIDS. And we are launching a new initiative that will give us the capacity to respond faster and more effectively to bioterrorism or an infectious disease -- a plan that will counter threats at home and strengthen public health abroad.

As we have for over 60 years, America takes these actions because our destiny is connected to those beyond our shores. But we also do it because it is right. That's why, as we meet here tonight, over 10,000 Americans are working with many nations to help the people of Haiti recover and rebuild. That's why we stand with the girl who yearns to go to school in Afghanistan; why we support the human rights of the women marching through the streets of Iran; why we advocate for the young man denied a job by corruption in Guinea. For America must always stand on the side of freedom and human dignity. Always.

Abroad, America's greatest source of strength has always been our ideals. The same is true at home. We find unity in our incredible diversity, drawing on the promise enshrined in our Constitution: the notion that we're all created equal; that no matter who you are or what you look like, if you abide by the law you should be protected by it; if you adhere to our common values you should be treated no different than anyone else.

We must continually renew this promise. My Administration has a Civil Rights Division that is once again prosecuting civil rights violations and employment discrimination. We finally strengthened -- We finally strengthened our laws to protect against crimes driven by hate. This year -- This year, I will work with Congress and our military to finally repeal the law that denies gay Americans the right to serve the country they love because of who they are. It's the right thing to do.

We're going to crack down on violations of equal pay laws so that women get equal pay for an equal day's work. And we should continue the work of fixing our broken immigration system -- to secure our borders and enforce our laws, and ensure that everyone who plays by the rules can contribute to our economy and enrich our nations.

In the end, it's our ideals, our values that built America -- values that allowed us to forge a nation made up of immigrants from every corner of the globe; values that drive our citizens

still. Every day, Americans meet their responsibilities to their families and their employers. Time and again, they lend a hand to their neighbors and give back to their country. They take pride in their labor, and are generous in spirit. These aren't Republican values or Democratic values that they're living by; business values or labor values. They're American values.

Unfortunately, too many of our citizens have lost faith that our biggest institutions -- our corporations, our media, and, yes, our government -- still reflect these same values. Each of these institutions are full of honorable men and women doing important work that helps our country prosper. But each time a CEO rewards himself for failure, or a banker puts the rest of us at risk for his own selfish gain, people's doubts grow. Each time lobbyists game the system or politicians tear each other down instead of lifting this country up, we lose faith. The more that TV pundits reduce serious debates to silly arguments, big issues into sound bites, our citizens turn away.

No wonder there's so much cynicism out there. No wonder there's so much disappointment.

I campaigned on the promise of change -- "Change we can believe in" -- the slogan went. And right now, I know there are many Americans who aren't sure if they still believe we can change -- or that I can deliver it. But remember this -- I never suggested that change would be easy, or that I could do it alone. Democracy in a nation of 300 million people can be noisy and messy and complicated. And when you try to do big things and make big changes, it stirs passions and controversy. That's just how it is.

Those of us in public office can respond to this reality by playing it safe and avoid telling hard truths and pointing fingers. We can do what's necessary to keep our poll numbers high, and get through the next election instead of doing what's best for the next generation.

But I also know this: If people had made that decision 50 years ago, or 100 years ago, or 200 years ago, we wouldn't be here tonight. The only reason we are here is because generations of Americans were unafraid to do what was hard; to do what was needed even when success was uncertain; to do what it took to keep the dream of this nation alive for their children and their grandchildren.

Our Administration has had some political setbacks this year, and some of them were deserved. But I wake up every day knowing that they are nothing compared to the setbacks that families all across this country have faced this year. And what keeps me going, what keeps me fighting, is that despite all these setbacks, that spirit of determination and optimism, that fundamental decency that has always been at the core of the American people -- that lives on.

It lives on in the struggling small business owner who wrote to me of his company: "None of us," he said, "…are willing to consider, even slightly, that we might fail."

It lives on in the woman who said that even though she and her neighbors have felt the pain of recession, "We are strong. We are resilient. We are American."

It lives on in the 8-year-old boy in Louisiana, who just sent me his allowance and asked if I would give it to the people of Haiti.

And it lives on in all the Americans who've dropped everything to go someplace they've never been and pull people they've never known from the rubble, prompting chants of "U.S.A.! U.S.A.! U.S.A!" when another life was saved.

The spirit that has sustained this nation for more than two centuries lives on in you, its people.

We have finished a difficult year. We have come through a difficult decade. But a new year has come. A new decade stretches before us. We don't quit. I don't quit. Let's seize this moment -- to start anew, to carry the dream forward, and to strengthen our union once more.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

(4) Barack Obama 2009 First Speech to a Joint Session of Congress **(O2)**

Madame Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, and the First Lady of the United States:

I've come here tonight not only to address the distinguished men and women in this great chamber, but to speak frankly and directly to the men and women who sent us here.

I know that for many Americans watching right now, the state of our economy is a concern that rises above all others. And rightly so. If you haven't been personally affected by this recession, you probably know someone who has -- a friend; a neighbor; a member of your family. You don't need to hear another list of statistics to know that our economy is in crisis, because you live it every day. It's the worry you wake up with and the source of sleepless nights. It's the job you thought you'd retire from but now have lost; the business you built your dreams upon that's now hanging by a thread; the college acceptance letter your child had to put back in the envelope. The impact of this recession is real, and it is everywhere.

But while our economy may be weakened and our confidence shaken; though we are living through difficult and uncertain times, tonight I want every American to know this:

We will rebuild, we will recover, and the United States of America will emerge stronger than before.

The weight of this crisis will not determine the destiny of this nation. The answers to our problems don't lie beyond our reach. They exist in our laboratories and universities; in our fields and our factories; in the imaginations of our entrepreneurs and the pride of the hardest-working people on Earth. Those qualities that have made America the greatest force of progress and prosperity in human history we still possess in ample measure. What is required now is for this country to pull together, confront boldly the challenges we face, and take responsibility for our future once more.

Now, if we're honest with ourselves, we'll admit that for too long, we have not always met these responsibilities -- as a government or as a people. I say this not to lay blame or look backwards, but because it is only by understanding how we arrived at this moment that we'll be able to lift ourselves out of this predicament.

The fact is, our economy did not fall into decline overnight. Nor did all of our problems begin when the housing market collapsed or the stock market sank. We have known for decades that our survival depends on finding new sources of energy. Yet we import more oil today than ever before. The cost of health care eats up more and more of our savings each year, yet we keep delaying reform. Our children will compete for jobs in a global economy that too many of our schools do not prepare them for. And though all these challenges went unsolved, we still managed to spend more money and pile up more debt, both as individuals and through our government, than ever before.

In other words, we have lived through an era where too often, short-term gains were prized over long-term prosperity; where we failed to look beyond the next payment, the next quarter, or the next election. A surplus became an excuse to transfer wealth to the wealthy instead of an opportunity to invest in our future. Regulations were gutted for the sake of a quick profit at the expense of a healthy market. People bought homes they knew they couldn't afford from banks and lenders who pushed those bad loans anyway. And all the while, critical debates and difficult decisions were put off for some other time on some other day.

Well that day of reckoning has arrived, and the time to take charge of our future is here.

Now is the time to act boldly and wisely -- to not only revive this economy, but to build a new foundation for lasting prosperity. Now is the time to jumpstart job creation, re-start lending, and invest in areas like energy, health care, and education that will grow our economy, even as we make hard choices to bring our deficit down. That is what my economic agenda is designed to do, and that's what I'd like to talk to you about tonight.

It's an agenda that begins with jobs.

As soon as I took office, I asked this Congress to send me a recovery plan by President's Day that would put people back to work and put money in their pockets. Not because I believe in bigger government – I don't. Not because I'm not mindful of the massive debt we've inherited – I am. I called for action because the failure to do so would have cost more jobs and caused more hardships. In fact, a failure to act would have worsened our long-term deficit by assuring weak economic growth for years. That's why I pushed for quick action. And tonight, I am grateful that this Congress delivered, and pleased to say that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is now law.

Over the next two years, this plan will save or create 3.5 million jobs. More than 90% of these jobs will be in the private sector – jobs rebuilding our roads and bridges; constructing wind turbines and solar panels; laying broadband and expanding mass transit.

Because of this plan, there are teachers who can now keep their jobs and educate our kids. Health care professionals can continue caring for our sick. There are 57 police officers who are still on the streets of Minneapolis tonight because this plan prevented the layoffs their department was about to make.

Because of this plan, 95% of the working households in America will receive a tax cut -- a tax cut that you will see in your paychecks beginning on April 1st.

Because of this plan, families who are struggling to pay tuition costs will receive a $2,500 tax credit for all four years of college. And Americans who have lost their jobs in this recession will be able to receive extended unemployment benefits and continued health care coverage to help them weather this storm.

I know there are some in this chamber and watching at home who are skeptical of whether this plan will work. I understand that skepticism. Here in Washington, we've all seen how quickly good intentions can turn into broken promises and wasteful spending. And with a plan of this scale comes enormous responsibility to get it right.

That is why I have asked Vice President Biden to lead a tough, unprecedented oversight effort – because nobody messes with Joe. I have told each member of my Cabinet as well as mayors and governors across the country that they will be held accountable by me and the American people for every dollar they spend. I have appointed a proven and aggressive Inspector General to ferret out any and all cases of waste and fraud. And we have created a new website called recovery.gov so that every American can find out how and where their money is being spent.

So the recovery plan we passed is the first step in getting our economy back on track. But it is just the first step. Because even if we manage this plan flawlessly, there will be no real recovery unless we clean up the credit crisis that has severely weakened our financial system.

I want to speak plainly and candidly about this issue tonight, because every American should know that it directly affects you and your family's well-being. You should also know that the money you've deposited in banks across the country is safe; your insurance is secure; and you can rely on the continued operation of our financial system. That is not the source of concern.

The concern is that if we do not re-start lending in this country, our recovery will be choked off before it even begins.

You see, the flow of credit is the lifeblood of our economy. The ability to get a loan is how you finance the purchase of everything from a home to a car to a college education; how stores stock their shelves, farms buy equipment, and businesses make payroll.

But credit has stopped flowing the way it should. Too many bad loans from the housing crisis have made their way onto the books of too many banks. With so much debt and so little confidence, these banks are now fearful of lending out any more money to households, to businesses, or to each other. When there is no lending, families can't afford to buy homes or cars. So businesses are forced to make layoffs. Our economy suffers even more, and credit dries up even further.

That is why this administration is moving swiftly and aggressively to break this destructive cycle, restore confidence, and re-start lending.

We will do so in several ways. First, we are creating a new lending fund that represents the largest effort ever to help provide auto loans, college loans, and small business loans to the consumers and entrepreneurs who keep this economy running.

Second, we have launched a housing plan that will help responsible families facing the threat of foreclosure lower their monthly payments and re-finance their mortgages. It's a plan that won't help speculators or that neighbor down the street who bought a house he could never hope to afford, but it will help millions of Americans who are struggling with declining home values – Americans who will now be able to take advantage of the lower interest rates that this plan has already helped bring about. In fact, the average family who re-finances today can save nearly $2000 per year on their mortgage.

Third, we will act with the full force of the federal government to ensure that the major banks that Americans depend on have enough confidence and enough money to lend even in more difficult times. And when we learn that a major bank has serious problems, we will hold accountable those responsible, force the necessary adjustments, provide the support to clean up their balance sheets, and assure the continuity of a strong, viable institution that can serve our people and our economy.

I understand that on any given day, Wall Street may be more comforted by an approach that gives banks bailouts with no strings attached, and that holds nobody accountable for their reckless decisions. But such an approach won't solve the problem. And our goal is to quicken the day when we re-start lending to the American people and American business and end this crisis once and for all.

I intend to hold these banks fully accountable for the assistance they receive, and this time, they will have to clearly demonstrate how taxpayer dollars result in more lending for the American taxpayer. This time, CEOs won't be able to use taxpayer money to pad their paychecks or buy fancy drapes or disappear on a private jet. Those days are over.

Still, this plan will require significant resources from the federal government – and yes, probably more than we've already set aside. But while the cost of action will be great, I can assure you that the cost of inaction will be far greater, for it could result in an economy that sputters along for not months or years, but perhaps a decade. That would be worse for our deficit, worse for business, worse for you, and worse for the next generation. And I refuse to let that happen.

I understand that when the last administration asked this Congress to provide assistance for struggling banks, Democrats and Republicans alike were infuriated by the mismanagement and results that followed. So were the American taxpayers. So was I.

So I know how unpopular it is to be seen as helping banks right now, especially when everyone is suffering in part from their bad decisions. I promise you – I get it.

But I also know that in a time of crisis, we cannot afford to govern out of anger, or yield to the politics of the moment. My job – our job – is to solve the problem. Our job is to govern with a sense of responsibility. I will not spend a single penny for the purpose of rewarding a single Wall Street executive, but I will do whatever it takes to help the small business that can't pay its workers or the family that has saved and still can't get a mortgage.

That's what this is about. It's not about helping banks – it's about helping people. Because when credit is available again, that young family can finally buy a new home. And then some company will hire workers to build it. And then those workers will have money to spend, and if they can get a loan too, maybe they'll finally buy that car, or open their own business. Investors will return to the market, and American families will see their retirement secured once more. Slowly, but surely, confidence will return, and our economy will recover.

So I ask this Congress to join me in doing whatever proves necessary. Because we cannot consign our nation to an open-ended recession. And to ensure that a crisis of this magnitude never happens again, I ask Congress to move quickly on legislation that will finally reform our outdated regulatory system. It is time to put in place tough, new common-sense rules of the road so that our financial market rewards drive and innovation, and punishes short-cuts and abuse.

The recovery plan and the financial stability plan are the immediate steps we're taking to revive our economy in the short-term. But the only way to fully restore America's economic strength is to make the long-term investments that will lead to new jobs, new industries, and a renewed ability to compete with the rest of the world. The only way this century will be another American century is if we confront at last the price of our dependence on oil and the high cost of health care; the schools that aren't preparing our children and the mountain of debt they stand to inherit. That is our responsibility.

In the next few days, I will submit a budget to Congress. So often, we have come to view these documents as simply numbers on a page or laundry lists of programs. I see this document differently. I see it as a vision for America – as a blueprint for our future.

My budget does not attempt to solve every problem or address every issue. It reflects the stark reality of what we've inherited – a trillion dollar deficit, a financial crisis, and a costly recession.

Given these realities, everyone in this chamber – Democrats and Republicans – will have to sacrifice some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars. And that includes me.

But that does not mean we can afford to ignore our long-term challenges. I reject the view that says our problems will simply take care of themselves; that says government has no role in laying the foundation for our common prosperity.

For history tells a different story. History reminds us that at every moment of economic upheaval and transformation, this nation has responded with bold action and big ideas. In the midst of civil war, we laid railroad tracks from one coast to another that spurred commerce and industry. From the turmoil of the Industrial Revolution came a system of public high schools that prepared our citizens for a new age. In the wake of war and depression, the GI Bill sent a generation to college and created the largest middle-class in history. And a twilight struggle for freedom led to a nation of highways, an American on the moon, and an explosion of technology that still shapes our world.

In each case, government didn't supplant private enterprise; it catalyzed private enterprise. It created the conditions for thousands of entrepreneurs and new businesses to adapt and to thrive.

We are a nation that has seen promise amid peril, and claimed opportunity from ordeal. Now we must be that nation again. That is why, even as it cuts back on the programs we don't need, the budget I submit will invest in the three areas that are absolutely critical to our economic future: energy, health care, and education.

It begins with energy.

We know the country that harnesses the power of clean, renewable energy will lead the 21st century. And yet, it is China that has launched the largest effort in history to make their economy energy efficient. We invented solar technology, but we've fallen behind countries like Germany and Japan in producing it. New plug-in hybrids roll off our assembly lines, but they will run on batteries made in Korea.

Well I do not accept a future where the jobs and industries of tomorrow take root beyond our borders – and I know you don't either. It is time for America to lead again.

Thanks to our recovery plan, we will double this nation's supply of renewable energy in the next three years. We have also made the largest investment in basic research funding in American history – an investment that will spur not only new discoveries in energy, but breakthroughs in medicine, science, and technology.

We will soon lay down thousands of miles of power lines that can carry new energy to cities and towns across this country. And we will put Americans to work making our homes and buildings more efficient so that we can save billions of dollars on our energy bills.

But to truly transform our economy, protect our security, and save our planet from the ravages of climate change, we need to ultimately make clean, renewable energy the profitable kind of energy. So I ask this Congress to send me legislation that places a market-based cap on carbon pollution and drives the production of more renewable energy in America. And to support that innovation, we will invest fifteen billion dollars a year to develop technologies like wind power and solar power; advanced biofuels, clean coal, and more fuel-efficient cars and trucks built right here in America.

As for our auto industry, everyone recognizes that years of bad decision-making and a global recession have pushed our automakers to the brink. We should not, and will not, protect them from their own bad practices. But we are committed to the goal of a re-tooled, re-imagined auto industry that can compete and win. Millions of jobs depend on it. Scores of communities depend on it. And I believe the nation that invented the automobile cannot walk away from it.

None of this will come without cost, nor will it be easy. But this is America. We don't do what's easy. We do what is necessary to move this country forward.

For that same reason, we must also address the crushing cost of health care.

This is a cost that now causes a bankruptcy in America every thirty seconds. By the end of the year, it could cause 1.5 million Americans to lose their homes. In the last eight years, premiums have grown four times faster than wages. And in each of these years, one million more Americans have lost their health insurance. It is one of the major reasons why small businesses close their doors and corporations ship jobs overseas. And it's one of the largest and fastest-growing parts of our budget.

Given these facts, we can no longer afford to put health care reform on hold.

Already, we have done more to advance the cause of health care reform in the last thirty days than we have in the last decade. When it was days old, this Congress passed a law to provide and protect health insurance for eleven million American children whose parents work full-time. Our recovery plan will invest in electronic health records and new technology that will reduce errors, bring down costs, ensure privacy, and save lives. It will launch a new effort to conquer a disease that has touched the life of nearly every American by seeking a cure for cancer in our time. And it makes the largest investment ever in preventive care, because that is one of the best ways to keep our people healthy and our costs under control.

This budget builds on these reforms. It includes an historic commitment to comprehensive health care reform – a down-payment on the principle that we must have quality, affordable health care for every American. It's a commitment that's paid for in part by efficiencies in our system that are long overdue. And it's a step we must take if we hope to bring down our deficit in the years to come.

Now, there will be many different opinions and ideas about how to achieve reform, and that is why I'm bringing together businesses and workers, doctors and health care providers, Democrats and Republicans to begin work on this issue next week.

I suffer no illusions that this will be an easy process. It will be hard. But I also know that nearly a century after Teddy Roosevelt first called for reform, the cost of our health care has weighed down our economy and the conscience of our nation long enough. So let there be no doubt: health care reform cannot wait, it must not wait, and it will not wait another year.

The third challenge we must address is the urgent need to expand the promise of education in America.

In a global economy where the most valuable skill you can sell is your knowledge, a good education is no longer just a pathway to opportunity – it is a pre-requisite.

Right now, three-quarters of the fastest-growing occupations require more than a high school diploma. And yet, just over half of our citizens have that level of education. We have one of the highest high school dropout rates of any industrialized nation. And half of the students who begin college never finish.

This is a prescription for economic decline, because we know the countries that out-teach us today will out-compete us tomorrow. That is why it will be the goal of this administration to ensure that every child has access to a complete and competitive education – from the day they are born to the day they begin a career.

Already, we have made an historic investment in education through the economic recovery plan. We have dramatically expanded early childhood education and will continue to improve its quality, because we know that the most formative learning comes in those first years of life. We have made college affordable for nearly seven million more students. And we have provided the resources necessary to prevent painful cuts and teacher layoffs that would set back our children's progress.

But we know that our schools don't just need more resources. They need more reform. That is why this budget creates new incentives for teacher performance; pathways for advancement, and rewards for success. We'll invest in innovative programs that are already helping schools meet high standards and close achievement gaps. And we will expand our commitment to charter schools.

It is our responsibility as lawmakers and educators to make this system work. But it is the responsibility of every citizen to participate in it. And so tonight, I ask every American to commit to at least one year or more of higher education or career training. This can be community college or a four-year school; vocational training or an apprenticeship. But whatever the training may be, every American will need to get more than a high school diploma. And dropping out of high school is no longer an option. It's not just quitting on yourself, it's quitting on your country – and this country needs and values the talents of every American. That is why we will provide the support necessary for you to complete college and meet a new goal: by 2020, America will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world.

I know that the price of tuition is higher than ever, which is why if you are willing to volunteer in your neighborhood or give back to your community or serve your country, we will make sure that you can afford a higher education. And to encourage a renewed spirit of national service for this and future generations, I ask this Congress to send me the bipartisan legislation that bears the name of Senator Orrin Hatch as well as an American who has never stopped asking what he can do for his country – Senator Edward Kennedy.

These education policies will open the doors of opportunity for our children. But it is up to us to ensure they walk through them. In the end, there is no program or policy that can substitute for a mother or father who will attend those parent/teacher conferences, or help with homework after dinner, or turn off the TV, put away the video games, and read to their child. I speak to you not just as a President, but as a father when I say that responsibility for our children's education must begin at home.

There is, of course, another responsibility we have to our children. And that is the responsibility to ensure that we do not pass on to them a debt they cannot pay. With the deficit we inherited, the cost of the crisis we face, and the long-term challenges we must meet, it has never been more important to ensure that as our economy recovers, we do what it takes to bring this deficit down.

I'm proud that we passed the recovery plan free of earmarks, and I want to pass a budget next year that ensures that each dollar we spend reflects only our most important national priorities.

Yesterday, I held a fiscal summit where I pledged to cut the deficit in half by the end of my first term in office. My administration has also begun to go line by line through the federal budget in order to eliminate wasteful and ineffective programs. As you can imagine, this is a process that will take some time. But we're starting with the biggest lines. We have already identified two trillion dollars in savings over the next decade.

In this budget, we will end education programs that don't work and end direct payments to large agribusinesses that don't need them. We'll eliminate the no-bid contracts that have wasted billions in Iraq, and reform our defense budget so that we're not paying for Cold War-era weapons systems we don't use. We will root out the waste, fraud, and abuse in our Medicare program that doesn't make our seniors any healthier, and we will restore a sense of fairness and balance to our tax code by finally ending the tax breaks for corporations that ship our jobs overseas.

In order to save our children from a future of debt, we will also end the tax breaks for the wealthiest 2% of Americans. But let me perfectly clear, because I know you'll hear the same old claims that rolling back these tax breaks means a massive tax increase on the American people: if your family earns less than $250,000 a year, you will not see your

taxes increased a single dime. I repeat: not one single dime. In fact, the recovery plan provides a tax cut – that's right, a tax cut – for 95% of working families. And these checks are on the way.

To preserve our long-term fiscal health, we must also address the growing costs in Medicare and Social Security. Comprehensive health care reform is the best way to strengthen Medicare for years to come. And we must also begin a conversation on how to do the same for Social Security, while creating tax-free universal savings accounts for all Americans.

Finally, because we're also suffering from a deficit of trust, I am committed to restoring a sense of honesty and accountability to our budget. That is why this budget looks ahead ten years and accounts for spending that was left out under the old rules – and for the first time, that includes the full cost of fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. For seven years, we have been a nation at war. No longer will we hide its price.

We are now carefully reviewing our policies in both wars, and I will soon announce a way forward in Iraq that leaves Iraq to its people and responsibly ends this war.

And with our friends and allies, we will forge a new and comprehensive strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan to defeat al Qaeda and combat extremism. Because I will not allow terrorists to plot against the American people from safe havens half a world away.

As we meet here tonight, our men and women in uniform stand watch abroad and more are readying to deploy. To each and every one of them, and to the families who bear the quiet burden of their absence, Americans are united in sending one message: we honor your service, we are inspired by your sacrifice, and you have our unyielding support. To relieve the strain on our forces, my budget increases the number of our soldiers and Marines. And to keep our sacred trust with those who serve, we will raise their pay, and give our veterans the expanded health care and benefits that they have earned.

To overcome extremism, we must also be vigilant in upholding the values our troops defend – because there is no force in the world more powerful than the example of America. That is why I have ordered the closing of the detention center at Guantanamo Bay, and will seek swift and certain justice for captured terrorists – because living our values doesn't make us weaker, it makes us safer and it makes us stronger. And that is why I can stand here tonight and say without exception or equivocation that the United States of America does not torture.

In words and deeds, we are showing the world that a new era of engagement has begun. For we know that America cannot meet the threats of this century alone, but the world cannot meet them without America. We cannot shun the negotiating table, nor ignore the foes or forces that could do us harm. We are instead called to move forward with the sense of confidence and candor that serious times demand.

To seek progress toward a secure and lasting peace between Israel and her neighbors, we have appointed an envoy to sustain our effort. To meet the challenges of the 21st century – from terrorism to nuclear proliferation; from pandemic disease to cyber threats to crushing poverty – we will strengthen old alliances, forge new ones, and use all elements of our national power.

And to respond to an economic crisis that is global in scope, we are working with the nations of the G-20 to restore confidence in our financial system, avoid the possibility of escalating protectionism, and spur demand for American goods in markets across the globe. For the world depends on us to have a strong economy, just as our economy depends on the strength of the world's.

As we stand at this crossroads of history, the eyes of all people in all nations are once again upon us – watching to see what we do with this moment; waiting for us to lead.

Those of us gathered here tonight have been called to govern in extraordinary times. It is a tremendous burden, but also a great privilege – one that has been entrusted to few generations of Americans. For in our hands lies the ability to shape our world for good or for ill.

I know that it is easy to lose sight of this truth – to become cynical and doubtful; consumed with the petty and the trivial.

But in my life, I have also learned that hope is found in unlikely places; that inspiration often comes not from those with the most power or celebrity, but from the dreams and aspirations of Americans who are anything but ordinary.

I think about Leonard Abess, the bank president from Miami who reportedly cashed out of his company, took a $60 million bonus, and gave it out to all 399 people who worked for him, plus another 72 who used to work for him. He didn't tell anyone, but when the local newspaper found out, he simply said, "I knew some of these people since I was 7 years old. I didn't feel right getting the money myself."

I think about Greensburg, Kansas, a town that was completely destroyed by a tornado, but is being rebuilt by its residents as a global example of how clean energy can power an entire community – how it can bring jobs and businesses to a place where piles of bricks and rubble once lay. "The tragedy was terrible," said one of the men who helped them rebuild. "But the folks here know that it also provided an incredible opportunity."

And I think about Ty'Sheoma Bethea, the young girl from that school I visited in Dillon, South Carolina – a place where the ceilings leak, the paint peels off the walls, and they have to stop teaching six times a day because the train barrels by their classroom. She has been told that her school is hopeless, but the other day after class she went to the public library and typed up a letter to the people sitting in this room. She even asked her principal for the money to buy a stamp. The letter asks us for help, and says, "We are just students trying to become lawyers, doctors, congressmen like yourself and one day president, so we can make a change to not just the state of South Carolina but also the world. We are not quitters."

We are not quitters.

These words and these stories tell us something about the spirit of the people who sent us here. They tell us that even in the most trying times, amid the most difficult circumstances, there is a generosity, a resilience, a decency, and a determination that perseveres; a willingness to take responsibility for our future and for posterity.

Their resolve must be our inspiration. Their concerns must be our cause. And we must show them and all our people that we are equal to the task before us.

I know that we haven't agreed on every issue thus far, and there are surely times in the future when we will part ways. But I also know that every American who is sitting here tonight loves this country and wants it to succeed. That must be the starting point for every debate we have in the coming months, and where we return after those debates are done. That is the foundation on which the American people expect us to build common ground.

And if we do – if we come together and lift this nation from the depths of this crisis; if we put our people back to work and restart the engine of our prosperity; if we confront without fear the challenges of our time and summon that enduring spirit of an America that does not quit, then someday years from now our children can tell their children that this was the time when we performed, in the words that are carved into this very chamber, "something worthy to be remembered." Thank you, God Bless you, and may God Bless the United States of America.

(5) Abstract English

This diploma thesis examines political speeches of George W. Bush and Barack Obama in order to find out if something like prototypical conservative or liberal language actually exists and in how far these ideological discrepancies are manifested in rhetorical devices. Since the political viewpoint of Bush and Obama differs significantly, the aim is to detect how the two politicians insert manipulative rhetorical strategies to convince the audience about their policies.

The speeches are compared from a critical discourse analytical perspective (CDA). As CDA has to be regarded as an ideological frame rather than a methodology, other linguistic approaches are used to analyse the speeches with a focal point on metaphorical and pronominal devices.

One of the main results is that metaphorical choices depend on an interplay between the topic and the contextual and historical embedding. The most elaborate metaphorical choices are used when discussing political key issues. For instance, Bush's most interesting metaphors are inserted when discussing war, while Obama uses them when speaking about the economical situation of the country. The examination proves that Bush's metaphorical system represents basic conservative morality. On the other hand, Obama's metaphorical devices are more complex. By inserting liberal and conservative metaphors he addresses both liberal and conservative voters.

The analysis of the pronominal choices reveals that the discrepancies of the two politicians' different pronominal choices are due to the political situation they see themselves confronted with and to ideological viewpoints. Furthermore, Obama chooses pronouns which accentuate personal commitment whereas Bush tries to avoid a pronominal system which emphasizes responsibility as he is dealing with the face-threatening situation of a war which is not very popular among the public. Moreover, the analysis shows that Obama is more skilled in considering the double listenership of the 'State of the Union' speeches as he both addresses the Congress and the American public and thereby, takes the chance to use the speech to promote his policy. In contrast, Bush is not aware of the

American public and seems to only speak to the Congress. Thereby, he does not use the speeches as an opportunity to justify certain political decisions in front of the American nation.

This diploma thesis proves that there is an interdependency between ideology and rhetorical choices. The awareness of this interdependency and the persuasive possibilities of grammatical and lexical choices enable the listener to defend him/herself from influence of manipulative language.

(6) Abstract Deutsch

Diese Diplomarbeit untersucht anhand von politischen Reden von George W. Bush und Barack Obama, ob es so etwas wie konservative oder liberale Rhetorik gibt und inwieweit ideologische Diskrepanzen in rhetorischen Anwendungen bzw. grammatischen Strukturen verankert sind. Das Ziel ist es, zu beschreiben, wie manipulative, rhetorische Stilmittel benutzt werden, um den Rezipienten von der Richtigkeit des politischen Handelns zu überzeugen.

Die Reden sind aus einer kritischen diskurs-analytischen Perspektive betrachtet. Da die Kritische Diskurs-Analyse (CDA) als Rahmenbedingung und nicht als Methodologie zu betrachten ist, werden andere linguistische Zugänge angewandt, um die Reden mit einem Fokus auf die Anwendung von Metaphern und Pronomen zu analysieren.

Eine Haupterkenntnis dieser Diplomarbeit ist die Interdependenz zwischen eingesetzten Metaphern und der historisch-kontextuellen Situation, in welcher ein Text produziert wird. Die am meisten durchdachten Metaphern werden benutzt, wenn die jeweiligen Redner Themen diskutieren, die von besonderer Relevanz sind. Zum Beispiel wendet Bush seine geistreichsten Metaphern an, wenn er über Krieg redet. Obama wiederum nutzt seine raffiniertesten Metaphern, wenn er über die ökonomische Lage der Nation spricht. Die Analyse zeigt, dass Bush primär Metaphern kohärent anwendet, die von Lakoff als prototypisch für das konservative „Strenger-Vater Modell“ (Strict- Father model) bezeichnet werden, während Obama sich einem komplexeren Metaphernsystem bedient und sowohl konservative wie auch liberale Metaphern einsetzt und dadurch eine breitere Wählerschaft für sich gewinnen möchte.

Weiters enthüllt die Pronomenanalyse, dass sowohl die kontextuelle Situation jedoch auch ideologische Ansichten die jeweiligen Pronomensysteme beeinflussen. Einerseits versucht Obama mit Hilfe von Pronomen persönliches Interesse und Betroffenheit zum Ausdruck zu bringen. Andererseits vermeidet Bush Pronomen, die Verantwortung akzentuieren, da sich sein Land unter seiner Führung mitten in einem nicht allzu populären Krieg befindet.

Außerdem, erkennt man im Rahmen einer Analyse, dass Obama sich der doppelten Zuhörerschaft der ‚State of the Union'- Reden besser bewusst ist, da er sowohl den Kongress, sowie auch direkt das amerikanische Volk anspricht. Dadurch versucht er mit der Hilfe der Reden seine politischen Richtlinien zu bewerben. Bush scheint sich dieser doppelten Zuhörerschaft nicht bewusst zu sein und verpasst dadurch die Möglichkeit, diverse politische Entscheidungen gegenüber dem Volk zu rechtfertigen.

Diese Diplomarbeit beweist somit, dass es ein Zusammenspiel zwischen Ideologie und rhetorischen Stilmitteln gibt. Das Bewusstsein dieser Interdependenz ermöglicht den aufmerksamen Zuhörer sich gegen den Einfluß von manipulativer Sprache zu wehren.

(7) Curriculum Vitae: Daniel Hämmerle

Persönliche Daten

geboren am	1985-07-31	in Malmö/ Schweden
Anschrift		Breitenfurterstrasse 413/7/8 1230 Wien
Telefonnummer		0699/ 100 33 702
E-Mail		daniel.haemmerle@gmx.at

Familienstand	ledig
Staatsangehörigkeit	Österreich/ Schweden

Ausbildungsdaten

Schulausbildung

1992-1996	Volksschule 23, Liesing, Franz Pülsl-Gasse 28
1996-2003	Bundesrealgymnasium und Bundesoberstufenrealgymnasium Anton Krieger-Gasse 25, Abschluss mit Matura
2005-2006	Zivildienst; Betreuung von SchülerInnen mit psychischen und physischen besonderen Bedürfnissen an der Anton Krieger-Gasse 25

Studium

seit 2003	Lehramtsstudium Englisch/ Geschichte an der Universität Wien

Sprachkenntnisse	Deutsch Muttersprache Schwedisch Muttersprache Englisch C2 Französisch B2

Berufspraxis

2003-2010	Unterrichten von Schwedisch an den Volkshochschulen Favoriten (1100 Wien), Brigittenau (1200 Wien), Meidling (1120 Wien), Alsergrund (1090 Wien)
2009-2010	Besuchsdienste für die Bandgesellschaft (österreichisches Hilfswerk für Menschen mit besonderen Bedürfnissen) 1160 Wien
2010-2011	Als Lehrer (Englisch/Geschichte) angestellt in der NMS Deutsch-Wagram

Besondere Fähigkeiten

Gitarre auf sehr hohem Niveau,
Klavier auf hohem Niveau,
Gesangsausbildung auf hohem Niveau,
Sehr gute PC Fähigkeiten