Introduction

The language we use is like a mirror – it reflects how we view ourselves; for example, we can examine how language is used in the political area to investigate understandings of who we are as Americans. Language is extremely powerful; it shapes, and can be used to manipulate, our perceptions and understanding of an event. I argue that, political language is always used calculatingly; a case in point was the government’s response to terrorism after September 11, which was often framed in terms of patriotism. Words such as "freedom" and "liberty" invoked important American ideals and helped to make military action (in Afghanistan and later Iraq) seem like the only appropriate response to the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

In his 2005 presidential inaugural speech, President Bush used the words "freedom," "free," and "liberty" forty-nine times in a twenty minute speech. Bush declared that there was no middle ground; nations were either "with us or against us." There was only "good" or "evil." This seemingly simplistic use of language was actually a very powerful tool Bush used to galvanize support for his cause, in this case military action. Bush also used "axis of evil" to invoke memories of America's fight against the Axis powers in World War II. Few in modern America would deny, at least superficially, that the Axis powers were bad, that World War II was a noble fight, and that America helped rid the world of tyranny in order to protect those who could not protect themselves. Therefore, invoking that metaphor helped bring acceptance for the American military action at home and emphasized the need for cooperation from other nations, just as many nations worked together during World War II.

But was war inevitable? Would war have been the US response if a Democrat had been in office? To answer these questions, I use concepts from anthropological linguistics, specifically framing and key words, to look closely at the language used by political parties in the United States. In particular I investigate political speeches made directly after the attacks on September 11 and during the 2004 presidential campaign. I focus on the use of narrative in framing the attacks of September 11 as an act of war, and examine at how the words "freedom" and "liberty" were used. In this presentation, I discuss some of the results of this investigation.

Background on the Conflict

About a month after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the United States military invaded Afghanistan with the intent to overthrow the Taliban, believed to be harboring Osama bin Ladin and members of al-Qaeda, who designed the September 11 attacks. The U.S. Military's Operation Enduring Freedom officially launched October 7. The government agenda on the war on terrorism extended past those behind the September 11 attacks, encompassing all terrorists. The administration, some of whom had a long standing distaste for Saddam Hussein stemming from the first Gulf War, began alluding that Hussein's regime in Iraq harbored terrorists. Tensions began to increase in the Middle East as Hussein would not submit to inspections for weapons of mass
destruction (WMD), which the United States interpreted as a threat to national security. The government did not invade Iraq until March 19, 2003. Bush was elected for his second term as president in November 2004 and a month later Saddam was captured on December 14. However, even with Saddam out of power, insurgents and civil war threaten to topple the nation as the war is still ongoing, as is the war in Afghanistan.

Dialogue Surrounding September 11 and Terror in Anthropology

Following September 11, critics investigated the relationship between the powerful and powerless in the context of nationalism. Herman Goring noted that, "People always will be brought to the bidding of leaders, all you have to do is tell them you are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for a lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country" (Roy 2002). The claim is that nationalism, while on the surface unites a country, only serves to divide humanity by highlighting differences in societies and creating fear of those differences. This brand of "Manichean nationalism" blurs the lines between policing and soldiering, between the civilian and the military worlds (Luntz 2002:728). Soldiers are given supercitizenship. Secrecy increases while civil liberties decrease. Collaboration between the media and the government establishes the war and September 11 as a media commodity. Media slogans such as "America's New War" creates a brand out of the conflict.

Nationalism also becomes important when investigating the "humanitarian wars" and the culture concept. Coined by Catherine Luntz, the "humanitarian wars" refers to the ethnocentric belief that the United States culture is strong while other societies are primitive (Luntz 2002:728). Traditional cultures are considered static and unchanging, with everyone in the culture in complete accord. Furthermore, anthropologist Mahmood Mamdani argued that the United States equates political tendencies of a few with entire communities in nonhistorical cultural terms (Mamdani 2002:767). This is what allowed the demonization of Islam in the Media with articles such as "What Went Wrong with the Muslim Civilization" by Bernard Lewis (Mamdani 2002:765). Religion was viewed as a political category, as the media and the government looked at Good Muslims verses Bad Muslims instead of civilian verses terrorist. Another aspect anthropologists investigated was the idea that knowing more about women in Islam or the meaning of religious ritual would help Americans understand what happened on September 11 in terms of terrorist organizations. Instead of political and historical explanations the government and the public relied on religo-cultural ones, which Lila Abu-Lughod contends is why female symbols, such as the veil, mobilized the "war on terror" (Abu-Lughod 2002:784). Because of these examples and other such instances scholars contend the current wars are racist.

Though the attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center unified much of the nation and did quell much dissent, minorities in America may have different perspectives than mainstream white society. Researchers discovered that once the shock had worn off, African American women described September 11 as more of the same, facing hardships in everyday life; in fact "Minorities have dealt with homegrown terrorism that is as much a part of America as apple pie" (Mattingly 2002:745). Furthermore, they were less likely to believe the media portrayal of the event, resistant to the pro-American campaign. They were skeptical of the American government, feeling
that it may have provoked the attacks. African Americans identified with a global community of "colored" people and had greater compassion for terrorists. In polls taken by the New York Times and the PEW ninety percent of the white population supported Bush's decision to bomb Afghanistan, while only seventy percent of African American supported the action (Mattingly 2002: 753).

America was said to engage in what could be termed as neo-colonialism in the Middle East, with its occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq. The Regan Administration utilized Afghanistan as a means to defeat the Soviet Union during the Cold War. They recruited radical religious Muslims to train in Pakistan and fight with the mujahideen, thus creating an Islamization of the anti-Soviet struggle. Previously, the tradition of jihad, that is war with religious sanctions, had been non-existent for the last four hundred years and was revived with the U. S. help in the 1980's (Mamdani 2002:770). The legacy of the United States' interference continued to affect the nation. Heroin production was introduced after the American occupation in the 1980's and instead of suppressing the drug's advancement, the United States government encouraged the production as a means of revenue. Thus a nation with virtually no drug addiction warped into a country of over a million addicts. As illustrated above, a key feature of neo-colonialism exploits the colonized nation for the benefit of the colonizers. Another attribute that characterizes neo-colonialism is equating political tendencies with entire communities in nonhistorical cultural terms that encourages collective punishment, which was the justification for the United States invasion of Afghanistan following the attacks on September 11. As noted author and speaker Arundhati Roy states, Afghanistan and Iraq are examples of "nineteenth century colonialism wrapped up in a twenty-first century war" (Roy 2002).

Though these discourses describe much of Anthropological thinking concerning September 11 and the subsequent wars, another discourse investigates these events from a linguistical perspective. One initial way to achieve this is by analyzing the language used by political parties. To understand how people used language, one must understand their framing. In finding what Republicans and Democrats actually say about themselves helps to recognize their worldview and as such how they would structure their language. Language reflects beliefs. George Lakoff argued that the language of on Republican and Democrats effects different world views. Republicans subscribe to the strict father model, in which the United States knows what is best and will act accordingly. This model also operates under the black and white assumption that there are good people and bad people and bad entities must be punished. Democrats follow the nurturant parent worldview: people have a responsibility towards one another as nations have a responsibility to care for each other. In looking at what both Republicans and Democrats say about each other, one can see examples of how these models may or may not hold up. However, it is a good place to start.

**Conceptual Tools**

Scholars may argue about the degree to which language dictates culture or vice versa, no one doubts the impact a language has on specific cultures. As Edward Sapir's found, "language [is] a symbolic guide to culture" (1949:62) and "vocabulary is a very sensitive index of the culture of a people" (1949:27).
Anthropological linguist Anna Wierzbicka took Sapir’s insights to heart and expanded on them, finding a close link between society and a language’s lexicon, the actual naming of visible and tangible things. For example language specific names for kinds of things shows their importance in a language (Wierzbicka 1997:1-2). The frequency of words, the number of times a particular word is used as well as the number of different words developed to express an idea, may reveal core values. For example, there are ninety different words for rice in the Hanunóo language of the Philippines.

Cultural elaboration also extends to semantics of word use, as individuals words often don’t translate exactly from one language to another. Complexities and slight variations of the culture specific words shape ways of thinking. The Russian word poalyj is translated to English as vulgar or common. A better definition would actually encompass “commonplace, trivial, trite, spiritually and moral base, petty, worthless, mediocre, devoid of high interests or needs” (Wierzbicka 1997:5) but would still not take into account the historical and cultural associations of the word. Specific words can be used as tools to understand a culture’s past experiences as Wierzbicka contends, “language and patterns of thought are interlinked” (1997:5).

Some examples include foods, customs, and social institutions. The German word Bruderschaft is defined in English as “(to drink) the pledge of ‘brotherhood’ with someone (subsequently addressing each other as du, the informal "you")” as opposed to the more formal Sie (formal "you") (Wierzbicka 1997:2). The reason this concept does not exist in the English language, indeed even contributing to the awkwardness of the definition, lies in part that English speakers no longer distinguish formal and informal ‘you,’ having long since dropped the informal ‘thee.’ Furthermore English speakers have no tradition of pledging friendship over a drink.

Wierzbicka proposes the investigation of key words which are those words that are “particularly important and revealing in a given culture” (1997:15). No finite set of words make up key words; they just must show the importance to a specific language. Wierzbicka identifies four criteria for key words. 1) The word must be established as a common word. 2.) It should be frequently used in a semantic domain, that is the domain of emotion, the domain of moral judgment, for example. 3.) It must be the center of a phraseological cluster. One example of a phraseological cluster is centered on the word freedom: freedom of speech, freedom of choice, freedom from persecution, freedom from tyranny. 4.) For a word to be a key word one can also look for its frequent appearance in proverbs, saying, popular songs, and book titles among other things (Wierzbicka 1997:15-16).

Frank Luntz, a Republican linguistic strategist, also understands the importance of emotions, claiming that twenty percent of life is decided by intellect and the remaining eighty percent based on emotion. "I can change how you think, but how you feel is something deeper and stronger and it's something inside of you" (PBS 2004). Luntz claims in his Republican Playbook that Americans really want symbols of America, their politicians to have interest in the day-to-day concerns of their lives, and their politicians to be "for something" rather than "against something." Some key terms are: democracy, justice, fairness, opportunity, next generation, family values, more effective government, goals and results, and accountability (Luntz 2007:7). In this paper the most important key
words liberty and freedom. Both "freedom" and "liberty" derive some of their meaning from the Latin *libertas*. *Liber* means that a person is not a slave thus *libertas* implies the "negation of the limitations imposed by slavery" (Wierzbicka 1997:126). Under the idea of *libertas*, it is not that one is able to do what ever one wishes; instead, restraints are in place allowing individuals to shape their lives within the framework of society.

Originally, the definition of freedom encompassed the ability to do what one wanted without being bond to another's wishes. Modern use of the word operates under a basic framework. First the word is not used to alter the meaning of a phrase. For example, "freedom of speech" will never allude to frankness or poetic license (Wierzbicka 1997:129). Secondly, freedom does not always translate to *libertas* (Wierzbicka 1997:129). Where *libertas* implies control is exercised and an individual will do something because they want to, freedom implies noninterference. That is (1) if an individual wants to do something they can do it and (2) if an individual does not want to do something they do not have to do it. Finally, as implied above, freedom leans towards a negative orientation: not to do things that one does not want to do and being able to do things *without the interference* from other people (Wierzbicka 1997:131 emphasis in the original).

Therefore, English speakers generally use 'from' following freedom – freedom from poverty, freedom from terror. Found in phrases such as "freedom from persecution" or "freedom from harassment," generally this expression is found in situations were some people do things to others, which prevent them from doing what they really want to do. Other times when there is not an individual to blame, such as in hunger, the phrase is framed in terms of rights; something is preventing people from doing what they have the right to do, namely eat enough not to starve. Thus, freedom from hunger. They are political statements that imply that social conditions are imposed on sufferers by others (Wierzbicka 1997:132). This implies a value judgment from the experiancer's point of view. "I think this is good for X to be free from Z" implies that Z is bad.

This theory of freedom as the right to be left alone stems from an Anglo-Saxon past. The Anglo theory of nonimposition states that individual rights are recognized in conjunction with the rights of others (Wierzbicka 1997:132). That is, people cannot always do something they want to do, but no one else is going to stop an individual from doing what they have the right to do. Freedom, under this reasoning is not a privilege, but a universal right.

Compared to "freedom," the use of "liberty" declined in America from the 17th and 18th centuries. With the rise of democracy and individualism there was less need to struggle against slavery and oppression. Liberty eventually evolved to mean public rights or rights of a social group (Wierzbicka 1997:132). Earlier use of liberty meant that an individual does as one wants to do without feeling constrained by other's disapproval. For example, the phrase, "not at liberty" implied that one was bound by what someone else's wishes. In contemporary English, "liberty" has been used mostly in political discourse. It is used with peoples rather than persons and there has been a sharp decline in the possessive liberty; a man's liberty or a woman's liberty is not used en everyday speech. Liberty is an abstract ideal, defined today in that it is everyone's inalienable right to do what they think is good and right (Wierzbicka 1997:136).
Framing

Lakoff, as a renowned linguist and cognitive anthropologist, focused his research on how people frame their language. "Framing is about getting language that fits your worldview. It is not just language. The ideas are primary – and the language carries those ideas, evokes those ideas" (Lakoff 2004:4). Furthermore all words are defined by its conceptual frame.

Lakoff claims that there are two different frames in American politics, the Republican “strict father” model and the Democratic “nurturant parent” model. These divergent models, or worldviews, provides ways of understanding key issues in American life. Debates are framed differently within each worldview.

From a cognitive science point of view, frames are largely unconscious but are able to define common sense. Repetition is also key to engraining frames in everyday life. Surface frames link to deep frames (Lakoff 2006:36-37). For example "war" implies military action and conjures images of armies, moral crusade, patriots supporting troops and surrender of an enemy. "Terror" is an emotional state of mind that cannot be beaten on a battle field. Combined as the "war on terror" these surface frames become a deep frame (Lakoff 2006:29). Furthermore deep frames inhibits opposite frames; once a frame is used it is near impossible to be used by the opponent to make a point. "Cut and run" was used by Democrats to shame those who wished to exit the War in Iraq. When Democrats used "stay and die" the frame no longer worked as it brought up images of the original Republican message (Lakoff 2006:37). Existing deep frames don't change overnight; persistence is key in creating and maintaining a deep frame. Negating another's frame only reinforces them. For example when Nixon claimed, "I am not a crook," the public immediately thought of the president as a crook (Lakoff 2006:38). Lakoff also recognizes the importance of emotions in framing issues.

Framing and emotions are used by politicians to make a better argument. Lakoff describes the "art of effective arguments." There must be moral premises and from a particular worldview. They are more effective if in the form of narrative structures, i.e. stories with heroes, villains, and victims. In the case of the Iraq War, the United States is the hero, Saddam the villain, and the Iraqi people the victims. Effective arguments must also undermine arguments on the other side, have issue defined frames with a problem and a solution and have commonplace frames that immediately resonate with people. Finally the language of surface frames must evoke deeper frames.

Lakoff (2004) claims that there are two different frames in American politics the strict father model proposed by conservatives and the nurturant parent model associated with progressives, which he discusses in his book Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate. The strict father model assumes the world is a harsh place and has a rigid black and white, right and wrong code of morality. The government is viewed as the "father" that must protect and discipline the "children," i.e. the American citizens so that they are obedient and act morally, which is required for success in a difficult and competitive world. Under this worldview, morality is to behave in one's own self-interest so that one may prosper in such a difficult world, not be a burden to society as well as elevate it as a whole (Lakoff 2004:7-8).

In opposition to the strict father model is the nurturant parent model, which is gender neutral. This worldview holds that both parents are responsible for raising the
children, children are born good and can be made better, and in following such logic, the world can also be made a better place. The parents' goal is to nurture the children so that they learn to nurture others. Ultimately, the nurturant parent model emphasizes empathy and responsibility for others as well as for one's self. Thus progressives offer protection to its citizens against crime, drugs, smoking, and, yes, even terrorist attacks (Lakoff 2004:12).

Even if people may identify more with one viewpoint over the other, all people understand the framing from both worldviews, at lest passively. Lakoff describes this biconceptualism in his book *Talking Points: Communicating our American Values and Vision*. Biconceptualism refers to how people have the both concepts within them and are able to recognize each even if they do not apply each view to their everyday life. To understand a John Wayne western, one must also understand the strict father model, even if they don't subscribe to the model politically. Furthermore, a person may use different models in different areas of one's life. A contractor may use the nurturant parent model in the union setting, but practice the strict father model in his or her own household (Lakoff 2006:12).

In order to see these models, helpful to compare the platforms of the political parties and the speeches.

*Republican Platform*

To understand how political parties utilize language, there must first be an understanding of how the party views itself and its policies. In the 2004 election Bush ran on a platform devoted to fighting the war on terror, strengthening healthcare needs, lowering taxes and passing education reforms. In their own words, the Republican Party's focus was on "winning the war on terror," "ushering in an ownership era," "building an innovative economy to compete in the world," "strengthening our communities," and "protecting our families" (Republican Party Platform 2004:2-3). The first item addressed in detail was the war on terror. According to the 2004 Republican Party Platform, Bush's greatest strategy was to call the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks an act of war rather than frame it as simply a crime. As such justice needed to be brought to this enemy of the United States (Republican Party Platform 2004:1).

By looking to the future, Republicans were able to build what they felt were strategies to win the war on terror through a systematic crack down on terror. "They [the president and the Republicans in Congress] have responded swiftly to the challenges of the new era, rather than remaining wedded to outdated theories and fighting battles that ended long ago" (Republican Party Platform 2004:5). As the main goal was to take action to maintain and increase the safety of the United States, there was an instant link between the terrorists of September 11 and Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD); the Platform clearly stated that "we will not allow the world's most dangerous regimes to possess the world's most dangerous weapons" and that the danger of mass destruction against Americans is "increased when outlaw regimes build or acquire weapons of mass destruction and maintain ties to terrorist groups" (Republican Party Platform 2004:5).

The Republicans have no doubt that terrorists will one day attempt to attack the United States once again and this attitude of the world seen as an inherently dangerous place justifies a preemptive strike. This is the philosophy driving the President's strategy for peace.
Bush's Stance on the war on terror can be summarized in the following:

- Terrorists long ago declared war on America, and now American has declared war against terrorists. We are defending the peace by taking the fight to the enemy.
- Nations that support terrorism are just as dangerous, and just as guilty, as the perpetrators of terrorism.
- There is no negotiation with terrorists.
- Taliban had been run out of Afghanistan and twenty-eight million people are free as well as the American people safer.
- Pakistan is an ally in the War on Terror, and the American people are safer.
- Because Saudi Arabia has seen the danger and has joined the War on Terror, the American people are safer.
- Because America and our coalition helped to end the violent regime of Saddam Hussein, and because we are helping to raise a peaceful democracy in its place, 25 million Iraqis are free and the American people are safer.
- Libya's chemical munitions have been destroyed making the American people safer.
- The A.Q. Khan network is out of business, ending one of the most dangerous sources of proliferation in the world and the American people are safer.

(Republican Party Platform, 2004:6-9)

As the war on terror is a military objective, the Republican platform aligns itself closely with the military and the supporting "coalition allies." The platform maintained, at least in 2004, that the Iraq conflict was necessary under the need to eradicate terrorism and was defendable by the information gathered at that time. When anyone objects to the effort of the troops, the Republican Party will "condemn inconsistent, ambiguous, an politically expedient statements on that point" for "uncertainty about America's commitment to [the troops] mission makes it immeasurably more difficult." That is dissent is seen as not only unpatriotic, but detrimental to the United States.

Democratic Party Platform


The Democratic Party is committed to keeping our nation safe and expanding opportunity for every American. That commitment is reflected in an agenda that emphasizes the security of our nation, strong economic growth, affordable health care for all Americans, retirement security, honest government, and civil rights.

The 2004 Democratic National Platform, Strong at Home, Respected in the World, addressed many of the same issues as the Republicans, aiming for a resolution in the Middle East; a strong economy; strong families in the form of improved health care, education, and environmental protection; and a strong American community. However,
there stance requires more diplomacy. It discussed how in the past, "American led instead of going it alone. We extended a hand, not a fist. We respected the world – and the world respected us" (Democratic National Convention Committee 2004:3). This theme of respect continues for most of the platform. Democrats criticize Bush for engaging in war without sufficient understanding of how terrorists operate, form or gain power in certain areas of the world; in short, the administration made no effort to "address the underlying factors that can give rise to new recruits" (Democratic National Convention Committee 2004:4). Democrats maintain that because terrorists are found in over sixty nations all over the world, the United States must utilize resources from other nations to help in the fight against terror. This party proposed its own methodology to suppress terrorisms.

Democrat stance can be summarized as the following:

- Improving intelligence to find and stop terrorists. This includes domestic as well as abroad.
- Cutting off terrorist funds.
- Preventing Afghanistan and other nations from becoming terrorist havens.
- Increasing public diplomacy to promote understanding and prevent terrorist recruitment.

(Democratic National Convention Committee 2004:4-5)

The party addresses the issue of WMD, but takes a more diplomatic stance. While, Republicans are inclined to act immediately with full military force, Democrats chose to use diplomacy and only engage militarily when there is no other choice. This party stresses pre-emptive strikes, just not of a military form. They suggest the necessity of maintaining strong connections with other nations, so that those nations will weed out their own terrorist and support American political agenda. This is also true for all international security issues. "To win over allies, we must share responsibility with those nations that answer our call, and treat them with respect. We must lead, but we must listen" (Democratic National Convention Committee 2004:9). Democrats also feel that "promoting democracy, human rights, and the rule of the law is vital to our long-term security" (Democratic National Convention Committee 2004:7). To win such a contentious war as Iraq, the nation must "internationalize" both politically and militarily (Democratic National Convention Committee 2004:7).

In the following sections I draw the above party platforms and at the speeches made directly after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. Bush made his first statement to the American public at nine-thirty in the morning while still at Emma Booker Elementary School in Sarasota, Florida, where he was visiting to push his education plan. "The Remarks by the President After the Two Planes Crash Into the World Trade Center" lasted only one minute as he tried to calm American citizens. With attention to the use of key words and narrative devices, I examine how 9/11 and the US’s appropriate response was framed by politicians, specifically Bush.
Framing the Response to Terrorism and the War in Iraq

Much was said after the attacks on September 11. But it was how that language was used that illustrates how the conflict was understood by politicians and the general public.

The idea that the attacks were actions of war rather than crimes of individuals appeared the first day. The closest reference I found to framing the attacks as a crime was in Bush's Statement by the President in his Address to the Nation" when he vowed to "bring them to justice." Even the idea of justice, as in the American justice system, can be extended to war, however, illustrating how pervasive the war frame was. Furthermore, two paragraphs latter, the president declares a "war against terrorism," leaving few to doubt that Bush defines that attacks as an act of war. Indeed on September 12, in the "Remarks by the President in Photo Opportunity with the National Security Team" Bush claimed that the "deliberate and deadly attacks" were "more than acts of terror," rather they were "acts of war." By the 15th, Bush was clearly stating he was headed towards military action in his "Radio Address of the President to the Nation." "Those who make war against the United States have chosen their own destruction" (source)

Nation as a person

A key metaphor for within the political arena, nations are often portrayed as individuals: friendly or hostile, mature or child-like. According to the rational actor model, nations act as individuals to gain the maximum assets, gained at the minimum costs and losses; that is nations act in their own best interest. As with a group of individual people there are mature nations, or "adult" nations, as well as child nations. Iraq, as a so called "underdeveloped" nation is thus equivalent to a child nation. The United States further individualized Iraq by placing Saddam Hussein in the role of the symbolic Iraq; the Bush administration was not against the Iraqi people, only their leader. "Saddam is a tyrant. He must be stopped" (Lakoff 2004:69).

Other nations were also personalized. By imposing the basic principles of friendship, the administration was able to categorize other nations into friends, enemies, and fair-weather friends. For example, friends are loyal. France and Germany have been lukewarm in their support of the Iraq War. Therefore, France and Germany, by not demonstrating loyalty are only fair-weather friends at best (Lakoff 2004:72).

By creating individual roles for nations, the government has also established identities easily framed in narrative form, that is a story with a hero, villain, and victim (Lakoff 2004:71). The story is reduced to the evils Saddam imposed on both his people and his neighboring nations, even becoming a tale of self-defense in linking Saddam to al-Qaeda and WMD. The United States simply protected itself.

September 11: “War” or “Crime”?

The framing of the attacks on the WTC and the Pentagon originally used crime terminology. The perpetrators would be "brought to justice" and "punished," which invoked concepts such as law, courts, lawyers, trials, sentencing, and appeals (Lakoff 2004:56). However, as the 2004 Republican Party Platform states, Bush "immediately
realized that it was an act of war, not just a crime” (Republican National Committee). War conjures images of casualties, enemies, military action, war powers, allowing the government more freedoms (Lakoff 2004:67). The problem is that it does not always coincide with the accepted parameters of war: there is no enemy army and no clear victory.

Language has been used to frame terrorists as sub-human. Compared to rodents – the United States was "smoking them out of their holes"- and swamp creatures who were "drying up the swamps where they live in," the Bush administration created a flat enemy to be despised (Lakoff 2004:56).

**Simplification of the Debates: “Good” vs “Evil”**

One of the justifications of the war on terror, is by characterizing terrorism as evil and by default war as good. The United States must be "morally strong to stand up to evil" (Lakoff 2004:57). By seeing terrorism as an inherent evil, with no underlying social causes such as poverty, those who fight against it, i.e. the United States and allies, are inherently good. Establishing terms such as 'good' and 'evil' invokes a religious flavor that allows a crusade-like mentality. Such action is not new to United States history – the first and second World Wars also used morality in the language of war (Hoey 2005:66).

Americans love the idea of freedom: freedom to make individual choices, the freedom to live one's life as one wishes, the freedom of speech. Perhaps no other concept is held so close to the American identity. Thus, whichever Party controls the concept of freedom, is in a position of greater power. George W. Bush's second inaugural address in January of 2005 managed to use the terms "freedom," "free," and "liberty" forty-nine times in a twenty minute span (Lakoff 2006:87). Other terms considered particularly effective are democracy, justice, fairness, opportunity, family values and accountability (Luntz 2004). Further manipulation is illustrated below (2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words not to use</th>
<th>Words to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privatization/private accounts</td>
<td>personalization/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tax reform</td>
<td>tax simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inheritance/estate tax</td>
<td>death tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global economy/globalization</td>
<td>free market economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outsourcing</td>
<td>taxation/innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented worker</td>
<td>illegal aliens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreign trade/global trade</td>
<td>international trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drilling for oil</td>
<td>exploring for energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trial lawyer</td>
<td>personal injury lawyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One way to view this is manipulation. Another is simply that language reflects different worldviews. Different words invoke different understanding depending on the Party affiliation. A typical understanding of "patriotism" for a stereotypical conservative reflects allegiance to the president or war time policies; to show dissent is to endanger the troops and the war effort. Revealing secret programs would endanger the lives of those protecting the nation (Lakoff 2006:44). Republicans publicly state in the 2004 Party Platform that "uncertainty about America's commitment" regarding the war is almost akin
to treason (Republican National Committee). Liberals on the other hand, according to Lakoff, feel it is a testament to the nation and the American public that opposition is allowed (Lakoff 2006:45). Dissent is the basis of freedom.

**Freedom and Liberty for All**

Even from the beginning, Bush used the value Americans placed on freedom, invoking the word often in his statements directly after the attacks on September 11. Bush claimed in his "Statement by the President in his Address to the Nation" on September 11, 2001, at 8:35 in the evening that "our very freedom came under attack" with the terrorist actions. He also used images of freedom versus oppression several times the next day in two different speeches. In "Remarks by the President in Photo Opportunity with the National Security Team" Bush declared that "freedom and democracy are under attack," later elaborating that the terrorists had not only attacked the United States but "freedom-loving people everywhere." The theme continued as Bush announced that people's lives were destroyed because "we embrace freedom" in "Remarks by the President While Touring the Damage at the Pentagon."

Bush continues this trend into his campaign for presidency in 2004, far out using the terms "freedom," "free," and "liberty" in comparison to Kerry. In five speeches Bush used "freedom" or "free" sixty-four times and "liberty" thirteen. Freedom is used as the antithesis of terrorists as seen in this example from Bush's July 9th Speech, "Defending the War in Iraq": "Because freedom is rising in places they claim as their own, the terrorists are increasingly desperate" (2004). America and Iraq and "people who love freedom" will "bring freedom to others" (Bush 2004). Framed in this way, it is good to love freedom, as Americans and those fighting for a "free" Iraq do and those who do not support the war are equated with terrorists. "Liberty," when used was often used in a set phrase. The most often used was "the ideal of liberty" found twice in Bush's "Defending the War in Iraq" and three times in the "Speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars Convention." As opposed to Bush, Kerry only used "freedom" nine times in six speeches spanning from July through November in 2004.

**Bush's Use of Narrative**

Every good story must have a hero, a villain, and a victim the hero must rescue from the villain as illustrated in Bush's July 9, 2004, speech, "Defending the War in Iraq." Americans are framed as the heroes who are "serving" to "bring freedom to others. The president lauded those in service for their "unselfish courage." He also commended the government, claiming "a lot of people are working hard on our behalf, your behalf, a lot of good people." If the government is "good" than it is working against bad entities, such as terrorists.

Terrorists and foreign fighters are framed as villains, who "spread fear" and disrupt our way of life." Once killed won't harm "innocent Americans" at home (2004). If Americans are indeed innocent, than terrorists must be guilty or evil. Bush then refers to such individuals as "cold-blooded," i.e. reptilian and thus not human. When Bush claims terrorists "hijacked a great religion," he employs the term "hijack" to reinforce the terrorist ways of these people.
The greatest terrorist in Bush's mind is Saddam. Interestingly enough in the first paragraph Bush mentions Saddam, he referred to the ruler of Iraq as only "the dictator." Saddam was described as someone who "tortured" and "tormented" his people, as Bush sited mass graves and thousands murdered. It is only because the United States "acted" that this evil villain was placed in prison and received "justice." Bush also claimed that people can "take the word of a madman or defend America." By framing it as an either or situation, if one chose to believe Saddam, one would not defend American and thus become a traitor.

If Saddam was the villain than Iraq was portrayed as a victim, "controlled by a dictator" who "tortured and tormented the people of Iraq." Afghanistan was also viewed as the victim. It was seen as a terror state overtaken by al-Qaeda who "trained and plotted and planned" their terrorist acts. But "because we acted," Afghanistan is now a democracy and an ally, making the United States a hero.

**Conclusion**

In investigating the political language surrounding terrorism following the 9/11 attacks, a link can be made between that day and the Iraq War. Though I am not prepared to say that had a Democrat been in office September 11 would not have led to war either in Afghanistan or Iraq, I do believe the evidence supports that the Bush administration linguistically paved the way towards war. This began the day the planes crashed into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, when Bush referred to the actions as an act of war. His administration continued to push this agenda through his 2004 campaign speeches.
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