

War Representation in the Bush's September 11th Speech

Ehya Amalsaleh

Shiraz University of Medical Sciences

Samad Sajjadi

Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences

Abstract

This paper examines the ways through which the idea of war has been "suppressed" in Bush's speech addressing American people on the first anniversary of the September 11. As is common in the political speech (Jucker, 1997), Bush, as an authoritative figure, tries to make his audience accept his views and, through identification with them, to persuade them to believe his stance. Although Bush has never used the word 'war' overtly in this speech, the idea is present all through his talk. This could stimulate the curious mind to find out why there is no direct reference to the term "war". The point is that although Bush is conscious of people's anger with what happened on the September 11, he is not sure about the extent to which the world people in general and the American in particular would accompany him and his government in retaliating the *enemy*. He is well aware of the significance of gaining public consensus in this regard and, to achieve this, he skillfully resorts to discursive strategies which will be of major concern in this study.

Keywords: Critical discourse analysis, war, September11, discourse and politics

INTRODUCTION

The present study is intended to show the role of language in representing war in the speech delivered by Bush on September 11, 2002. Regarding the impact of language in promoting certain preplanned targets, Silberstein (2002) maintains that "words helped many things happen", (p. 11). By the same token, this article is to explore the ways language is manipulated to inculcate war ideas into people's mind on the one hand and to legitimize its occurrence on the other. In politics, using language 'with persuasive intention' is very common. Politicians use the language to meet different purposes; that is, in Jucker's term (1997), politicians use language "not only to persuade but also to inform, to entertain, and

perhaps to deceive or cover up", (p.123). Fairclough (1989), in this connection, also holds that politicians are generally concerned with manipulating and using language in a way to serve their own purposes. He continues to claim that they are very active in providing a relationship between discourse, ideology and power in the society as well.

In this concern, Bush's speech on the September 11th is good enough to show that, as a politician, he is also far from exception in using discursive strategies to warrant people's agreement in instantiating war ideas. He resorts to such strategies to persuade people to be in line with his inclinations. What is interesting is that although Bush has never used the word 'war' in this speech, the idea is present all through his talk. The reason why Bush abstains from referring to the idea of war overtly can be accounted for by the Critical Linguists' assumption (van Dijk, 2001, Fairclough, 1995, Hodge & Kress, 1993) that ideology works more effectively when it is not visible. That is to say *invisibility* is the key point in making the ideology appear more commonsensical, as the audience generally tends to give in rather than resist when encountering a common sense idea.

In addition to accepting common-sense ideas, as mentioned by Nesler et al. (1993) in van Dijk (2001) the audience usually tends to accept ideas expressed by authoritative figures. This could account for Bush's success in winning over people's consensus at a critical moment in the American history. Likewise, the fact that Bush's Speech could successfully rally people around his war-oriented policies is tantamount to what van Dijk (2001) indicates as the "way social power abuse... [is] enacted", (p.1) .

. Now, bearing in mind the aforementioned points on authorities' tendencies to inculcate certain pre-fabricated ideas into the mind of their audience, let's see how such ideas are taken as common sense by the audience. One important way, as mentioned by van Dijk (2001) is to "control people's mind". He adds that "since people's minds are typically influenced by text and talk, we find that discourse may at least indirectly control people's actions, as we know from persuasion and manipulation". People, usually do not have a fixed perception of reality, as mentioned by

Huckin (n.d., P.2); rather, the seemingly *immutable* reality can be constructed or it may be subjected to change “through interaction with others, as mediated by the use of language and other semiotic systems”.

Language, as shown above, is very functional in creating/changing certain attitudes in people. Nevertheless, such functional features, indirectly bringing about change, tend to remain concealed unless deliberate attempts are made to make them known. Such attempts are more likely to bear fruit if they are carried out systematically, within the framework of discourse oriented approaches, designed to disclose functional features underlying texts and talks. That is, a particular approach is required to bring this underlying function of language to the surface. To do this, the present study adopted Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) to deal with the impact of Bush’s speech on his audience, which is supposed to serve as a good example of the way language could be manipulated to impinge on the public life of the society.

Language was once believed to be ‘innocent’ concerning the establishment of power, ideology, etc. It was treated just as a medium for conveying the meaning from the speaker/writer to the listener/reader. Now, however, with the advent of CDA, language is known to be highly effective in reflecting as well as constructing power relation, attitude, ideology, etc. This makes the role of a critical analyst more essential in making people aware of the role language can play and the way it is used by those who have access to information to control people’s mind.

In order to impinge upon people through the medium of language, the speaker/writer, according to van Dijk (1997a, p. 5), tries to affect either “Episodic Memory and Semantic” or “Social Memory” or both. The former, episodic memory, concerns individual’s experience which deals with information processing in Short Term Memory, while the latter “stores more general, abstract and socially shared information” (p.5). As members of a community, people have *shared perceptions* dealing with the nature of the language they use and the way they adopt the language to fulfill their objectives. These *Shared perceptions* according to

Sivestein, as reported by Blommaert (1997), “reside in the grammatical organization of the language (...) as well as in semiotic processes at large...”, (p.3). In this connection, Bush’s September 11 speech is a good example verifying Sivestein’s point of view. In his speech, by resorting to the strategic use of language, Bush tries to base his talk on, and sometimes even build up, shared social and political beliefs. In doing so, he refers to certain issues all people are aware of (i.e. the September 11 catastrophe) on the one hand and to issues he intentionally wants to lead people toward (i.e. accepting the upcoming war) on the other, mainly through the strategic use of language.

Theoretical framework

In order to show the relationship existing between a text and the social actor representation, it seems necessary to go over some notions of the theoretical framework of CDA through which such relations are to be examined. CDA deals with “...the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (van Dijk, 2001, p.1). Accordingly, in addition to describing discourse structures, the framework attempts to *explain* these structures with regard to their social structure characteristics and their role in social interactions. So, as it is understood, CDA primarily deals with social problems and tends to reveal the point that “power relations are discursive” (Fairclough and Wodak, as quoted by van Dijk, 1997a). The proponents of this framework maintain that texts are not used just to inform us of certain realities. Rather, they themselves construct the supposedly social reality, based on the ideological standpoints of the person, organization, etc. that is involved in the development of such materials. Focusing on such issues, CDA has therefore turned out to be basically an ideologically oriented framework. CDA is, at the same time, a multidisciplinary domain of study.

Within the framework of CDA, van Leeuwen (1996, p.32) has taken a *sociosemantic* approach “in which social actors can be represented”. In this concern, he maintains that:

?

... the categories I shall propose ... should ,..., be seen as pan-semiotic: a given culture (...) has not only its own, specific array of ways of representing the social world, but also its own specific ways of mapping the different semiotics on to this array, of presenting ,..., what can be realized verbally as well as visually, what only verbally, what only visually... (p.34).

van Leeuwen (1996), in this connection, tends to show “the principle ways in which social actors can be represented in discourse”, (p.65). To do this, he proposes a “network” by which one can categorize social actors. As the notion, network, implies, the division between categories is not so clear-cut and, hence, one social actor may be positioned in or represented by more than one boundary simultaneously. The network attempts to show how different linguistic categories might be used for the purpose of representing a social actor from a particular standpoint. It makes the systematic analysis of discourse possible. Theo van Leeuwen asserts that how “the network brings together what linguists tend to keep separate: it involves a number of distinct lexicogrammatical and discourse-level linguistic systems, transitivity ... because all these systems are involved in the realization of social actors”, (p.67). It is very important to see how social actors are represented in a text since it can then unfold the ideologies and presuppositions hidden in the language used.

van Leeuwen (1996), then, does draw on linguistic notions while trying to show representational options used in a text or talk. In this network, he used three kinds of linguistic transformation, namely “deletion, rearrangement and substitution”, each with a particular linguistic realization, as explained by the writer as follows:

Deletion involves voice, and also nominalization and adjectivalisation, rearrangement principally involves transitivity, while substitution is initially realized by aspects of the structure of the nominal group..., that is, the system of the reference (...) and the Numerative (...) and then by lexis... (p. 67).

The comparison of van Leeuwen's approach to other proponents of CDA indicates that Fairclough (1989, 1995) and Hodge and Kress (1993) talk about the terms "presence/absence" of the social actors and "obscuring" the reality, respectively, while van Leeuwen (1996) introduces other terms known as "exclusion" and "inclusion". These terms are used to show which social actors are excluded/ included to fulfill certain objectives and how this has happened. The excluded social actor may be sent to the background or be completely suppressed, making the interpretation of the text difficult, if not impossible. Exclusion can be very revealing of the ideology residing behind and its effect can be even more significant provided that it is performed in a systematic way.

Furthermore, while Hodge & Kress (1993) introduce "transformation", such as "nominalization", for the effect of making the causal processes less clear, van Leeuwen (1996) discusses "nomination" to show what social actors are identified with what kinds of nomination, "formal, semi-formal", or "informal". This can, also, reveal the writer/speaker's attitude towards certain events or social actors. What is interesting in van Leeuwen's framework is that it provides a subtle and systematic tool for analyzing the text in its context.

Data

As was indicated before, Bush's speech on the September 11, 2002 will constitute the data required to investigate the objectives set up for this study. Our initial investigations showed that the speech could be rich enough to fulfill the study's requirements for data collection. The speech has proved to be a good representative of similar talks, delivered to accomplish certain pre-fabricated objectives; in this talk, as will be evidenced below, the main objective has been to fulfill Bush's intention in capturing people's agreement on starting the war on Iraq.

Data Analysis

President Bush, in his speech on 11 September, 2002, serving as the study's data, attempted to reinforce and relive what he had explicitly

announced in his previous speech delivered immediately after the occurrence of the "event" a year before. In his previous speech, right after the event, he openly declared a war, *a prolonged war against the enemy* residing in the Arab World; the Moslem enemy. In his 11th September 2002 speech, Bush says: "America strives to be tolerant and just. We respect the faith of Islam, even as we fight those whose actions defile that faith" (sentences 47-8).

As can be seen in the above statements, Bush first talks about American's *tolerance*- a term denoting one's reluctance to remember something painful or unpleasant- followed by his direct reference to the word *Islam*, which he respects as a religion, but continues to blame the religion's followers for being responsible for the defilement of the *faith*; he skillfully resorts to such terminologies to let his audience know that they somehow have to bear such people although they don't like them. What Bush apparently emphasizes in his speech comprises freedom and justice, and unity among the American people, although the concept of war- skillfully sent to the background- is omnipresent, underlying all his speech.

From the scio-cultural perspective, the ideas which are absent from the text are usually as important as those expressed explicitly (Fairclough, 1995) since they reveal what is taken as *given* and common sense by the speaker. In this speech also war image is present all through Bush's speech, although not explicitly; The speech can be roughly divided into three sections: a) reviving the agony of the attack; b) highlighting the significance of American unity in combating the enemy, accompanied by the clear-cut distinction made between the audience and the enemy and c) inculcating the significance of retaliation into his audience. All these sections have been skillfully formulated to construct the war image by provoking people's emotions.

In the first nine sentences, intended to revive the agony of the attack, Bush tries to create the atmosphere of anger, fear and horror in people and, in sentence 7, for the first time, he builds up a 'scenario', which will repeat itself in different ways throughout the speech (sentences 39 and 40)

to show that the enemy's threat is real and its consequence can be great (*determined* enemy, gang of *fanatics*...). To ensure the desired effect, Bush resorts to topicalization, such as *remembering the horror, reliving the anguish, re-imagining the terror is hard and painful* (sentence 4). Bush seems to be willing to show and present people's feeling as new information. In so doing, he intends to obtain people's support for his party to confront the enemy. In other words, he wishes to win American support for a war against the 'Enemy' in general and Iraqi regime in particular. Though Bush skillfully evades declaring war against Iraq, he resorts to expressions like 'weapons of mass destruction' to direct public attention toward Saddam and Iraqi regime as well.

Before referring to and activating American unity, Bush attempts to provoke American's sense of patriotism, to highlight the American unity, to raise their emotion towards their homeland by using three consecutive sentences, i.e. sentences 11 through 13, on the *greatness of America*. This is to prepare the audience to think about unity among themselves as some critical decisions are to be made soon. The statements, in fact, tend to create a wave of patriotism. Sentences 17 to 56 center on the notions of 'we', 'us', 'this nation' and 'America'. Using these phrases repeatedly, Bush tries to construct a 'cultural identity', implying that a threat to one American is a threat to all of them, mainly through the strategy of giving thematic role to "we", "this nation" and "America" as well as topicalizing them. Appealing to people's patriotic feeling could facilitate Bush's intention of winning public support for some tough decisions to be made, like confrontation with Iraq. Furthermore, Bush in these sentences draws a line between 'We' and the 'Enemy'; 'We' symbolizes a strong nation, a nation whose people are ready to give their lives or to sacrifice themselves for the sake of establishing freedom and equality among all nations, including their own. He uses the terms 'Us' and America, and other evocative terms to provoke solidarity emotions among the nation. Throughout the speech, Bush represents himself collectively, referring to himself as a member of the community. Unlike his last year speech, this year, he never uses the first person singular pronoun. Instead, he has

repeatedly used the first person plural pronoun 'we' to present himself and his government as an integrated part of the community. He understands the need to generate appealing images of himself and his colleagues, and resorts to a number of examples to do so. He presents himself to the American people, as a person who confronts hardship victoriously and is competent enough to eradicate the mess.

Bush's speech draws on two broad categories of social actors; 'We' American and the 'Enemy'. His speech, in general, accommodates the 'xenophobic' discourses according to which 'We' represents a praiseworthy nation at the expense of downgrading 'Others'. To realize this objective (i.e. admiration vs. humiliation) the pronoun 'we' has been employed 23 times, as an "included" social actor whereas the term 'enemy' has been "excluded" (as 'others') so frequently, resulting in an application ratio of 3.3 to 1 (table 1, below). When Bush wishes to display people as active and dynamic ones who are capable of making decisions, he resorts to the strategy of "inclusion", with objectives different from those achievable through "exclusion" strategy which is adopted to primarily target certain social actors or events as given or common sense idea that is less likely to be challenged by the audience. There are good examples of what is referred to as "hide/highlight" in CDA, according to which, those ideas that are hidden are eventually less explicit than those highlighted. This strategy could enable the speaker/writer to resort to certain explicit ideas to provoke the audience emotionally while, at the same time, concealing the main objectives underlying the speech, leading the audience toward the acceptance of the speaker's preplanned targets. This would enable the speaker to have the upper hand in emerging victorious in case the audience discovers the hidden agenda and, accordingly, chooses to complain about or resist the speaker's stance. In other words, the speaker would find it easy to categorically deny the existence of any intentions other than those explicitly referred to. The following table displays Bush's attempt in using the strategies of 'exclusion/inclusion to represent the social actors.

Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion in Bush's speech

	Inclusion	Exclusion	
		Backgrounding	Suppression
Enemy	7	0	3
We	23	1	1

When a social actor is *suppressed*, according to van Leeuwen (1996), we have actually excluded both the social actors and their actions. No trace is remained for the audience to compensate for the removed actors or their activities. This, nevertheless, can affect the audience in two opposing ways, either completely ignoring them, hence aggravating their absence or, on the other hand, generalizing their negative representation to the whole community of OTHERS. This depends, of course, on how the social actor is *excluded*. *Suppression*, as a subcategory of exclusion, *may* be realized through different grammatical forms, one of which is 'nominalization'. In the case of the following expressions, the role of the suppressed social actors seems to be intensified in example 1, while the same role can be generalized to include every single American in example 2; meanwhile, in example 3, it is not clear, from that very sentence, who is responsible for the 'loss of so many lives', provoking the audience to put the blame on OTHERS:

- The attack on our nation was an attack on the ideals that make us a nation.
- And remembering the horror, reliving the anguish, re-imagining the terror is hard and painful.
- The loss of so many lives left us to examine our own.

Usually the interpretation of a suppressed social actor is not that easy and one can only determine the role by resorting to different texts and comparing them in relation to the same issue (van Leeuwen, 1996). In contrast, the social actor sent into the background, may be more easily interpreted and compensated by the audience. It can be realized grammatically through present or past participle as well as infinitive with to, where the social actor appears in the same text (van Leeuwen, 1996).

A final remark worth mentioning is that the so-called included/excluded statements, statistically speaking, might not be so considerable in number to write and, hence, might seem to be too trivial to deserve a detailed account of their nature. Nevertheless, qualitatively speaking, they are worth mentioning in the sense that they indicate the ways social actor roles are represented.

In order to find out the type of role and the reason accounting for the assignment of a role to a particular social actor, a few remarks are in order. To begin with, allocating roles in representation seems to be a strategic decision adopted to serve the speaker/writer purposes, as is understood from van Leeuwen's (1996, p.43) statement that representation *can reallocate roles, rearrange the social relations between the participants*. Moreover, role allocation is not materialized in vacuum; rather, it normally occurs in certain social/ political contexts with predetermined purposes. Hence, regarding the September 11 speech, it seems imperative to investigate the type of social roles being allocated, the type of contexts used and the sort of objective(s) followed.

Table 2: Role Allocation in Bush's Speech

	Activation	Passivation	
		Subjection	Beneficialisation
Enemy	5	4	0
We	21	4	1

In the September 11 speech, Bush takes the strategy of provoking hostile emotions against non-American. This, in part, is brought about via the roles assigned to the social actors, which are identified by the terms 'Enemy' and 'We' in the speech. Bush takes the strategy of "positive-self representation" (van Dijk, 1997b, p.33) in his speech; and this self presentation seems to have been greatly demanded, considering the time and place where the speech is delivered. At this time of the year, one year after the event, being present at the same place makes it necessary to campaign for a new sense of patriotism by resorting to nationwide

appealing terms like "We" as a great nation and so forth. Such appealing terms make up the *framing* (Huckin, n.d., p. 5) of his speech. Framing refers to the way the text is presented in addition to the *perspective (angle, slant) the writer is taking*.

What is interesting is that 'We' is realized through active statements whenever they are to be represented as the agents of highly praised and positive actions. The reverse is true with the term 'Enemy' who is represented in active voice whenever his/her harsh action is depicted, as shown below:

- Each of us was reminded that we are here only for a time.
- The attack on our nation was also an attack on the ideals that make us a nation.
- We resolved a year ago to honor every last person lost
- And we will not allow any terrorist or tyrant to threaten civilization with weapons of mass murder. (the enemy subjected)

With respect to the 'positive self representation' (1997b, p. 33) asserts that *the policies or standpoints of our group are represented as altruism*. In so doing they provoke the *negative other representation* along with upholding self-presentation. In so doing, Bush has provided the audience with a list of 'What WE respect' as follows:

Table 3: Examples of the sort of ideas respected by We

- Life is precious
- To live in liberty
- To live in equality
- To value every life
- To seek freedom

And all these, according to Bush, are denied by the enemy who is mostly represented by socially negative terminologies like 'terrorist', 'gang of fanatics', 'darkness', etc. Americans are represented as protectors of humanity, while the enemies as the representation of horror and violence. But who is the enemy? At the outset there is one 'unanimous' enemy, whose identity is shown in terms of his action, but as

the president moves forward the idea leads to a number of 'enemies' whose identities are not unknown any more. What is obvious, according to Bush, is that the attackers are not American: Rather, they are foreigners and belong to a different religious group who are implicitly known to belong to Islamic factions, coming from certain Islamic states. In sentence 47, Bush explicitly declares his respect for Islam, but immediately continues to use a 'disclaimer', implying that the enemy should be a Moslem. As van Dijk (1997b, p.15) suggests, his claim might be just *a strategic form of impression management and positive self-presentation, engaged in to disclaim possible prejudice or racism his audience might attribute to him.*

War representation in Bush's Speech

Bearing in mind numerous representations on 'exclusion'/inclusion' and 'role allocation' enumerated and discussed thus far, the paper will now proceed to focus on the image of war which is present all through Bush's speech. At the outset, he attempts to inculcate the attack image into the audience mind, to instigate a sense of horror and apprehension. He further tends to instantiate the idea that the threat is still in action,, that the enemies are 'determined' and that all those representing 'We' *are not invulnerable to their attack.* This can set the stage for the final episode of the play; i.e. starting the *war*, which requires that Bush could capture the audience's both consensus and positive reply. To achieve this, he employs different strategies, namely using 'collectivized', nationwide appealing terms, such as 'we', 'this nation', 'American', etc., which could help to promote the audience's agreement along with a sense of patriotism, resulting in the construction of a unanimous war idea nationwide.

In sentence 17, he implicitly introduces the need for action:

- And these counted days should be filled with things that last and matter.

But how should these objectives be achieved is deliberately suppressed in his talk. Using this strategy has the advantage of the underlying idea being denied by the speaker in case it could stimulate a social resistance. Bush, after talking about the *counted* days, goes on to remind the

audience of the obligation they have toward those who have lost their lives and their families, followed by degradation and abstraction of the enemy, while he carries on to employ patriotic terms like "Us" and "We" to revitalize the strength and unity of the American people and, at the same time, want them to hear 'history's call', i.e. to attack the "enemy". Instead of explicitly talking of the war, he relies on the 'social memory', which has already been constructed by the media in general. People, based on their personal experience and social and cultural memory will most probably understand that the history's call is a retaliating 'war' and 'our answer' should entail people's active involvement in the war. However, if there arose a strong opposition against the war, the speaker could deny his underlying intention altogether. This is referred to as insinuations by Huckin (n.d., P. 5) in the sense that such expressions *are comments that are slyly suggestive*. The audience, then, may not be able to challenge such ideas since the idea is not stated directly.

Next, Bush continues to talk about the positive features of Americans, known as 'positive self representation' as:

- Our nation is patient and steadfast.
- This statement allows the interpretation that people are ready to defend their country and attack the enemy 'across the world' because they 'threaten civilization with weapons of mass murder'

Then, after constructing the scenario that the enemy's threat is imminent, Bush states that:

- We will not relent until justice is done and our nation is secure.

In this way, he tries to legitimize war against the enemy. Again the 'howness' of the action, i.e. the manner of staging the war, has been suppressed. The above sentence is immediately followed by the point that *we will finish what our enemies have begun*. As to how will they manage to finish the enemy's action is not mentioned at all; rather, it is expected to have been formed in the mind of the audience. In sentence 48, for the first time the word 'fight' is used, followed by the justification for being involved in the upcoming war. That is, they fight for a greater cause; for defending themselves and bringing about freedom. In addition, he resorts to euphemism to talk about war. In so doing, the 'war', though

understood by the nation through their shared social memory, is both suppressed strongly and given a different feature from that widely known by the nation; that is, war is depicted as a 'journey' (in sentence 54). This makes the issue of war look like a rather simple adventure, involving little risks for American soldiers being involved in the war. Furthermore, it is a 'mission', implying people's obligation in getting involved in the war.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As proponents of CDA maintain, texts (written or spoken) are not, as commonly perceived, to inform us of some reality, as it virtually occurs; rather, based on the ideological inclination and the purpose of their speakers/writers, texts tend primarily to construct the reality as they would like to. In this concern, the current study made an attempt to identify the strategies Bush employed to represent the concept of *war* in his 11th September speech, using certain pre-fabricated socio-political inclinations. In order to win people's support, for his particular interpretation of the 'war' and, accordingly, plan for the following moves that are the covertly implied real intentions, underlying the speech, Bush seems to be completely aware that, in the first place, he needs to generate an appealing image of himself and his country, if he is to meet his underlying objectives successfully. At the same time, he knows pretty well that he has to create a negative image of the enemy. In order to achieve these targets, i.e. a positive image of his allies versus a negative picture of the enemy, he resorts to the inclusion/exclusion strategy to first guarantee the unity among the nation and to misrepresent the enemy. He presents the American people, including himself, as those who "Value every life" (sentence 25) and misrepresents the enemy as those who *value none*. Such expressions are intended to make the nation ready, at least mentally, for accepting the use of force against their brutal "enemy". Bush understands that American people should feel that they are strong enough to defeat the enemy. This is what Bush tries to inject throughout his speech as appears in sentence 38: "This nation has defeated tyrants and liberated death camps, raised the lamp of liberty to every captive land."

The linguistic tool employed by Bush to generate a grandiose image of Americans among the audience is based on the strategy of *activation*, which would display the social actors which are remarkably active and powerful to pave the ground for initiating action. In addition to incarnating the grandiose feeling among Americans, Bush is well aware that he should portray the attackers as strong but wicked enemies in order to justify the need for the instigation of an extensive war against them. This could account for Bush's statement (sentence 8) that "we are not invulnerable to their attacks". Bush employs linguistic strategies, to show that *we* are great nation and hence can victoriously defeat the *enemy*. This will guarantee *our* victory against the *enemy*. Such strategies will encourage the audience to get involved in the war directly, or at least choose to support it indirectly. In this speech it is noticed that the most frequently *included* social actors are: *we*, *American*, while the most frequently back grounded or suppressed ones are the attackers, or the *enemies*. All the positive actions are carried out by *We Americans* while the *enemy*, except for few cases, is sent to the *background* or even is *suppressed*. This may encourage different interpretations, of which can be that the *enemy* is omnipresent and *we* should be aware of that, justifying and legitimizing war against the enemy. In addition, by foregrounding *We*, Bush and his audience are represented as great and competent nations, being able to defeat the *enemy* easily to liberate the American and even the whole world. In addition to *activation*, the application of *collectivized* words as *we*, *Americans*, *this nation* has been very effective in signaling agreement among the nation. This strategy is used to relive people's spirit and provide a positive and strong image of Americans as well as creating a wave of patriotism nationwide.

To conclude, the analysis is carried out to show that the 'howness' of a text might be as crucial as its 'whatness'. Above all, this study tends to focus on the amazing power of language in representing events and realities of our world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to express their sincere gratitude to Dr. L. Yar Mohammadi, whose invaluable advice, particularly in relation to the wonders of CDA, made the execution of this study possible.

REFERENCES

- Blommaert, J. & Bulcaen, C. (1997). *Political linguistics*. The Netherlands: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Huckin, T. N. (n.d.) *Social approaches (6)*, *Critical discourse analysis*. Retrieved from: http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pubs/BR/functionalse3_6.htm
- Jucker, A. H. (1997). Persuasion by inference: Analysis of a party political Broadcast. In J. B. Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political linguistics*, pp. 121-139. The Netherlands: John Benjamin publishing Company.
- Silberstein, S. (2002). *War of words*. London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*, pp. 352-371. Oxford: Blackwell.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997a). *Political discourse and political cognition* Printed at Congress Political Discourse, Aston University.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997b). What is political discourse analysis. In J. B. Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political linguistics*, pp. 11-53. The Netherlands: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of discourse. In C. R. C. Coulthard and M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Text and Practices*, pp. 32-71. London: Routledge.

APPENDIX

Good evening.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A long year has passed since enemies attacked our country. 2. We've seen the images so many times, 3. They are seared on our souls, 4. And remembering the horror, reliving the anguish, re-imagining the terror is hard and painful. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. For those who lost loved ones, it's been a year of sorrow, of empty places, of newborn children who will never know their fathers here on earth. 6. For members of our military, it's been a year of sacrifice and service far from home. |
|---|---|

7. For all Americans, it has been a year of adjustment, of coming to terms with the difficult knowledge that our nation has determined enemies
8. And that we are not invulnerable to their attacks.
9. Yet in the events that have challenged us,
10. We've also seen the character that will deliver us.
11. We've seen the greatness of America in airline passengers who defied their hijackers and ran a plane into the ground to spare the lives of others.
12. We've seen the greatness of America in rescuers who rushed up flights of stairs toward peril, and
13. We continue to see the greatness of America in the care-and compassion our citizens show to each other.
14. September the 11th, 2001 will always be a fixed point in the life of America.
15. The loss of so many lives left us to examine our own.
16. Each of us was reminded that we are here only for a time.
17. And these counted days should be filled with things that last and matter: love for our families, love for our neighbors and for our country, gratitude for life and to the giver of life.
18. We resolved a year ago to honor every last person lost.
19. We owe them remembrance, and
20. We owe them more.
21. We owe them and their children, and our own, the most enduring monument we can build, a world of liberty and security, made possible by the way America leads and by the way Americans lead our lives.
22. The attack on our nation was also an attack on the ideals that make us a nation.
23. Our deepest national conviction is that every life is precious, because every life is the gift of a creator who intended us to live in liberty and equality.
24. More than anything else, this separates us from the enemy we fight.
25. We value every life.
26. Our enemies value none, not even the innocent, not even their own.
27. And we seek the freedom and opportunity that give meaning and value to life.
28. There is a line in our time, and in every time, between those who believe that all men are created equal and those who believe that some men and women and children are expendable in the pursuit of power.
29. There is a line in our time and in every time between the defenders of human liberty and those who seek to master the minds and souls of others.
30. Our generation has now heard history's call,
31. And we will answer it.
32. America has entered a great struggle that tests our strength and even more our resolve.
33. Our nation is patient and steadfast.
34. We continue to pursue the terrorists in cities and camps and caves across the Earth.

35. We are joined by a great coalition of nations to rid the world of terror.
36. And we will not allow any terrorist or tyrant to threaten civilization with weapons of mass murder.
37. Now and in the future, Americans will live as free people, not in fear and never at the mercy of any foreign plot or power.
38. This nation has defeated tyrants and liberated death camps, raised this lamp of liberty to every captive land.
39. We have no intention of ignoring or appeasing history's latest gang of fanatics trying to murder their way to power.
40. They are discovering, as others before them, the resolve of a great country and a great democracy.
41. In the ruins of two towers, under a flag unfurled at the Pentagon, at the funerals of the lost, we have made a sacred promise to ourselves and to the world:
42. We will not relent until justice is done and our nation is secure.
43. What our enemies have begun,
44. We will finish.
45. I believe there's a reason that history has matched this nation with this time.
46. America strives to be tolerant and just.
47. We respect the faith of Islam,
48. Even as we fight those whose actions defile that faith.
49. We fight not to impose our will, but to defend ourselves and extend the blessings of freedom.
50. We cannot know all that lies ahead.
51. Yet we do know that God has placed us together in this moment to grieve together, to stand together, to serve each other and our country.
52. And the duty we have been given,
53. Defending America and our freedom is also a privilege we share.
54. We're prepared for this journey.
55. And our prayer tonight is that God will see us through and keep us worthy.
56. Tomorrow is September the 12th.
57. A milestone has passed,
58. And a mission goes on.
59. Be confident;
60. Our country is strong.
61. And our cause is even larger than our country.
62. Ours is the cause of human dignity, freedom guided by conscience and guarded by peace.
63. This ideal of America is the hope of all mankind.
64. That hope drew millions to this harbor.
65. That hope still lights our way.
66. And the light shines in the darkness,
67. And the darkness will not overcome it.
68. May God bless America.