Language at War: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Speeches of Bush and Obama on Terrorism

By

Emmanuel Sarfo and Ewuresi Agyeiwaa Krampa
Department of English, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana
E-mail: bigsarforo@yahoo.com & eresi_k@yahoo.com

Abstract

The concept of terrorism (and antiterrorism) is a complex phenomenon that has received a lot of debate in the last decade. A highly complex phenomenon, terrorism stands at the forefront of national and international agendas. Taking on many forms, it is associated with a wide variety of groups and motivations. It has been presented in different ways, depending on who is speaking. It is against this backdrop that this paper seeks to do a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of speeches of Bush and Obama on terrorism. Using six speeches from Bush and Obama as the data and using a qualitative content analytical approach, it draws on van Dijk's concept of Critical Discourse Analysis. The study reveals that Bush and Obama projected terrorism negatively while they projected anti-terrorism positively by carefully selecting emotionally charged vocabulary and expressions. The notion of power as control, mind control and context control were common features of Bush and Obama's speeches. This study has implications for the theory of Critical Discourse Analysis and studies on terrorism.

Keywords: *Terrorism, speech, linguistic forms, critical discourse analysis, mind control*.

1. Introduction

A highly complex phenomenon, terrorism stands at the forefront of national and international agendas. Taking on many forms, terrorism is associated with a wide variety of groups and motivations. Moreover, the emotionally charged nature of the term itself makes it especially difficult to define. In simple terms, terrorism is the threat or use of violence for political, religious or ideological purposes designed to influence the attitudes and behaviour of a group or to achieve objectives that are otherwise unattainable (Turner, Switzer & Redden, 1996; Rapport & Alexander, 1982). The Council of the European Union describes terrorism as an offence under national law, which, given its nature or context, may seriously damage a country or an international organization - seriously intimidating a population, or unduly compelling a Government or international organization to perform or abstain from performing any act, or seriously destabilizing or destroying the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organization (The Council of the European Union, 2002).

Although speeches on terrorism have been part of American politics for a long time now, they seem to have somewhat become more popular with ex-President Bush and the incumbent U.S President, Barack Obama, since 2001, as a result of the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York. Seeing itself as probably the freest, decent and most powerful society in existence (D'Souza, 2006), the US has a policy of 'no-negotiation-with-terrorists' and therefore such speeches are usually used to criticize, warn, and invoke fear in the so-called terrorists. However, the issue of who a terrorist is has given rise to different interpretations and attitudes to/towards the term, with some justifying the legitimacy of terrorist acts 'if the cause is genuine ... [seeing] terrorism as a tool of resistance against outside influence and control' (Turner, Switzer & Redden, 1996). For instance, in an interview with an ABC reporter, John Miller, in 1998, Osama bin Laden asserted that 'America has no shame... the worst thieves in the world today and the worst terrorists are the Americans'. In writing an introduction to Language, Discourse & Society, an international journal, O'Hare (2011) quotes Professor Celine Marine Pascal as saying that language is more than just a tool communicating with another. To her, the world gains meaning

through language, and that 'one person's terrorist is another person's freedom fighter. The language we use both reflects and shapes the kind of world we create around us'. This is a clear indication of the complexity of the term 'terrorism' (or 'terrorist).

It is therefore unsurprising that the concept of terrorism has attracted some scholarly attention. Agner (2002), whose article, 'Why terrorism doesn't work' identifies some important reasons why terrorism conflicts tend to go into long-lasting deadlocks - the imbalance of power, the failure of negotiations and the effect of the mass media. Aning's (2010) 'War on terror' examines the connections between development aid, security and the War on Terror (WOT) and finds that aid programmes have become highly securitized and politicized as a weapon for the realization of the goals of war on terror after 9/11. Zysberg & Zysberg (2012) explore 'Differential reaction patterns to September 11th's events' of Americans and 'bystander populations' and conclude that Americans view the situation more as a war and tend to be less yielding or understanding toward the perpetrators than the 'bystander populations'. In its study on 'Exploring the root and trigger causes of terrorism', the Transnational Terrorism, Security & the Rule of Law (2007), states that one of the causes of terrorism was that it was viewed as a means of communicating a message and using violence as a way to further solidify the triumph of their (terrorists) cause.

Also, speeches have received considerable attention from scholars. Different approaches have been used in such studies, including: Critical Discourse Analysis (David & Dumanig, 2011; Horváth, 2011; Adetunji, 2006; Boyd, 2009); Critical Discourse Analysis with the Systemic Functional Linguistics (Kamalu & Agangan, 2011; Wang, 2010); Political Linguistics, Pu (2007); and checklist model (van Leeuwen, 2009). These studies mostly highlighted issues of race, racism, identity, unity, cultural transmission and other political issues. Apart from that, while some of the studies were pragmatic, semantic or stylistic, others were lexico-grammatical in nature.

Even though the current paper also employs CDA, it differs from those mentioned above as it focuses on the subject of terrorism. Again, what makes this study differ from other studies on terrorism is that it focuses on the linguistic portrayal of terrorism in the speeches of two American presidents.

2. The Present Study

Theoretical Framework
This paper draws on the critical discourse analytical theory. According to van Dijk (1998: 352), Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. He identifies some of the dominant notions in CDA as 'power', 'dominance', 'inequality', 'hegemony', 'ideology', 'class', 'gender', 'race', 'discrimination', among others which he labels as 'macro level of analysis'. However, he posits that micro-level of social order involves language use, discourse, verbal interaction and communication. CDA, thus, tries to bridge the 'gap' between the two micro and macro approaches.

Fairclough (2003), on the other hand, classifies the various approaches of CDA into those that include a detailed analysis of a text and approaches that do not involve a detailed text. According to Fairclough & Wodak (1997: 271-280) CDA addresses social problems. They posit that CDA regards: power relations as being discursive; discourse as constituting society and culture; discourse as doing ideological work; discourse as history, making reference to culture, society and ideology in historical terms; that the link between text and society is mediated; that CDA is interpretative and explanatory; and discourse as a form of social action.

Van Dijk asserts that CDA concentrates on the abuse of power especially on dominance, examining how power in discourse is abused by controlling people's beliefs and actions to suit the interests of dominant groups as against the interest of the powerless or the will others. He says that those who have power

control discourse. According to him, social power is the result of access to and control of resources such as force, money, status, fame, knowledge and information. In the exercise of these powers, dominant groups through text and talk, may either directly or indirectly coerce, influence, control or even abuse the minds of people through persuasion and manipulation.

Text and talk control people's minds, and, therefore, discourse may also indirectly influence people's actions through persuasion and manipulation. This means that those groups who control most influential discourse also have more chances to control the minds and actions of others. Such powers of dominant groups "may be integrated in laws, rules, norms, habits and even a quite general consensus" leading to 'hegemony' (Gramsci, 1971, cited in van Dijk, 1998: 355).

This theoretical framework is considered suitable and appropriate because the present study seeks to establish how power, ideology, context control and mind control manifest themselves through the various linguistic choices the two American presidents made.

3. Methodology

Data collection and Treatment

The data were obtained from the internet, http://www.google.com (see References for specific details). These were scripted speeches delivered by Presidents Obama and Bush in the last decade (2001-2011). All of the speeches were delivered in the U.S.A but at different venues including the U.S Naval Academy, U.S Congress, the White House, National Archives Museum and the U.S Department of State. A total of ten speeches were chosen from the internet, out of which six, three each of Bush's and Obama's, were purposively selected. The following are the summaries of the speeches.

Bush 1 – *President Bush's speech on Terrorism*: Bush spoke about the 9/11 event together with some acts of terrorists. He also spoke about Guantánamo Bay and a program created to capture these terrorists so as to keep America safe. BSH 2: *President Bush's speech on the War on Terrorism, delivered on November 30, 2005 at the US Naval Base*. He described the terrorists and their acts but most importantly he emphasized their strategies carried out in Iraq. BSH 3:   A speech delivered on September 20, 2001. President Bush addressed a joint session of Congress and a national television audience to launch the *war on terror*, a phrase he used for the first time that night. In this speech, he first described the terrorists like he did in his previous speeches. He then declared war on terrorism and asked for the help of other nations. He also assured Americans of their safety.

OBM 1- *Protecting our security and our values*: Delivered at the National Archives Museum, Washington, DC, this speech was about Guantánamo and terrorism, delivered on May 21, 2009. Obama addressed the issue of Guantánamo established by Bush's government. In this speech, he explained why he banned the interrogation techniques used for terrorists, ordered the closure of Guantánamo and ordered a review of all the pending cases at Guantánamo. He also spoke about terrorism and anti-terrorism in general. OBM 2: Obama addressed the war in Afghanistan and the new strategy that was being carried out in Afghanistan and Pakistan to fight terrorism. OBM 3- *A Moment of Opportunity*, delivered on May 19, 2011: In that third speech of Obama, he briefly talked about terrorism and anti-terrorism and the death of Osama bin Laden as terrorism was not the only focus of his speech.

4. Data Analysis Procedure

In an attempt to analyse the data presented, we used a qualitative content analysis approach, which is "a research method for the subjective interpretation of the context of the text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes and patterns" (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005:1278). It goes beyond merely counting words or extracting objective content from texts to examine meanings, themes and patterns that may be manifest or latent in a particular text. It allows researchers to understand

social reality in a subjective but scientific manner. In analysing the data collected, the speeches were coded as BSH 1, BSH 2, BSH 3, OBM 1, OBM 2 and OBM 3 for easy referencing, where BSH means Bush and OBM means Obama. The data were critically scrutinised in order to identify the various lexico-grammatical items used by the two speakers to depict terrorism and anti-terrorism in their speeches. In doing this, we paid attention to grammar and vocabulary while using critical discourse analysis for a macro-level analysis (van Dijk, 1998) to observe how power, ideology, context control and mind control manifest in the speeches.

5. Analysis and Discussion

Linguistic Projection of Terrorism and Anti-Terrorism
The data collected and analyzed showed that there were various linguistic resources (e.g. words and phrases) that projected terrorism and anti-terrorism in the speeches. Indeed, these linguistic resources were wide spread such that they were realized in all the six (6) speeches analyzed. These linguistic features included vocabulary, phrases, clauses and sentences. It is noteworthy that although all the linguistic resources identified in the collected data were widespread, some appeared to be more widespread than others. Each of these linguistic resources is illustrated and extensively discussed in the subsequent paragraphs.

Vocabulary Items
It is a generally true that some words, even when in isolation and not used with other words or in context, have the tendency to communicate some meaning or purpose. It has been reported that because words have communicative purposes (say to create a good impression or a bad picture), it behoves individuals to be careful and mindful of their choice of words, consciously or unconsciously (Sekyi-Baidoo, 2002). The data analyzed showed that different kinds of words that projected terrorism and anti-terrorism could be found in the speeches. These words were solely lexical and/or content words and belonged to the four major word classes in English- nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. It is noteworthy also that of the four major word classes, nouns were dominantly used. The following are illustrations.

Vocabulary Items that Projected Terrorism
The following words were used to project terrorism as verminous:
1. Attack (OBM 2, L 26 pg.1)
2. Kill (OBM 1, L 1, pg.7)
3. Enemy (OBM 2, L 22, pg.5)
4. Danger (BSH 3, L 12 pg.1)
5. Tragedy (BSH 3, L 16, pg.4)

The 'armed men' were not only referred to as terrorists but also as an 'enemy'- a person who hates somebody or who acts and speaks against something. The use of 'enemy', somewhat, created an impression that these people (terrorists) were against their (Americans') interests and therefore must not be tolerated. The mention of 'enemy' in Example 3 was most likely to arouse anger aside fear. Contextually, 'danger' was used to depict terrorism and portray it as something that could jeopardise the existence of humanity. Also, the speaker described the 9/11 event as a 'tragedy'. Without having heard the initial part of the speech where the speaker gave a recap of the number of lives that were lost in the attack, the audience could be reminded of the sad memories through the use of the word 'tragedy'. In the entire speech, Bush used the word 'tragedy' to evoke feelings of sorrow and grief. 'Tragedy', thus, contextually highlights the concept of terrorism and projects it as something obnoxious or unpleasant.

Examples 3, 4 and 5 above highlight van Dijk's (1998) study on CDA, specifically mind control and context control. This assertion stems from the notion that controlling people's mind is another fundamental way to reproduce dominance and hegemony. Most of our beliefs about the world are acquired through discourse (van Dijk, 1998; Fairclough, 2001). Unless inconsistent with their beliefs and

experiences, recipients tend to accept beliefs (knowledge and opinions) through discourse from what they see as authoritative, trustworthy or credible sources such as scholars, experts, professionals or from other reliable sources (Nelser et al. 1993). From the speeches analysed, it is evident that Americans believe in freedom. The belief in freedom is evident in Bush's speech when he says, 'I'll continue to work with the international community to construct a common foundation to defend our nations and protect our freedoms' (BSH 1, L 29-31 pg.10). Therefore, the use of such words as 'kill', 'attack', 'enemy', 'tragedy' and 'danger' denote negativity and is inconsistent with their beliefs. Coming from a credible and authoritative source as claimed by Bush, however, the audience are somewhat manipulated in their minds to believe and accept the acts of terrorism as nefarious and, hence, have a negative outlook towards such acts. It can also be opined that the vocabulary items are indicative of context control because the speakers appear to have taken advantage of the 'situation (terrorist attacks), setting (time and place), participants present (security personnel and citizens of America) and mental representation: goals, knowledge, attitudes, opinions and ideologies (van Dijk, 1998; Diamond, 1996) to manipulate the audience to believe that terrorism is evil.

Vocabulary Items that Projected Anti-terrorism:
The following project anti-terrorism as a means of fighting and guarding against terrorism:
6. Supreme Court (BSH 1, L8, pg.8)
7. CIA (BSH 1, L 10, pg.10)
8. Troop (OBM 2, L 23, pg.2)
9. Military Commissions (OBM 1, L 2, pg.6)
10. Justice Department (OBM 1, L 8, pg.8)

The nouns in examples 6, 7, 9 and 10 are all names of legal bodies authorized by the US government to carry out actions in order to ensure safety. The speaker, perhaps, mentioned these people to let his audience know that the actions they carried out were legal, unlike the 'terrorist' 'who wear no uniform' and 'do not mass armies on borders...' The nouns, 'troop', 'Military Commissions' and 'Justice Department' connote an idea of resistance as far as terrorism is concerned, thereby projecting anti-terrorism.

The ideas contained in these vocabulary items that project anti-terrorism lend support to van Dijk's notion of power as control. He asserts that a central notion in most critical works is that of power, and more specifically the social power of groups or institutions. He defines social power in terms of control. Thus, groups have (more or less) power if they are able to control the acts and minds of (members of) other groups. The two speakers under reference made use of such words to let their audience know that the 'war' could only be won through the use of security agents and of course the law. Some of the vocabulary items such as 'Supreme Court', 'CIA', 'troops', 'Military Commissions' and 'Justice Department' put the minds of the audience at ease because they denote legitimacy, power and dominance (Fairclough, 2001) over acts of terrorism, which is a way of manipulating the audience into accepting the measures carried out against terrorists.

Phrases and Clauses
Phrases and clauses were identified as a linguistic resource employed by the presidents to project terrorism and anti-terrorism. That is, the individual words in a phrase/a clause may not necessarily project terrorism and anti-terrorism in isolation but rather collectively. After a careful analysis of the speeches, it was observed that the verb phrase was most frequent followed by the noun phrase. This is probably because of the frequent description of the acts and actions of terrorism and anti-terrorism.

Phrases/Clauses that Projected Terrorism:
11. to plot evil and destruction (BSH 3, L.10, pg.4)
12. violent extremist (OBM 2, L 32, pg.8)
13. to kill the innocent and create chaos for the cameras

(BSH 2, L 23-24 pg.4)
14. the slaughter of innocents (OBM 2, L 17 pg.1)
15. launch attacks against America (BSH 2, L 18, pg.3)

In example 13 above, the act of taking the life of people by the terrorists was described by the speaker as killing. 'Kill' is defined as to 'make somebody or something die'. Emphasis must be put on the word 'make' because in this context the individuals did not choose to die; rather, death was imposed on them. This act could somewhat be defined as treacherous, especially when the speaker went on to say 'innocent lives'. That is, the act was treacherous because death was imposed on the lives of 'innocent people' who did not deserve it. The speaker could have said 3,000 people died in the plane crash but in order to make his audience aware of the 'enemy' they were dealing with he chose to use such a verb phrase so as to arouse sentiments. Clearly, the expression is used by the speaker to depict the terrorist as a brutal enemy.

In Example 14, the speaker used the word 'slaughter' and not 'kill' in order to be as blunt as possible. In describing his own actions he did not use such extreme negative words. He described his activities using words like 'fight', 'dismantling' and 'defeating'. The speaker emphasised that the killing was done cruelly to people who did not deserve it. Clearly, therefore, the activities of the terrorist were presented and portrayed by the speaker as nefarious. The phrase 'the slaughter of innocents' therefore created a terrible perception about the terrorists and in so doing terrorism is projected as cruel, brutal, heartless, callous, and lethal.

The speaker, in Example 15, tried to tell America that on daily basis, attacks were being planned against Americans. The terrorists did not give up; hence they also must not give up until 'complete victory' was theirs. This was a way of suggesting to his audience that the war and strategies on terrorism must be accepted. The speaker, thus, used the phrase to make Americans aware of how close the activities of terrorism were to them. By so doing, he projects terrorism negatively to them.

Phrases/Clauses that Projected Anti-terrorism:
The following were used to portray antiterrorism:
16. under the banner of this domestic unity and international legitimacy (OBM 2, L 30 pg.1)
17. to fight this enemy (OBM 2, L 8, pg.4)
18. hunt the enemy (BSH 2, L 18, pg.2)
19. to construct a legitimate framework for Guantánamo detainees(BSH 3, L 13 pg.5)
20. to prevent a cancer from once again spreading through that country. (OBM 2, L 13-14, pg.6)

To 'hunt the enemy' creates the picture that it is a bad person that is being tracked down. The idea of dealing with the enemy as suggested in the verb phrase, Example 18, is indicative of the fight against terrorism.

Examples 16, 19 and 20 project anti-terrorism positively in the sense that the 'enemies' the speaker spoke of did not 'abide by any law of war' but they (Americans), though were also in the war, did so legally. That is, the measures and strategies they took concerning the defeat were lawful, legitimate and justifiable as they were backed by law. These statements tried to nullify any sense of doubt or uncertainty in the minds of those who thought the war, detainees and justices being carried out against the terrorists were wrong. Again, there is a portrayal of determination and strong will to nib terrorism in the bud, as a result of which anti-terrorism is projected.

In the verb phrase in Example 20, the speaker strategically stated their aim as preventing 'a cancer from once again spreading'. He likened terrorism to a deadly illness called cancer and symbolised Afghanistan as the patient under a cancerous attack. The Americans were, therefore, in Afghanistan to cure

Afghanistans of their illness and prevent any spread to other countries. In other words, the speaker sought to create the impression that the rest of the world mattered to them (Americans) just like their very own welfare mattered to them (Americans). Like the other instances in which anti-terrorism was projected, the example above is indicative of Americans resolution to prevent, stop or curb terrorism. By so doing, anti-terrorism legitimised.

The examples that project terrorism and anti-terrorism at the phrasal and clausal levels corroborate van Dijk's concept of mind control. In the speeches of Bush and Obama, they tactically employed the use of certain phrases and clauses to paint a bad picture about the concept of terrorism, while they lured the audience into accepting anti-terrorism. This is evident in Examples 14 and 20. This is a manifestation of mind control because '... the recipients may not have the knowledge and beliefs needed to challenge the discourses or information they are exposed to' (Pu, 2007). For instance, the only evidence the audience had as to why there were troops in Afghanistan was what the speaker said, 'to prevent a cancer from once again spreading through that country' (OBM 2, L 13-14, pg.6). The audience may not have had any other knowledge or information on why those troops were sent to Afghanistan except for what they were told and therefore could not challenge but only believe the speaker. Like the presidents, citizens of America seem to believe in freedom and so knowing this, the speakers carefully used expressions that would denote their interest in the freedom and welfare of the people and that of terrorists' interest against the freedom and welfare of Americans.

Sentences

In order to appreciate the real sense of the projection of terrorism and antiterrorism, it was necessary to consider sentences, as sentences make complete senses: simple, compound and complex sentences. Most of the sentences that were used to project terrorism and anti-terrorism were complex. Perhaps, this is a reflection of the complex nature of the concept of terrorism and antiterrorism. In other words, talking about a complex phenomenon may require complex language use. It is worth mentioning, however, that since lexical items and phrases subsume under sentences, a sentence structure in itself may not necessarily project terrorism and anti-terrorism. Rather, it is the various components and/or constituents of the sentence structure that depict terrorism. Below are examples of sentences that project terrorism. These examples will be followed by another set of examples that project anti-terrorism.

Sentences that Projected Terrorism:

21. He was a mass murderer who offered a message of hate - an instance that Muslims had to take up arms against the West, and that violence against men, women and children was the only path to change (OBM 1, L 21-23, pg.1).
22. Americans saw the destruction the terrorists had caused in New York and Washington and Pennsylvania, and they wondered if there were other terrorist cells in our midst poised to strike (BSH 1, L 13-15, pg.1).
23. Our commanders believe they're responsible for most of the suicide bombings and the beheadings and the other atrocities we see on our television (BSH 2, L 11-12, pg.3.).
24. We watched the twin towers collapse before our eyes and it became instantly clear that we'd entered a new world and a dangerous new war (BSH 1, L 8-9, pg.1).
25. On September 11, 2001, 19 men hijacked four planes and used them to murder nearly, 3,000 people (OBM 2, L 10-11, pg.1).

In Example 23, the speaker specifically mentioned some of the acts of the terrorists although the audience may have already been aware. He carefully selected some of the most gruesome activities and referred to the other activities of the terrorist as 'atrocities'. He did this to ignite some sort of dislike from the audience. He also did this to gradually paint a bad picture about the terrorists so that perhaps all (Americans and non-Americans) would be against them as America needed allies to fight this war. In this example, it can be seen explicitly that, terrorism was emphasised and brought to the fore via the use of language. To equate the instantiations of the U.S commanders to the beheadings, atrocities and other

terrorist activities makes it possible for the audience to see the complex nature of the terrorist activities as well as how barbaric and diabolical these activities were.

Van Dijk (1998) asserts that our beliefs about the world are acquired through discourse; hence, it is not surprising that the speakers embraced the opportunity to use language to somewhat brainwash the audience into accepting that terrorism is inhuman, whereas anti-terrorism is in their (Americans) best interest. As can be seen from the speeches, Americans uphold certain beliefs and values (for example, freedom) and, therefore, the acts of terrorism such as 'suicide bombings' were indeed' inconsistent with their personal beliefs' (Nesler et al, 1993). Example 23 above, therefore, highlights mind control in CDA.

It can be deduced from Example 24 that the speaker gave a recap of the 9/11 event not because his audience were not aware or may have forgotten but because he somewhat wanted to rekindle fear and pain. It is evident in the speaker's speech that he was concerned about the safety and welfare of his people and as such this excerpt was not to deliberately cause pain but to turn his audience against the terrorists. He did this by bringing back to memory any pain and fear that was caused as a result of the terrorist attacks. In doing so, the audience were reminded of who and what the enemies were. All who may or may not have lost a loved one and were affected in some other way by the 9/11 event but yet were indecisive or against measures being planned against these terrorists seemed to have been cleverly manipulated to join in the fight against terrorists. To recount the 9/11 incident and link it to 'a dangerous new war' in the same sentence allows the audience to see the attack as a war, and therefore creates the environment to face the 'enemy'.

The compound sentence in Example 25 can be said to be suggestive of some coordinated action- hijacking and murdering- of acts of terrorism. These armed men changed the very thing that was supposed to comfortably send people to their destination into a dangerous tool. The airplane is created not only to transport people but also to make them have and feel as comfortable and secure as possible. From the expression above, it can be inferred that these 'armed men' disrupted this comfort and peace by turning the airplane into weapons, endangering the life of those on board.

Examples 24 and 25 are in line with van Dijk's (1998) notion of context control. This is because the speakers strategically took advantage of the context (situation, setting and ongoing actions) to discuss the concept of terrorism and to manipulate the people into accepting the measures being carried out against the terrorists. It can be inferred from the excerpts that the speakers defined the communicative situation by deciding the place and time of the communicative event, or on which participants may or must be present. It is, therefore, not surprising that the speakers skilfully used such language in the midst of security bodies and those who were affected by the attack.

Sentences that Projected Anti-terrorism:
26. The United States is a nation of laws, and we must abide by these rulings (OBM 1, L 27-28, pg.6).
27. We're now approaching the five-year anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, and the families of those murdered that day have waited patiently for justice (BSH 1, L 18-19, pg.8).
28. We will take defensive measures against terrorism to protect Americans (BSH 3, L 12-13, pg. 4).
29. I can say that questioning the detainees in this program has given us information that has saved innocent lives by helping us stop new attacks, here in the United States and across the world (BSH 1, L 26-28, pg.3).
30. These procedures were designed to be safe, to comply with our laws, our Constitution and our treaty obligation (BSH 1, L 22-23 pg.4).

The speaker made a careful selection of his words in Example 28. He created a picture that, although it was the Americans who were being abused, they were careful in their defence since they were a people

who believed in freedom unlike the terrorists who sought not only to kill but 'to disrupt and end a way of life'. In the sentence, a strong desire to combat terrorism is explicitly presented.

In Example 29, the speaker justified the act of interrogating the detainees (terrorists). By so doing he informed his audience of what was being done to those detained but he did not give them full details for security reasons. He sought to let his audience out of the dark and protect their face or respect their presence. He explained his actions, perhaps, to enlighten or manipulate his audience so he could have their support (in his actions) and not be criticized or opposed. He did not inform his audience about the reasons for the acts of the terrorists; however, he gave reasons for his actions concerning terrorism. He gave the reasons and justified them, painting a picture that these terrorists were simply nefarious and they committed ruthless acts for no apparent reason. The speaker assured them that his reasons were justifiable as all these measures were carried out to keep citizens safe. The sentence, thus, makes us aware of the government's attitude towards terrorism; it is anti and definitely not pro.

In Example 30, the speaker did not mention what these procedures were but assured his audience that they were lawful and safe. He did this because he knew he could not disclose the details of the procedure. Though most Americans are against the terrorists, they may not have necessarily agreed or supported the plans and strategies used against the terrorists. Therefore, he assured them (the audience) that the procedures, although secret, were safe and lawful in order to put the audience at ease. More importantly, it can be inferred from the sentence that the government obviously wanted to counter terrorism; hence, the need to put in place some procedures and strategies.

The examples above reflect van Dijk's (1998) concept of power as control. This is because the speaker used language to his advantage as he was of a higher authority than his audience were. He had more power and therefore took advantage of it to exercise his powers by manipulating and indirectly imposing the concept of anti-terrorism on his audience.

Examples 27, 28 and 30 also mark mind control. This is because the speakers cleverly manipulated and persuaded the speakers into thinking that the acts of anti-terrorism were done in their best interest, especially because these acts of terrorism were 'inconsistent with their personal beliefs' (Nesler et al. 1993). Context control could also be said to reflect in the examples because the speakers showed that they were in charge by cleverly deciding what to talk about, when, where and how to talk about the situation at hand.

Cognitive Mechanism of Manipulation

In the speeches, terrorism was projected as evil and since it was evil there was the need to curb it. Anti-terrorism, on the other hand, was projected as appropriate and lawful. It is through the various linguistic resources that one gets to know how terrorism and anti-terrorism were projected. These linguistic resources were, however, used by employing cognitive mechanisms of manipulations. Cognitive mechanisms of manipulation are based on interfering with processes of understanding, affecting general beliefs, attitudes and ideologies, and forming or changing specific personal mental models representing personal opinions and emotions (Rudyk, 2007). The analysis of the speeches revealed some cognitive mechanisms of manipulation. First, the means by which terrorism was projected is discussed, followed by how anti-terrorism was projected.

Terrorism

The projection of terrorism as evil was done through an appeal to a highly emotional event which had a strong impact on personal mental models as is highlighted by the examples below:

31. On September 11, 2001, 19 men hijacked four planes and used them to murder nearly 3,000 people (BSH 1, L 5, pg.1).
32. Tonight we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom (BSH 3, L13-14, pg1).

In the examples above, very emotional, personal and mental models about the September 11, 2001 attacks in the USA were repeatedly employed to generalize the level of general beliefs, attitudes and ideologies. Such social beliefs, attitudes and ideologies are not personal models but shared social representations of a group of people, or forms of social cognition (van Dijk 2006).

Another means by which terrorism was presented was via events which happened outside the U.S as is illustrated in the examples below:
33. Just last week they massacred Iraqi children and their parents at a toy giveaway outside an Iraqi hospital (BSH 2, L 31-32, pg.4).
34. As the recently foiled plot in London show, the terrorists are still active, and they are still trying to strike America and they are still trying to kill our people (BSH 1, L 28-30, pg.1).

These actions were performed by terrorists in different countries (Britain and Iraq). But by mentioning them, the speaker was obscurely forming the general belief that the world's citizenship security was also in danger and, thus, needed to be protected.

Anti-terrorism
In the speeches of the two presidents, anti-terrorism was projected as lawful and appropriate through indirectness (Searle, 1969). Indirect speech acts can either set up a power imbalance between an addresser and an addressee or mask it. In the examples below, the speaker provided information to the listeners:
35. The thousands of FBI agents who are now at work in this investigation may need your cooperation and I ask you to give it (BSH 3, L 19-20, pg.5).
36. I ask for your patience with the delays and inconveniences that may accompany tighter security and for your patience in what would be a long struggle (BSH 3, L 21-22, pg.5).

Both examples above are requests that belong to the category of injunctions and hence commit the addressee to a certain future course of action - cooperating with authority. It can be inferred from the examples that decisions had already been made concerning the agents responsible for security and the measures that had been put in place to ensure security. With the course of action already chosen, the addressee's commitment to support the government was no longer the case. Rather, the requestive form of the utterances in the examples was to save the addressee's face, to create the atmosphere of an intimate relationship, and thus to disguise power imbalance between the speaker and the addressee. In this context, the speaker's decision did not appear to be one of imposition but coordinated with the addressee, which is a covert exercise of power, or manipulation (Rudyk, 2007). From the illustrations above, it can also be inferred that anti-terrorism was projected as lawful and appropriate in that they ensured the freedom and security of the people.

Language is seen as connected with ideological means, although language in itself may not be ideological (Wodak, 2006). Fairclough (1989) recognises that power is not just a matter of language, it is an ideology in itself. For him language contributes to the exploration and domination of some people through commonsense assumptions ideologically shaped by power relations. Power abuse does not only involve the abuse of force but more crucially may affect the minds of people. It is said that power and ideology influence our linguistic choices and vice- versa. From the analysis, it was realised that the linguistic choices by the two presidents were influenced by their ideology. This was done for the promotion of freedom as is evident in the examples below:
37. I'll continue to work with the international community to construct a common foundation to defend our nations and protect our freedoms (BSH 1, L 29-31 pg.10).
38. We're fighting for our way of life and our ability to live in freedom (BSH 1, L4, pg.32)

Examples 37 and 38 reiterate Americans' ideology of their 'way of life' and freedom. Thus, the fight against terrorism is to protect and maintain America's ideology.

5. Conclusion

The chief objective of the study was to find out which linguistic resources were used to project terrorism and anti-terrorism by Bush and Obama in their speeches. The study was informed by van Dijk's (1998) concept of Critical Discourse Analysis. His notion, together with some scholars' (Fairclough, 2001; Rudyk, 2007) notion of power as control, mind control and context control was, thus, the main conceptual underpinning of the study.

The study found that vocabulary items, phrases, clauses and sentence structures constituted the linguistic resources that were used to project terrorism and anti-terrorism as far as speeches on terrorism by the two presidents were concerned. The vocabulary items used to project terrorism and anti-terrorism were dominantly verbs and nouns. The phrasal categories that were used to project terrorism and anti-terrorism included verb phrases, noun phrases, adjectival phrases, adverbial phrases and prepositional phrases and clauses while sentences that were used to project terrorism and anti-terrorism included simple, compound and complex sentences. Through these linguistic forms, the two presidents legitimised antiterrorism and illegitimised terrorism.

The study has some implications for theory and practice. The theoretical position that language can be used to construct an ideology, or establish a power relation of imbalance between two groups of people was amply supported by the study. To this end, it can be asserted that the present study has implications for the theory of Critical Discourse Analysis. Also, the theoretical stance that political discourses are, generally, characterized or underpinned by linguistic expressions carefully selected by speakers in order to achieve a certain purpose or intent and to have a specific kind of impact on listeners was underscored by this study. It was evident in the study, for instance, that both Bush and Obama carefully and intentionally selected specific forms, words and expressions in order to make a specific impact on their listeners. The study therefore has implications for the theory of Political Discourse Analysis. The study has implications for the increasing interest in research on the concept of terrorism. It provides an impetus for further studies in the concept of terrorism, especially from the linguistic point of view.

References

Adetunji, A. (2006). Inclusion and exclusion in political discourse: deixis in Olusegun Obasanjo's speeches. *Journal of Language and Linguistics.* 5 (2), 1475-8989.

Agner (2002) *Why terrorism doesn't work* (Draft Article). Retrieved from http://www.agner.org/ cultsel/terror.pdf.

Aning, K. (2010). Security, war on terror and ODA. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 3(2), 3-28.

Boyd, M. S. (2009). De-constructing race and identity in US presidential discourse: Barack Obama's speech on race. *Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, 75-94.

David, M. K. & Dumanig. F. (2011). National unity in multi-ethnic Malaysia: A Critical discourse analysis of Tun Dr. Mahathir's political speeches. *Language, Discourse and Society*.1(1), 11-31.

Diamond, J. (1996). *Status and power in verbal interaction. A study of discourse in a close-knit social network.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

D'Souza.D (2006) *What's so great about America?* Retrieved from http:// www.wisdomword.info/dinesh_dsouza

Fairclough, N. L. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman Press.

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997) *Critical discourse analysis* . In T. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction.* 2, 258-284. London: Sage

Fairclough, N. L. (2001). *Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research*. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer: *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (121-38). London: Sage.

Fairclough N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Prison notebooks.* New York: International Publishers.

Horváth J. (2011) *Critical discourse analysis of Obama's political discourse*. Retrieved from http://www.pulib.sk/elpub2/FF/Ferencik2/pdf_doc/6.pdf

Hsieh H. F. & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*. 15 (9), 1277-1288.

Kamalu, I. & Agangan, R. (2011). A critical discourse analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's declaration of interest in the PDP presidential primaries. *Language, Discourse and Society.* 1(1), 32-54.

van Leeuwen, M. (2009). 'Clear' vs. 'woolly' language use in political speeches: The case of the controversial Dutch political Geert Wilders. *Tekstblad*. 15(2), 6-11.

Nesler, M. S., Aguinis, H., Quigley, B. M. & Tedeschi, J. T. (1993). The effect of credibility on perceived power. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 23(17), 1407-1425.

O' Hare, K. (2011). *Language, Discourse & Society. E-journal*. Washington DC. College of Arts & Sciences. Retrieved from http://www.american.edu/cas/news/language-discourse-society-journal.cfm

Pu, C. (2007). Discourse analysis of President Bush's speech at Tsinghua University, China. *Intercultural Communication Studies*. XVI.1, 205-216.

Rapport, D. and Y. Alexander. (1982). *The rationalization of terrorism*. Maryland: University publications of America.

Rudyk. I (2007). Power relations in president Bush's state of the union speech. *International Journal of Language Society and Culture.* 5(23), 68-76.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sekyi-Baidoo, Y. (2002). *Learning and communication*. Accra: Infinity Graphics Ltd.

The Council of the European Union (2002*). Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism* (2002/475/JHA). Retrieved from eur-lex.europa.eu /LexUriServ/ LexUriServ.do?uri... 2002F0475— EN— 09.12.2008 — 001.001— 1

Transnational terrorism, security & the rule of law (2007). Retrieved from http://www .transnationalterrorism.eu.

Turner, M. J, Switzer, K & Redden, C. (1996). *American government: Principles and practices*. USA: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998*). Ideology. A multidisciplinary study*. London: Sage

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society.* 17 (3*).* 359-383.

Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 1(3). 254-261.

Wodak, R. (2006). Mediation between discourse and society: Assessing cognitive approaches. *Discourse Studies*. *8*(1). 179-190.

Zysberg & Zysberg (2012). Differential reaction patterns to September 11th's events. *International Journal of Peace and Development Studies. 3(1). 6-12.*

Sources of the Speeches
(Accessed: 24th May, 2012, 3:20pm.
Bush 1: www.nytimes.com/2006/09/06/.../06bush_transcript.html
Bush 2: www.washingtonpost.com > World > Middle East > Iraq
Bush 3: www.georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov › ... › September 2001
Obama 1: www.andyworthington.co.uk/category/guantanamo/page/84/
Obama 2: www.whitehouse.gov/.../remarks-president-address-nation-wa
Obama 3: www.whitehouse.gov/.../2011/.../19/remarks-president-barack