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Abstract

This paper is investigating how metaphors are used in political speeches to achieve persuasion. By analyzing three speeches dealing with the 2003 Iraq war delivered by Bush, Blair and Howard, I try to find out the similarities and differences in how metaphors are constructed; how they are used as a persuasive technique; and lastly if the different military contribution of the three countries affected how metaphors are constructed. The main theory used in this study is Critical Metaphor Analysis suggested by Charteris-Black (2011). The analysis suggests that the speeches contain different kinds of metaphors like THE-STATE-AS-PERSON metaphor, the POLITICS IS BUSINESS metaphor and JOURNEY metaphors. The analysis also suggests that Bush, Blair and Howard make use of THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario as well as THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym. Metaphors are generally found to be used in a similar way in order to show that the politicians are ‘right’. Still, there are some differences that could be attributed to the different military contributions of the countries and their different roles in the war.
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1. Introduction

Investigating the conceptual role of metaphor in relation to discourse is a topic that continues to be of interest to scholars since the publishing of Lakoff and Johnson’s book *Metaphors we live by* (1980). How conceptual metaphor is utilized to communicate ideologies in political discourse is of interest to many scholars (e.g. Zinken, 2003; Lule, 2004; Charteris-Black, 2004-2011; Musolff, 2012; Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012; Lawton, 2013). Rojo López and Orts Llopis (2010) have studied the role of conceptual metaphor in financial texts and how the use of metaphors can enhance the approval of the argumentation of a politician. Closely related to the present study, which is concerned with how metaphors are utilized as a persuasive strategy in wartimes, is a study conducted by Sahlane (2013). Sahlane compared the use of metaphor by pro-war and anti-war-parties to the 2003 Iraq war. This examination revealed how different kinds of metaphors were used for argumentative purposes.

The present study examines how metaphors are used as an argumentative strategy in pro-war political discourse in order to persuade the audience of the rightness of invading Iraq (2003). It is based on a comparative analysis of three pro-war speeches delivered by George W. Bush, Tony Blair and John Howard. The three politicians belong to three different countries: US, UK and Australia respectively. In conducting a comparative analysis of the use of conceptual metaphor in political rhetoric, this study aims to complement the existing body of research. The present study is employing Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) as suggested by Charteris-Black (2011) to the data. Thus the theoretical basis and linguistics concepts used in the analyses are situated within a cognitive linguistics framework. Metaphors are identified and analyzed through using the Metaphor Identification Procedure’ (MIP) suggested by the Pragglejaz Group (2007). The study shows that the three politicians used metaphors to achieve persuasion. All three have made use of different metaphors. Still, they vary in the way they used metaphors which could be attributed to their real role and contribution to the war or their previous social experiences.

This study complements the existing literature on the complex issues of ideology and metaphor as a conceptually-based strategy in rhetoric by studying three different speeches given by three different politicians and trying to explore the aspects of similarities and dissimilarities in the use of metaphors.
The present study consists of eight sections, starting with the aim of the study, followed by a presentation of the theoretical framework and the adopted methodology, and ending with the analysis of the data and a discussion of the results.
2. **Aim and research questions**

The present paper examines three political speeches given by Bush, Blair and Howard who are the representatives of the US, the UK and Australia respectively. The speeches were given in the course of the 2003 Iraq war. By exploring these three speeches, this study aims to answer the following questions:

➢ What are the similarities/dissimilarities between the uses of metaphors by the three politicians?
➢ How do the three politicians use metaphors as a persuasive technique?
➢ In what way does the diverse military contribution of the three countries in the Iraq war affect how the politicians portray the role of their countries in the war metaphorically?

It is mention worthy that the present study only explores metaphors that are used by two or more of the three statesmen. Although I realize the importance of studying individual uses of metaphors and how that might reveal other aspects of how metaphors are used cognitively, metaphors that are used by only one statesman will not be explored in this essay. This is because one of the main aims of the present study is to compare how the three statesmen used the same metaphors, and whether they used metaphors in the same way.
3. Theoretical framework

3.1. Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) is of great interest to critical studies that are concerned mostly in propping the cognitive and discursive strategies in different types of discourse including political discourse (Musolff, 2012, p. 302). The theory was developed by Lakoff & Johnson (1980). According to Lakoff & Johnson “The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 9). Conceptually, metaphor is regarded as a “cognitive operation” in which different domains of knowledge and experiences are pulled together (Chilton, 2005, p. 22; Musolff, 2012, p. 302). Due to its conceptual orientation, metaphor is regarded as a “vehicle for understanding” and an essential factor in constructing “social realities” (Musolff, 2012, p. 302). According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), the source domain tends to be physically and socially situated whereas the target domain tends to be more abstract (pp. 156-160).

Lakoff and Johnson suggest that most of the ordinary conceptual system – how we think and act – is “fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 8). They describe the relation between the conceptual system and metaphor as follows:

The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor. (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, p. 4)

Conceptual metaphor is realized linguistically in many different metaphorical expressions which use different cross-domain mappings within the same general model. In order to make it clear how metaphors shape the conceptual system, Lakoff and Johnson give many examples to show how metaphors work. An example from everyday language is the metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR:

---

Your claims are indefensible.

He attacked every weak point in my argument. His criticisms were right on target.

I demolished his argument. I've never won an argument with him.

You disagree? Okay, shoot!

If you use that strategy, he'll wipe you out.

He shot down all of my arguments. (2003, p. 4)

The mapping of our experience from the source domain WAR onto the target domain ARGUMENT affects how we understand the target domain. Our understanding of WAR is triggered by expressions such as: indefensible, attack, target and so on, which shape the argument and affect how we understand it (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 8). Even if the WAR is metaphorical and not real, we still structure our argument according to the concept of WAR. We do not only ‘talk’ but we ‘think’ about the argument in terms and phrases of war such as: we can win or lose, use strategies, the argument has weak points, we can attack the opponent, defend our position, etc. The metaphor structures our action in the ARGUMENT (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 4). Metaphors have the power to highlight certain aspects of an argument while hiding others. In the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor, the competitive aspect of battle is highlighted whereas the cooperative aspect of it is hidden (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 10).

3.2. Critical Metaphor Analysis

The conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) developed by Lakoff & Johanson was dubbed by Charteris-Black as ‘Critical Metaphor Analysis’ (Musolff, 2012, p. 303). In the present study the term ‘Critical Metaphor Analysis’ is used as it suits its analytical purposes and considers the essence of the conceptual metaphor theory at the same time. Political argument is persuasive in nature and based on using effective rhetorical methods for demonstrating the advantages of the speaker’s policy, on the one hand, and the disadvantages of his/her opponent’s policy, on the other hand (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 1). Charteris-Black argues that metaphor with its cognitive effectiveness is essential for persuasion. Investigating the systematic choices of metaphor is necessary in order to make the purpose clearer (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 3). Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) explores how rhetoric is used to reach legitimation (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 3).
This approach has three stages: identifying the metaphor, interpreting it and explaining it (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 45).

In order to examine how rhetoric can be persuasive, Charteris-Black has relied on Aristotle’s rhetoric artistic proofs: pathos, logos and ethos (Charteris-Black, 2011, p.7). Charteris-Black argues that being ‘right’ is a prerequisite for being legitimate and consequently persuasive (see Figure 1).
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**Figure 1.** Rhetorical means for persuasion in political discourse (adapted from Charteris-Black, 2011, p.14).

As Figure 1 shows, a politician can be ‘right’ and thus achieve persuasion by having the right intention, right thinking, sounding right and telling the right story. In order for the speaker to gain the audience’s trust, s/he has to convince the audience that s/he has the ‘right intention’. Politicians are considered to have the right intention if they express their concern about the social matters that ultimately benefit the people (Charteris-Black, 2011, pp. 13, 311). Furthermore, morality and integrity are crucial in order to persuade the audience that the politician has the right intention (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 311). ‘Thinking right’ involves rationality in the reasoning of political
issues. Using metaphor can be helpful in showing rationality of reasoning if it is utilized to bring
to the mind of the audience some familiar experience which they can associate with more complex
issues of state management (Charteris-Black, 2011, p.35-36). ‘Sounding right’ entails the
emotional impact of the politician’s discourse that should reflect the social emotions of the state
and sharing that with citizens. It is crucial for legitimization and trustworthiness to show that the
addressee is involved emotionally with those addressed and shares their socio-cultural grounded
emotions (Sornig, 1989, pp. 97-98). In short, sounding right is about creating a suitable emotional
atmosphere for persuasion (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 15). Lastly, ‘telling the right story,’
according to Charteris-Black, could be achieved through the creation of a ‘myth’ which has an
appeal to reason and emotion. ‘Telling the right story’ or creating the ‘myth’ is about giving
explanations and reasons for political choices that appeal to the audience’s previous experiences
(Charteris-Black, 2011, p.15). The creation of the ‘myth’ involves positively representing one
party while negatively representing the counterparty in order to legitimize the argumentation
(Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 40).

3.2.1. Persuasion and metaphor
Persuasion is defined as one party convincing another with a particular point of view through the
means of language (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 13). Persuasion “refers to the intention, act and effect
of changing an audience’s thinking” (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 13). It is a complex multi-layer
process; it is the outcome of the interaction between intention, linguistic choices and the context
(Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 51). The process of persuasion relies on different methods that can be
referred to as ‘rhetoric’ (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 13). Rhetoric refers to the methods used by the
speaker to achieve persuasion apart from his/her “intention, action and effect” (Charteris-Black,
2011, p. 13). Metaphor is closely connected to the cognitive mechanism of persuasion being used
to illustrate one point and discard any other alternative options or views (Charteris-Black, 2011,
p. 32). In the overall persuasive methods of political discourse, metaphor is commonly used to
draw a mental picture or a way of understanding ‘us’ and ‘them’. Bad qualities/deeds (using
metaphors) are attributed to the out-group (them) and good qualities/deeds are attributed to the in-
group (us) (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 32).
3.3. The metaphorical structure of foreign policy

The data chosen to be analyzed in this paper is a pro-war argumentation which is why the present study makes use of Lakoff’s (2009)² model of the metaphorical systems of the foreign policy in times of war. In a paper exploring how the American politicians used metaphors to argue in favor of the Gulf war (1991), Lakoff identified many metaphorical systems use in time of war. Among those systems, there are five systems that the present study makes use of. This is because the metaphorical systems suggested by Lakoff are based on his analysis of the Gulf War though some of the metaphors he found in his study were not found in this present study. The following are the metaphorical systems the present study makes use of:

1. **STATE-AS-PERSON.** The state is conceptualized as a PERSON engaged in social relation, having family, friends and enemies. States could be peaceful or aggressive (Lakoff, 2009, p.7).

2. **THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario.** It is a conflict to settle moral accounts (Lakoff, 2009, p. 7). The cast of the just war has three characters the hero, a victim - which could also be the hero- and a villain. The struggle in THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario is based on a moral cause. The moral cause is usually punishing the villain for his evil deeds which could be the outcome of two possible causes: self-defense against an act of aggression committed by the villain or a rescue mission for someone assaulted by the villain (Lakoff, 2009,p.8). Closely connected to THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario is THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym.

3. **THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym.** The RULER stands for the STATE and thus can play the hero or the villain role in THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario.

4. **POLITICS IS BUSINESS.** The system is used to understand actions intended to achieve certain gains but might turn to have some negative results. It applies the notion from the domain of BUSINESS to POLITICS in the sense that a wise management to the BUSINESS equals wise management of POLITICS (Lakoff, 2009, p.7).

² The original article was published 1991 but I am using a reprint published 2009.
5. RISKS AND GAMBLES. This strategy aims at certain gains but this gain is subject to risks and the possibility of losses.

3.4. The conflict frame and the fear strategy

How persuasion is emotionally effective has been analyzed by Ferrari (2007), who studied how PERSONIFICATION is employed to persuade an audience. She found that persuasion was constructed on what she called the “conflict frame”. This frame is based on arousing different emotions with the aim to convince the audience (p. 603). As mentioned above, THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario employs PERSONIFICATION so that STATES can be perceived in terms of PERSONS. Within the frame of THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario two characters could be distinguished from each other, the ‘hero’ or the ‘us’ group and the ‘villain’ or the ‘them’ group. By associating bad qualities to the ‘them’ group and good qualities to the ‘us’ group, the conflict frame is established. An important strategy is used to construct the conflict frame, which is the ‘fear strategy’. The fear strategy is a persuasive attitude which works by strategically evoking two opposed emotions: fear and confidence (Ferrari, 2007, p.614). By discursively constructing two spaces – the internal space, or the space of confidence, and the external space, or the space of fear, - the audience is persuaded emotionally (Ferrari, 2007, p.614). The conflict frame is what constructs the internal and external spaces in which fear coincides with ‘them’ represented as threat, and confidence coincides with ‘us’ represented as a life of protection and tranquility (Ferrari, 2007, p.617).
4. The social context

When analyzing the role of metaphor in political discourse using CMA, it is crucial to study the social context. It is impossible to understand the cognitive implications of the metaphorical use of language without associating it with the complementary social context where it took place (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 50). Chilton (2004) notes that a text does not hold the meaning in itself but rather from the audience’s previous experiences. Recognizing the importance of the context to CMA, a brief summary of the socio-political context is found in this section. The intention is to illuminate the different aspects/perspectives of social life at the historical time within which the texts under analysis take place.

In this section I am making use of a diversity of secondary resources consisting of media and law in order to provide another version of reality other than what the primary data (i.e., the three political speeches) presents. By so doing, I aim to give a clearer picture of how the layman perceived and reacted to the issue of war.

4.1. The role of the media

On September 11, 2001, a series of terrorist attacks and airline hijackings committed by 19 militia associated with the Islamic extremist group al-Qaeda were committed against targets in the US (Bergen, 2016). Two planes hit the World Trade Center’s tower, one hit the Pentagon, and the last crashed in a field in Pennsylvania (Bergen, 2016). The attacks resulted in vast destruction with over 3,000 people dead and approximately 10,000 injuries. The emotional stress caused by the attacks - especially the collapse of the World Trade Towers- was overwhelming (Bergen, 2016). Later that day, the President of the United States, George W. Bush addressed the nation and declared the “war on terror” (WoT). He vowed to punish those who attacked America and their supporters (Bergen, 2016). Troops were sent to Afghanistan in order to vanquish Al-Qaeda and find Osama bin Laden, its mastermind. Approximately two years later on March 18, 2003, despite a lack of evidence relating the Iraqi regime with Al-Qaeda, Bush declared war on Iraq as a part of the broad war on terror (Bergen, 2016).

The officially stated reason of the war was to disarm Saddam Hussein and overpower his army because of his possession of weapons of mass destruction, his support for terrorism and to liberate the Iraqi people from the tyrant ruling regime. Pres. Bush and his administration advocated
the war in Iraq, but what about the American people? A survey conducted by CNN/US today and published on February 10, 2003, showed that 63% of Americans were in favor of military action to disarm Saddam Hussein. 49% were afraid of other attacks on America that might cost them family members or friends while 66% were afraid that this attack might be within the coming weeks. The approval rate for Bush’s policies reached 61% (CNN.com/U.S, 2003). Another series of public opinion polls conducted by The Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) from January 2003 through September that year, found that there were three main misperceptions related to the pro-war attitude of 60% of Americans. These include the belief that evidence linking Iraq to Al Qaeda was found and consequently, Iraq was involved in the 9/11 attacks, the belief that weapons of mass destruction (WMD) were found in Iraq, and lastly that the world public opinion approved the decision of war against Iraq (WorldPublicOpinion.org, 2003). The research team conducted further investigations to determine the source of misconceptions and concluded that the media was responsible. Additionally, in cases where the participants in the poll tended to get their information from printed newspapers and books they were more prone to disapprove the war decision. On the other hand, the participants who relied on news channels to gain their information tended to support the decision of war. (Kramer and Michalowski, 2005, pp. 461-62) pinpointed that the media failed to provide a correct assessment for the claims of the Bush administration which affected the audience and pushed them to believe that the government decision was the right thing to do. Another primary source of the misleading, partial information that led to these misperceptions, was the war marketing campaign launched by the Bush administration with the aim to gain public support for the war (Kramer and Michalowski, 2005, p. 461-462). In this campaign people with high ranks were addressing the people through different media channels to persuade them that the decision of war was right (Kramer and Michalowski, 2005, p. 462).

Even though the present study focuses only on the examination of three speeches given by Bush, Blair and Howard, it is still important to realize that the British and Australian roles were more or less supportive while the US was the one who led the war. To quote Pres. Bush’s own words: “America's determination to lead the world in confronting that threat” (Bush, October 7, 2002).
4.2. Legality of the war

It is beyond the scope of this paper to explore any political stance or analytical hypothesis of the political life at the time of the Iraq war. Political rhetoric with its persuasive end is based on the mechanism of argumentation (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p.1). That is why it is crucial to pinpoint the full argumentation of the waging of war on Iraq in order to create a comprehensive image of the social context. War was sold to the audience as a legitimate war assuming that the US and its allies were authorised from the Security Council to disarm Iraq by force:

In the case of Iraq, the Security Council did act, in the early 1990s. Under Resolutions 678 and 687 -- both still in effect -- *the United States and our allies are authorized to use force in ridding Iraq of weapons of mass destruction*. This is not a question of authority, it is a question of will (Bush, lines 35-37. Italics mine)

According to Bush, the US and its allies are acting in a legal way to disarm Iraq as they are authorized to use force according to two resolutions issued by the Security Council back in 1990. The United Nation’s charter states that no country has the right to attack another country except in three cases. Those cases include self-defense against an armed attack, if this country is authorized by the UN Security Council to attack another state that seems to breach the international peace, or thirdly, for "humanitarian intervention" (Jagger, 2003). Iraq did not attack the United States nor did its government threaten to do so (Kramer and Michalowski, 2005, p. 449). So what were the legitimate causes of the war?

Kramer and Michalowski argue that the Bush administration linked the Iraqi regime to Al-Qaeda and the attack of September 11th with no sufficient proof. On that basis, the war would be legitimized as self-defense (2005, p. 449). Soon, the United States, United Kingdom, and Spain sought to get support from the UN in their war against Iraq but failed due to the strong opposition of Germany, France and Russia (Kramer and Michalowski, 2005, p. 449). A draft resolution was developed stating that Iraq had breached the disarming resolution and so would be regarded as a threat to international peace. If they had succeeded in gaining UN approval, this would have led to the legitimation of the war against Iraq under authorization from the UN. It is worth noting that the previous speeches given by the Bush administration rarely bore any traces of humanitarian
reasons behind the war in the beginning (Kramer and Michalowski, 2005, p. 450). Only after the failed attempt to gain the support of the United Nations, who found no reliable evidence confirming the link between the Iraqi regime and Al-Qaeda, the humanitarian reasons become the final resort to legitimize the war on Iraq (Kramer and Michalowski, 2005, p. 449-450).
5. Method

Throughout the present study, Charteris-Black’s methodology of CMA (2011) is applied to the data. Thus, the critical analysis of the text underwent three stages: identifying the metaphor, interpreting it and then explaining it with relevance to its rhetoric purpose i.e. persuasion. Identifying the metaphor is done through applying the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) suggested by the Pragglejaz Group (2007). MIP has four steps as follows:

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse.
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
   (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be:
      — More concrete [what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste];
      — Related to bodily action;
      — More precise (as opposed to vague);
      — Historically older;
   Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.
   (c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning and can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical. (Pragglejaz Group, 2007,p.3)

Charteris-Black (2004) employed the exact same procedure suggested by the Pragglejaz Group but without “formalizing” or “testing” his approach as suggested by Steen (2010: 6). Charteris-Black states that identifying metaphor is done by comparing the actual meaning of the word as well as the textual meaning to see whether or not the word has been used out of its “basic sense”
In the process of identifying metaphors, I made use of *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (Rundell & Fox, 2002) which is a corpus-based dictionary. The main reason to use this dictionary is that it is based on a corpus that is relatively recent which is of a major importance to the present study’s exploration of contemporary discourse. For the second stage, interpretation, following Charteris-Black’s steps, the present paper relies on Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) conceptual metaphor theory. The primary assumption of this theory is that the concrete physically-biased human experience is associated to the abstract non-physical denotation of the metaphor (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 45). The third stage is to explain the implication of the use of the metaphor. This is done by contrasting the basic meaning with the contextual meaning and trying to figure out the implication of this relation and how it is related to the politician’s ideology.
6. Data

For qualitative reasons and due to limitations, the data is restricted. As shown in Table 1 below, the research involved three political speeches given by George W. Bush, Tony Blair and John Howard on March 17, 2003, March 20, 2003 and March 20, 2003 respectively which is the same day as the start of the invasion. The speeches consist of 1768, 679 and 1168 words respectively.

Table 1. A comparison between the three speeches and the military contribution of each country at the start of the Iraq war on 20 March, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politician</th>
<th>Date of speech</th>
<th>Words count</th>
<th>Military troops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Bush</td>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>150,000 (the USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Blair</td>
<td>March 20</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>28,000 (the UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Howard</td>
<td>March 20</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>2,000 (Australia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 shows, the US sent 150,000 troops to the Iraq war, the UK sent 28,000 troops while Australia sent 2,000 troops. (Aljazeera, 2011) The variation of the military contribution is given special attention in the present study because it may affect the role of each country in the hierarchy of the war leadership which, in turn, might be reflected in their discourse.

The data is collected in the written form. Despite the fact that the speeches were originally meant and designed as a spoken discourse, investigating the written form gives the advantage of a thorough reading and analysis with closer focus on the linguistic units and the lexical units without any visual semiotic or phonetic aspects such as, word stress and intonation that may interrupt the spoken form.

There are two main reasons for choosing these speeches. All of the three speeches are given in wartime. Wartimes are periods where persuasion becomes the ultimate aim to gain public support (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 58). The other reason is that the speeches were delivered publicly shortly before or on the first day of the invasion of Iraq (See Table 1). From the prospect of timing, they might be considered as the final step toward war justification. The speeches represent the peak of a long process of debate and argument over the legitimization of the war. It would make sense to assume that these speeches would have traces of the majority of the persuasive techniques used to reach a final stage of decision-making.
7. Results and analysis

The analysis begins by exploring how metaphors are used in argumentation. This is done by analyzing excerpts from the texts on a metaphorical basis. After analyzing the metaphors, attention will be turned to the context in order to analyze how the process of argumentation, by employing metaphors, leads to persuasion. After each model a short summary is provided to show the similarities/dissimilarities between the political actors. The analysis is exploring three metaphorical models that the three politicians made use of: THE-STATE-AS-PERSON, POLITICS IS BUSINESS and JOURNEY metaphors.

The analysis shows that four kinds of metaphors are used: Reification, PERSONIFICATION, metaphors from the domains of JOURNEY and metaphors from the domains of BUSINESS.

Table 2. Types and frequencies of the metaphors used in the speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source domain/type</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Blair</th>
<th>Howard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REIFICATION</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONIFICATION</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNEY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 2 shows, the most dominant metaphor is PERSONIFICATION. Bush use PERSONIFICATION once every 36 words, Blair use PERSONIFICATION once every 56 words whereas Howard makes use of PERSONIFICATION once every 55 words. Metaphors from the JOURNEY domain are used 8 times by Bush, 3 times by Blair while they are not used by Howard. Metaphors from the domain of BUSINESS are used 5 times by Bush, 2 times by Howard but they are not used by Blair. Generally, Bush’s use of metaphors is much more frequent than that of the other two statesmen but this may be due simply to the fact that his corpus is larger.

The present study will not explore reification. Reification was found to be used according to its very basic sense. It is used as a figure of speech referring to “an abstraction as if it were something tangible and concrete” (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 201). Though reification is used on a broad scale in all three speeches, it relies on diverse source domains with no unifying
argumentative purpose which will not benefit the present study with its aim to examine, among other things, how metaphor works as a persuasive strategy in the argumentation of war.

Example of reification:

1) Our good faith has not been returned (Bush, line 7)

In example 1, good faith, which is an abstract entity, is represented as something more concrete which could be given and returned. This kind of use is not of interest to this paper as it holds no metaphorical significance in terms of constructing a persuasive argument.

Only one kind of reification is discussed in this paper: PERSONIFICATION. According to the previously mentioned definition of reification, PERSONIFICATION is a type of reification because it refers to abstract entities as human beings. In section 7.1.1, I focus on one type of PERSONIFICATION: THE-STATE-AS-PERSON metaphor because it underlies the concepts of the foreign policies of the states (Lakoff, 1993, p. 240). The current study has the war on Iraq at the center of its interest, and as the war decision is a matter of foreign policy, exploring this metaphor will benefit the process of analysis.

7.1. PERSONIFICATION

PERSONIFICATION is “a linguistic figure in which an abstract and inanimate entity is described or referred to using a word or phrase that in other contexts would be used to describe a person” (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 61). PERSONIFICATION is used to either evoke empathy for a social group or an ideology evaluated as heroic, or arouse opposition towards a specific social group or ideology evaluated as villainous (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 61). This is done by attributing positive values to one group while negatively evaluating the other group (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 62). According to Lakoff (2009, p.7), one of the ways to justify war is conceptualizing the STATE as a PERSON who is engaged in social relationships. Among many possible cross-domain mappings, in referring to THE STATE as a PERSON, some states could be conceptualized as good persons, other states could be conceptualized as bad persons or even criminals. Some are friends, others are enemies while others could be victims. In short, everything that could be attributed to the source domain (PERSON) in his social surrounding is now metaphorically attributed to the target domain (STATE).

As shown in Table 2, Bush, uses PERSONIFICATION in an extensive way exceeding the use of other metaphors:
2) For more than a decade, the United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime without war. (Bush, lines 1-3. Italics mine)

In extract (2) above, the USA, and OTHER NATIONS, on the one hand, and the IRAQI REGIME, on the other hand, are conceptualized as PERSONS. Verbs like have pursued and disarm trigger the metaphor because they refer to actions conceptually attributed to PERSONS not STATES. Persons can pursue efforts and disarm other persons while the abstract entity of the states apparently cannot. In this metaphor the source domain is PERSON while the target domain is STATE, whether this STAES is the USA, OTHER NATIONS or IRAQ. As stated above, in employing PERSONIFICATION, person-like actions and qualities can be attributed to abstract entities, in this case the STATES. The STATES are conceptualized not merely as social groups but as groups in a conflict where the USA and other nations are the good guys. By using adjectives denoting good actions like patient and honorable before the noun efforts, Bush constructs the group of the good guys. On the other hand, and in contrast to the picture of the good guys, IRAQ is portrayed as a PERSON who should be disarmed. The verb disarm implies that Iraq already possesses weapons since the verb triggers the notion that IRAQ is an armed PERSON. Thus, we conclude that Iraq has done something wrong. Why should other nations seek to disarm it if it did nothing? By portraying it as a wrongdoer, IRAQ is conceptualized as the bad guy. Bush expands on this idea further in the following extract:

3) The regime has a history of reckless aggression in the Middle East. It has a deep hatred of America and our friends. And it has aided, trained and harbored terrorists, including operatives of al Qaeda. The danger is clear: using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country, or any other (Bush, lines 16-20. Italics mine)

In extract (3) Bush states that the Iraqi regime has an aggressive history in the Middle East, hates America and its friends, sponsors terrorist groups such as al Qaeda, and even worse, the regime has weapons of mass destruction. The Iraqi regime could give WMD to terrorists who could strike the USA and kill thousands of people as Bush states “the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country, or any other”. Iraq and the terrorists have an ambition to kill innocent people. In this extract the whole
international community is personified and again divided into groups; the USA and its friends against Iraq and terrorist groups. The consistent systematic association of bad values to the opponent is obvious in this extract as the IRAQI REGIME is portrayed as an AGGRESSIVE PERSON, full of hate and encourages violence. It is noteworthy that in reality Iraq did not attack US nor threaten to do so. That is why the actual doer of harm, according to Bush’s speech, is the terrorist who already attacked the US on September 11th, while Iraq is the one helping the terrorist by providing them with WMDs. The use of the modal verb could in extract (2) indicates possibility. So, how would Bush convince the audience that the threat is certain and that a war is needed to stop it? I would argue that by attributing negative values to the negatively portrayed social groups, Iraq and the terrorists, Bush might aim to pinpoint the notion that they don’t ‘have the right intention’ and thus he shakes the foundation of their trustworthiness and integrity.

The effect of utilizing PERSONIFICATION in the way discussed might help Bush to show that he is ‘thinking right’ in waging war against the lawless Iraqi regime. After justifying the war by portraying the IRAQI REGIME as a HOSTILE PERSON sponsoring terrorism, Bush portrays THE FREE NATIONS as PROTECTIVE PERSONS:

4) That is the future we choose. Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent. And tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility (Bush, lines 120-12. Italics mine)

As mentioned earlier in section four, Bush failed to gain legal support to his preemptive war against Iraq. It could be that Bush tries to gain support on ethical grounds this time. Using words and phrases like free nations, have a duty, defend and accept triggers the PERSONIFICATION. Bush again attributes good deeds to the US and its allies who “accept that responsibility” and who are willing to defend the innocent people by “uniting against the violent”. Bush is seeking international support for his protective and defensive act. That would explain why he shifted from “free nations” to “our”, which helps create the inner group.

An important strategy used in combination with THE STATE-AS-PERSON is THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym (Lakoff, 2009, p. 9; Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 257). As we can see in extract (5) below, Hussein stands for Iraq:

5) The terrorist threat to America and the world will be diminished the moment that Saddam Hussein is disarmed (Bush, lines 85-86. Italics mine)
The extract shows how the ruler stands for the state as it is not really Hussein who is going to be disarmed but the Iraqi armed forces. This strategy is important because it evokes the sense that only one person will be disarmed and hides the fact that a whole country will face a military course and a lot of innocent people will face a terrible fate. Besides helping to hide some aspects of the whole picture, using THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym helps to narrow the scope of guilt and empathy with the opponent. If the audience is thinking of war as a process of disarmament of one person, who is already portrayed as criminal, they will not sympathize with him or feel the guilt of the action as it is morally justified. By stating that “The terrorist threat to America and the world will be diminished the moment that Saddam Hussein is disarmed”, Bush puts a name and a face to evil. It would make sense to make terrorists the face of evil because they are the ones who attacked the USA on 9/11, but Bush chooses Saddam Hussein in his speech. This is based on the grounds that Hussein and his regime, as discussed earlier, sponsor terrorism. Bush’s foreign policy was very clear from the beginning when he stated that terrorists and those who support them will be treated alike: “We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them” (Bush, September 11, 2001). The use of THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym has portrayed Hussein as the face of evil, showing that Bush cares about protecting his people against the threat, or Hussein, thus managing to manifest his ‘right thinking’ and ‘right intention’. Bush creates two groups, the in-group and the out-group, and then attributes bad qualities/deeds to the out-group which may be seen as the reasons why the US has to fight them. By so doing, Bush manages to ‘tell the right story’.

Like Bush, Blair uses the STATE-AS-PERSON metaphor. He portrays the nations of the world as groups, some are in peace and consist of the in-group and some endanger that peace and consist of the out-group:

6) The threat to Britain today is not that of my father’s generation. War between the big powers is unlikely, Europe is at peace, the Cold War already a memory. But this new world faces a new threat of disorder and chaos born either of brutal states like Iraq armed with weapons of mass destruction or of extreme terrorist groups. Both hate our way of life, our freedom, our democracy (Blair, lines 11-13. Italics mine)

As extract (6) shows, THE BIG POWERS and IRAQ are both personified. On the one hand, THE BIG POWERS are portrayed as a group of people living in peace and it is unlikely to be involved in war against each other. On the other hand, IRAQ is portrayed as a PERSON armed with weapons of mass destruction. Blair differentiates between what he calls the new world and the old world or
the world of his father’s generation. The *new world* to Blair is the world where the *big powers* and *Europe* are at peace and living a life of tranquility and order. The *new world* consists the in-group where the UK exists. In opposition to this *new world*, there is a *new threat* coming from Iraq and the terrorists. The out-group, according to Blair, hates the in-group’s way of life, freedom and democracy. That hatred may justify the probable aggressive actions of the out-group as a hate crime.

There is another type of interesting use of PERSONIFICATION. Blair portraits IRAQ and THE TERRORIST GROUPS as PERSONS, a couple who will give birth to a catastrophe to UK the *new world*:

7) This new world faces a new threat of disorder and chaos *born either of brutal states like Iraq armed with weapons of mass destruction or of extreme terrorist groups* (Blair, lines 12-13. Italics mine)

8) My fear, deeply held, based in part on the intelligence that I see is these threats come together and *deliver catastrophe* to our country and our world (Blair, lines 15-17. Italics mine)

9) My judgement as prime minister is that *this threat is real, growing* and of an entirely different nature to any conventional threat to our security that Britain has faced before. So our choice is clear: back down and leave Saddam hugely strengthened or proceed to disarm him by force. Retreat might give us a moment of respite but years of repentance at our weakness would, I believe, follow. (Blair, lines 28-36. Italics mine)

IRAQ and THE TERRORIST GROUPS are conceptualized as PERSONS with bodies who are capable of giving birth to babies. The baby is portrayed as a *threat of disorder and chaos* which when *delivered* will turn to be a *catastrophe* to Britain and the *new world*. Blair pushes the BIRTH metaphor further by personifying the THREAT and portraying it as a BABY which is *growing*. The metaphor is emotionally loaded because it gives a clear message that the production of the relationship between Iraq and the terrorist groups will be harmful and destructive to the *new world*. The use of verbs connected to the human experience of pregnancy and giving birth such as *growing, deliver* and *born* give the notion that the situation is real and urgent and tolerates no delay in decision making. The result of such a metaphor is persuading the audience of the argument on the basis of its rationality ‘thinking right’ and ‘having the right intention’ by keeping the *catastrophe* from destroying the UK and the *new world*. The use of the BIRTH metaphor highlights
the defensive argument of Blair in the sense that if the threat is allowed to grow, it will bring destruction to the UK and the new world. According to Blair meeting the threat before growing is the right thing to do. He uses a human experience that evokes normally strong positive emotions like the experience of giving birth and switches its semantic implication to something which is negatively evaluated. This emotional implication contributes to the ‘sounding right’ which contributes to the process of persuasion.

Blair uses THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym in his speech:

10) My judgement as prime minister is that this threat is real, growing and of an entirely different nature to any conventional threat to our security that Britain has faced before. For 12 years the world tried to disarm Saddam after his wars in which hundreds of thousands died. UN weapons inspectors say vast amounts of chemical and biological poisons such as anthrax, VX nerve agent and mustard gas remain unaccounted for in Iraq. (Blair, lines 28-33. Italics mine)

As extract (10) shows, Blair describes the threat as different in nature than any threat Britain faced before. Then he uses Saddam in place of Iraq and attributes war crimes to him as he was responsible for the death of hundreds of thousands of people: “the world tried to disarm Saddam after his wars in which hundreds of thousands died”. Blair brings to the audience’s mind the previous bad actions of Saddam. By portraying Saddam, who stands for Iraq, as a war criminal, Blair is creating his argument of war on a rational basis. I would argue that waging war as a response to a 12-year-old war crime may not be especially rational but it still has an emotional effect when mentioning that the UN inspectors reported that Saddam has vast amount of chemicals and biological poisons. A man who was once capable of killing hundreds of thousands of people might do the same thing again. The target could be something Saddam hates, like the new world. By putting all the pieces together, we might conclude that Blair attempts to show that he is ‘telling the right story’.

Howard is no different when it comes to the use of PERSONIFICATION. In the first line of his speech, Howard conceptualizes the STATES as PERSONS:

11) We are determined to join other countries to deprive Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction, its chemical and biological weapons, which even in minute quantities are capable of causing death and destruction on a mammoth scale (Howard, lines 4-6. Italics mine)

Howard utilizes THE-STATE-AS-Person metaphor in order to create the in-group-out-group classification of the states. He portrays the world nation as two groups; friends and enemies. The
friends are the good group who aim to save the world from criminals or the enemy. Iraq possesses WMD which can produce massive destruction. To prove that the out-group, Iraq, is dangerous and should be deprived of its weapons of mass destruction, Howard portrays IRAQ as an AGGRESSIVE PERSON who has a criminal history of hostility:

12) *Iraq has been an aggressor in the past against its neighbours* and even its own people (Howard, line 7. Italics mine).

13) *Iraq has long supported international terrorism*. Saddam Hussein pays $25,000 to each family of Palestinian suicide bombers who wreak such murderous havoc in Israel. He has sheltered and sponsored many terrorist groups. International terrorism knows no borders. We have learnt that to our cost. Australia and Australians anywhere in the world are as much targets as any other western country and its people. Therefore the possession of chemical, biological, or even worse still, nuclear weapons by a terrorist network would be a direct undeniable and lethal threat to Australia and its people. That is the reason above all others why I passionately believe that action must be taken to disarm Iraq. Not only will it take dangerous weapons from that country but it will send a clear signal to other rogue states and terrorists groups like Al Qaeda which clearly want such weapons that the world is prepared to take a stand (Howard, lines 15-26. Italics mine).

As extract (12) and (13) show, Howard portrays IRAQ as an AGGRESSIVE PERSON who supports international terrorism. He then makes use of THE-RULER-FOR-STATE metonym when he uses Hussein as a representative of Iraq. Howard claims that Iraq supports terrorism and then claim that “Saddam Hussein pays $25,000 to each family of Palestinian suicide bombers who wreak such murderous havoc in Israel. He has sheltered and sponsored many terrorist groups”. Based on this argument, Howard advocates to wage war in order to disarm Iraq. Iraq could at any moment supply the terrorists with lethal weapons and the terrorist could attack Australia. But why Australia? Because, according to Howard, it is a Western country and all Western countries are a target for terrorism:

14) Australia is a western country with western values. Nothing will or should change that. *That is why we are a target* (Howard, lines 44-45. Italics mine).

Beside the defensive cause of waging the war, Howard has another reason. He wants to send a signal to other rogue states, North Korea in particular as extract (15) shows, that the world will take a stand. Friends back each other. That might explain why Australia decides to join its friends and go to war. Australia needs the help of USA in its international affair:
15) There’s also another reason and that is our close security alliance with the United States. The Americans have helped us in the past and the United States is very important to Australia’s long-term security. It is critical that we maintain the involvement of the United States in our own region where at present there are real concerns about the dangerous behaviour of North Korea. A key element of our close friendship with the United States and indeed with the British is our full and intimate sharing of intelligence material (Howard, lines 27-35. Italics mine).

On the metaphorical level, America and North Korea are personified. PERSONIFICATION is triggered by words like helped and behaviour. While the US is positively pictured in terms of helping Australia before, North Korea is portrayed negatively as having a dangerous behaviour that concerns Australia. It might be that Howard hopes that his support to the US in its war will be returned in the future and if the dangerous behavior of North Korea becomes an aggressive act, the US will back up Australia. To quote Howard’s words: “the United States is very important to Australia’s long-term security”.

Howard tries to ‘tell the right story’ by explaining how bad Iraq is and why his country should join the war to disarm it. He manifests his ‘right thinking’ by showing that he aims at a long-term benefit in case of any dangerous behavior from North Korea. Considering the national security of his country as a priority could be seen as a sign of ‘right intention’.

The use of THE-STATE-AS-PERSON metaphor highlights the conflict between two parties and creates what is known as the conflict frame (Ferrari, 2007, p. 617). According to Ferrari, the conflict frame is closely associated with two opposite feelings: the feeling of fear and the feeling of confidence (2007, p. 617). These two feelings are attributed to the distinction between two groups; the in-group and the out-group. Fear is a response to the threat coming from the out-group whereas confidence is a feeling of familiarity shared with the in-group (Ferrari, 2007, p. 617). Arousing the feelings of fear and confidence is crucial in ideological argumentations (Ferrari, 2007, p. 617). The present study suggests that the three politicians may aim to ‘sound right’ by evoking the feelings of fear and confidence. The feelings of fear and confidence are aroused by employing THE-STATE-AS-PERSON metaphor in order to distinguish between the in-group and the out-group. On the one hand, attributing good qualities to the in-group evokes the emotion of confidence. On the other hand, attributing bad qualities to the out-group evokes the emotion of
fear. These two emotions contribute largely to the ideology of the addresser causing the people to seek protection by accepting and trusting the argument of the politician (Ferrari, 2007, p. 619).

**Summary**

Lakoff (2014) argues that when a public discourse is reframed, the common sense is changed and the way people see the world is altered (p. xii). The three speeches changed how states are conceptualized by using PERSONIFICATION. In the three speeches, the in-group-out-group schema is constructed by portraying two social groups in which one is good while the other is bad. The leaders of US, UK and Australia mention the same reasons for supporting the war: Iraq is a criminal who has WMD which will be given to terrorists who will, without doubt, strike the western world because they hate the western values and the western way of life. It is a defensive/protective act against the aggression of Iraq which has a history of aggression and sponsors the terrorist groups who have a history of attacking western countries. Beside these reasons, Howard mentions another reason: He needs the help of the US if North Korea acts against the Australian interest. Bush and Blair and Howard use THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym to conceptually minimize the consequences of the act of war. The analysis also shows that Blair uses the BIRTH metaphor in a unique way.

The analysis shows that the use of THE-STATE-AS-PERSON metaphor and THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym might suggest the attempt of the three politicians to show their ‘right thinking’ by deciding to confront the threat before it strikes their countries. They might try to show that they have the ‘right intention’ by protecting their people from a disaster. They might also attempt to show that they are ‘telling the right story’ by giving reasons why they advocate going to war. The use of the BIRTH metaphor might be an attempt from Blair to ‘sound right’ by arousing the feelings of the audience. By arousing the feelings of fear and confidence in their audiences, Bush, Blair and Howard try to persuade the audience of their argument.

**7.1.1. THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario**

THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario has three main characters: the hero, the villain and the victim (Lakoff, 2009, p.8). Lakoff identifies two possible narrative stories; if the hero is
the victim it will be a self-defense story. If the victim is another person saved by the hero, it will be a rescue story (Lakoff, 2009, p. 8).

The self-defense story is told by all the three politicians while the rescue mission is only told by the American president. The self-defense story has already been discussed in the previous section, in examples such as (3), (4), (10), (11), and (13). An example of the rescue story is the following extract:

16) Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them. If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you. As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free. In a free Iraq, there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms. The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near (Bush, lines 57-61. Italics mine)

In extract (16) above, the removal of the Iraqi regime is portrayed as a benefit to the Iraqis who will be rescued from a tyrant who is raping, torturing and executing them. To Bush, the Iraq war is a battle between good and evil. The process of the war is portrayed as a liberation process which entails that the Iraqis are victims of the villain Hussein.

The other character in THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario is the hero. The hero should be morally motivated. Besides saving the innocent Iraqis, as shown in extract (16), the US is portrayed as a hero who is fighting a moral war to sustain the moral values of liberty and freedom in extract (17):

17) The United States, with other countries, will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land. And the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace (Bush, lines 115-119. Italics mine).

As extract (17) shows, the US is portrayed as a HERO who is going to war because of the good of all mankind. The hero is fighting for freedom and in order to vanquish hatred and violence. In short, the described war is a moral war in every sense.

No traces of the rescue story are found in Blair’s or Howard’s corpuses. Still, it is noteworthy that Blair portrays the role of the UK in the war, more specifically, after the removal of Saddam Hussein:
18) I hope the Iraqi people hear this message. We are with you. Our enemy is not you but your barbarous rulers. Our commitment to the post-Saddam humanitarian effort will be total. *We shall help Iraq move towards democracy* and put the money from Iraqi oil in a UN trust fund so it benefits Iraq and no-one else. Neither should Iraq be our only concern. President Bush and I have committed ourselves to peace in the Middle East based on a secure state of Israel and a viable Palestinian state (Blair, lines 43-49. Italics mine)

As extract (18) shows, Blair portrays the role of the UK in the post-Saddam era, as a PERSON helping another person to move towards a new road in life, the democracy road. I would argue that Blair tries to connect the role of the UK in the Iraq war to the bigger image of the two worlds he created earlier. As discussed earlier in section 7.1.1, Blair differentiates between two worlds, the *new world* and the old one. The *new world* has *democracy*. Blair clarifies that the UK’s role is to help Iraq to move towards *democracy* which might refer to the *new world*’s way of living. Based on how they portray their countries’ role in the war, I would argue that Blair is more concerned with the conflict between the new and old worlds while Bush is more concerned with the conflict between good and evil in general.

Unlike the US and the UK, Australia is not portrayed as a hero:

19) The removal of Saddam Hussein will lift this immense burden of terror from the Iraqi people (Howard, line 76)

In extract (19), Howard explains that the war will benefit the Iraqis without mentioning his heroic role as Bush and Blair did. Maybe this can be attributed to the limited contribution of the Australian troops which makes it difficult to claim heroic role. Besides that, we recall the explicit self-interest reason of joining the war, which contrasts with the heroic image (see extract 15).

**Summary**

In employing THE STATE-AS-PERSON metaphor, the three politicians utilize a scenario known as the FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR. Bush, Blair and Howard portray the villain, and the victim almost the same way. The three statesmen differ in the way they portray the hero. Bush is the only one to use the rescue story. That might be attributed to the leading role of the US. While Bush and Blair attribute heroic deeds and qualities to their countries, Howard does not do that. This can be interpreted in the light of the supportive role of Australia in the war. Because the US and the UK are in the position of sharing the leadership, they are attributing a leading heroic role
to themselves. On the other hand, the Australian contribution and role are limited. Maybe this justifies attributing no heroic role to Australia metaphorically.

### 7.2. POLITICS IS BUSINESS

POLITICS IS BUSINESS is a metaphor “where efficient political management is seen as akin to efficient business management. As in a well-run business, a well-run government should keep a careful tally of costs and gains” (Lakoff, 2009, p. 6). The POLITICS IS BUSINESS metaphor makes war a matter of cost-benefit analysis. The analysis is done by comparing the gains and costs of the war, and by deciding whether the gains are worth the costs (Lakoff, 2009, p. 6).

According to Bush, the Iraqi regime has made advantage of democracy to gain time in which the underlying metaphor TIME IS MONEY works:

20) My fellow citizens, events in Iraq have now reached the final days of decision. For more than a decade, the United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime without war. That regime pledged to reveal and destroy all its weapons of mass destruction as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf War in 1991. Since then, the world has engaged in 12 years of diplomacy. We have passed more than a dozen resolutions in the United Nations Security Council. We have sent hundreds of weapons inspectors to oversee the disarmament of Iraq. Our good faith has not been returned. The Iraqi regime has used diplomacy as a ploy to gain time and advantage (Bush, lines 1-8. Italics mine)

21) On November 8th, the Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 1441, finding Iraq in material breach of its obligations, and vowing serious consequences if Iraq did not fully and immediately disarm (Bush, lines 39-41. Italics mine)

In extract (20), Bush provides us with his reading of the reality. He describes how the US and other nations chose diplomacy as a way to pursue their goal and disarm Iraq, and how the Security Council made some resolutions to ensure the disarmament of Iraq. In the POLITICS IS BUSINESS metaphor, the resolution of the Security Council could stand for a contract. According to Bush, the Iraqi regime “pledged to reveal and destroy all its weapons of mass destruction as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf War in 1991”. By continuing to possess WMD, The Iraqi regime did not fulfill its deal of the contract.

As extract (21) shows, the Iraqi regime seems to breach its obligations in order to pursue its own interest and gain more money/power in terms of weapons of mass destruction and other lethal weapons that help it to be stronger. On the other hand, the US and the other nations have tried
patiently to find a diplomatic way to make the Iraqi regime fulfill its obligations but their “good faith has not been returned”. The implication of the metaphor is that the Iraqi regime is lacking ethics in dealing with its obligations and partner (the Security Council) and thus leaves no other options to the US and its allies but the option of war, as example (22) shows:

22) Should Saddam Hussein choose confrontation, the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war, and every measure will be taken to win it. (Bush, lines 76-77)

Portraying the Iraq war as a decision decided after every measure to avoid war has been taken, might imply that the war decision is enforced on the US and is not a matter of choice. The US is not an aggressor. It is Hussein who choose confrontation, not America. Portraying the case this way, might help Bush to ‘sound right’ and gain the empathy of the audience. Bush expands on metaphors from the domain of POLITICS IS BUSINESS to involve RISKS AND GAMBLES:

23) Americans understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past. War has no certainty, except the certainty of sacrifice. (Bush, lines 78-79. Italics mine)

RISKS AND GAMBLES are notions closely connected to commerce. They are actions taken to achieve a certain gain where there is a risk of costs or undesirable effects (Lakoff, 2009, P. 10). In extract (23), Bush demonstrates his rationality by showing that he and the Americans know that the war decision is risky and might involve costs. He understands costs in terms of sacrifices, which suits the heroic role of the USA in the metaphorical construction. Bush has his one and only solution to minimize the sacrifice. I would argue that with the use of the word paid, Bush tries to arouse the feelings of the audiences by recalling the 9/11 attack and connecting it to his argument. After all, the Iraq war is regarded as a part of the war on terror which is a response to the 9/11 attack. By portraying the act of war as a payback of the 9/11 attack - given that the way Iraq is portrayed suggests the implication that it is involved in the attack by sponsoring terrorism - Bush balances the moral book by making Iraq pay for its mistakes. This metaphor is rooted in the conceptual metaphor MORAL ACTIONS ARE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS. (Charteris-Black, 2011.p. 266) The harm of the war can, according to Bush, be reduced by applying the full power:

24) Yet, the only way to reduce the harm and duration of war is to apply the full force and might of our military, and we are prepared to do so (Bush, lines 80-81)
In his rational argument and after pointing out the risky side of his decision, Bush gives the solution which suits his argument, applying the maximum power. How can we end violence by imposing more violence? Using the maximum power could be a rational solution if the conflict is inescapable and the only way to put an end to it is to win it by using the maximum force. The inescapability of the war is elaborated in Bush’s phrase: “every measure has been taken to avoid war”. This argument contributed to the process of persuasion by reflecting the politician’s rational way of thinking and ‘telling the right story’.

The analysis shows that the word *cost* is used twice in the corpus of Howard. The word *cost* is connected to the BUSINESS domain:

25) Iraq has been an aggressor in the past against its neighbours and even its own people. If Iraq is allowed to keep these weapons not only might she use them again but moreover other rogue countries will copy Iraq knowing that the world will do nothing to stop them. And the more countries that have these weapons – countries run by despotic regimes – the greater becomes the likelihood that these weapons will fall into the hands of terrorists. If that happens can anyone doubt that the terrorists will use them whatever the *cost* might be? (Howard, lines 7-12. Italics mine)

26) International terrorism knows no borders. We have learnt that to our *cost*. Australia and Australians anywhere in the world are as much targets as any other western country and its people (Howard, line 18-20. Italics mine).

Howard uses BUSINESS metaphors to justify the war. He argues that going to war will benefit Australia which was a target once to a terrorist attack and learned a lesson to its *cost*. Going to the war will end the threat and minimizes the loss of Australia. Like Bush, Howard uses metaphors from the BUSINESS domain to create a suitable emotional atmosphere for his argument by arousing the feelings of the audiences. He does not assess the gains and costs of the war as Bush does. Howard uses the BUSINESS metaphors to remind the audience of a previous experience and to arouse their *fear* from a probable similar attack. We have seen how *fear* could be aroused by differentiating between two groups. The audience is expected to *fear* the *bad* out-group and have *confidence* in the *good* in-group. That, I would argue, is similar to what happens when the politicians remind the audience of an aggressive attack it has been victim to in the past. The audience might become afraid of a similar experience and seeks protection in the in-group which decides to go to war to protect it. That is how politicians attempt to convince the audience by ‘sounding right’.
Table 2 shows that Bush uses metaphors from the domain of BUSINESS 5 times. Howard uses them in his speech 2 times. On the other hand, no sign of expressions from the domain of BUSINESS is found in Blair’s speech. This may be due to the different leadership position of the US and the UK in the act of war. It was the US who leads the war in the first place. Despite the signs of the leading role of UK explored in the analysis of the use of the FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario, UK still comes in the second place in the leadership chain. Matters of risk assessment are more likely to be in the hands of the ultimate leader, the US. Another reason that might explain why metaphors from the domain of BUSINESS are found in the speeches of Bush and Howard but not the speech of Blair, is the fact that the corpus of Blair is much less than the corpuses of the other two politicians. It is important to mention that how Bush uses metaphors from the domain of BUSINESS differs from the way Howard uses them.

Summary
POLITICS IS BUSINESS is used by Bush and Howard but not used by Blair. The analysis shows that Bush tries to question the integrity of his opponent by claiming that Iraq breaches its obligations of disarmament. Bush tries to ‘tell the right story’ and shows his ‘right thinking’ by keeping a tally of the costs and gains of the inescapable war. The analysis suggests that Bush and Howard might try to ‘sound right’ by connecting their argument to previous experiences of their audiences, the terrorist attacks their countries were victims to. As a leader, Bush tries to express his country’s morality by stating that the US is willing to pay the cost of liberty and freedom of all mankind.

7.3. JOURNEY metaphors
According to Charteris-Black (2011, p. 66), JOURNEY metaphors were introduced to cognitive linguistics by Lakoff & Johnson in their book Metaphors we live by (1980). Charteris-Black (2004) suggests that social purposes can be regarded as destinations in JOURNEY metaphors. (p. 74). JOURNEY metaphors include required elements and optional ones. According to Charteris-Black, the required elements can be: start, point, path and entities moving along the path (2011, p.66). The optional elements can be: mode of travel, guides, companions, and so on (Charteris-Black, 2011. pp. 66-67).
The opening sentence in Bush’s speech is metaphorical in the sense that he personifies the EVENTS IN IRAQ and pictures them as TRAVELERS who reached the final destination after a long journey lasted for 12 years:

27) Events in Iraq have now reached the final days of decision (Bush, line 2. Italics mine)

After that, he describes the 12 year-journey of the United States and other nations to disarm Iraq and how they chose the diplomatic, peaceful route all that time:

28) The United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime without war (Bush, lines 2-3. Italics mine)

A journey entails the existence of travelers, vehicle, destination, routes and so on. The metaphor entails that travelers, i.e. the US and other nations have two routes to choose between: the diplomacy route or the war route. They choose the peaceful diplomatic route and the vehicle of a patient and honorable efforts. The travelers are heading towards a final destination which is the disarmament of Iraq. According to Bush, choosing the peaceful route is not the right decision any more. Because it drifts the nations toward a tragedy:

29) Instead of drifting along toward tragedy, we will set a course toward safety (Bush, lines 23-24. Italics mine)

According to Bush, pursuing the same diplomatic route will lead to a tragic end, because Iraq might use WMD against other nations or perhaps even a terrorist group might lay a hand on these weapons with the help of Iraq. In both scenarios, choosing another route (choosing war) is the wise thing to do because it leads to safety. Taking the decision that spares the nation a dreadful end could be regarded as an attempt from Bush to manifest his ‘right thinking’ and ‘right intention’.

Blair portrays the process of disarmament of Iraq in terms of war. Britain is a warrior who has two choices to make; either to retreat or to fight:

30) Our choice is clear: back down and leave Saddam hugely strengthened or proceed to disarm him by force. Retreat might give us a moment of respite but years of repentance at our weakness would, I believe, follow (Blair, lines 34-36. Italics mine)

If Britain chooses to retreat the result will be years of repentance. According to Charteris-Black, JOURNEY metaphors encourage the followers to accept the short-term suffering in order to achieve a worthwhile long-term objectives (2011, p. 67). Blair argues that there are two routes to
follow, to back down and get a moment of respite while Saddam hugely strengthen or go to war and spare years of repentance. Blair advocates the hard, long-term objective even if it involves hardships because the end is desirable. The way Blair argues for his choice reflects his attempt to show that he ‘thinks right’ and that he has the ‘right intention’ to spare his nation what he believes to be an undesired end if the UK chooses retreat.

Two other metaphors can be found in Blair’s corpus. One of them describes a short-term destination and a long-term destination. UK will show Iraq the road towards democracy but it has a longer road to go, the road of peace in the Middle East:

31) Our commitment to the post-Saddam humanitarian effort will be total. We shall help Iraq move towards democracy (Blair, lines 45-47. Italics mine)

32) President Bush and I have committed ourselves to peace in the Middle East based on a secure state of Israel and a viable Palestinian state. We will strive to see it done. But these challenges and others that confront us: poverty, the environment, the ravages of disease require a world of order and stability. (Blair, lines 48-51. Italics mine)

It is noteworthy that Blair and Bush share the same perspective of a long-term JOURNEY of peace in the Middle East. While Bush sees it as a destination towards safety, Blair sees it as a JOURNEY full of obstacles heading towards a secure state of Israel and Palestinian state. In order to reach the destination Blair and his travel mate, Bush, have to overcome many hardships and challenges as poverty, disorder and diseases. While PERSONIFICATION is used to contrast between the poles of good and bad, JOURNEY metaphors are used to create solidarity between the one group in order to reach the positively evaluated destination (Charteris-Black, 2011. P. 67). JOURNEY metaphors contribute to the identity of the leadership of Bush and Blair in the sense that they foreground their rationality and try to show that they are ‘thinking right’ and having the ‘right intention’.

I would argue that the differences in the use of how to portray the process of disarmament of Iraq may be due to portraying America as the leader who chooses the routes and the strategy of war while Britain is portrayed as a warrior in an ongoing combat. This may explain as well the choice of expression from the war field that suits the hand-to-hand compact expressions as: confronting, frontline, strive, target, attack, hide at the back, and retreat. So far it is noticeable that US is conceptualized as a heroic leader while Britain as a heroic warrior.
No sign of the JOURNEY metaphor is found in Howard corpus. The limited number of the Australian troops may indicates why it is unreasonable to participate in decisions concerning leadership as the choice of the best route to follow and so on.

Summary
Eight JOURNEY metaphors are found in Bush’s corpus. Three JOURNEY metaphors are found in Blair’s corpus while none are found in Howard’s. This may be due to limitation of the corpus. Still, an explanation was given in this present study. Using JOURNEY metaphors could help to manifest how Bush and Blair ‘thinking right’ and having the ‘right intention’. JOURNEY metaphors are found to be closely associated to the identity of leadership in wartimes which does not suit the military role of Australia.
8. Discussion

In this section, I try to answer the research questions by summarizing the results of the analysis. Then I compare some of the results suggested in this paper to results found by other researchers.

The text analysis suggests that there are signs of similarity and dissimilarity in how metaphors are used by Bush, Blair and Howard. All three politicians utilize PERSONIFICATION and its subcategory, THE-STATE-AS-PERSON metaphor in order to distinguish between two groups: a positively evaluated social group (the ‘us’ group) and a negatively evaluated social group (the ‘them’ group). In THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario, the villain is well identified by all three statesmen as being Saddam Hussein and his regime. Bush, Blair and Howard portray their countries and the Iraqi people as victims. The US and the UK are portrayed as heroes while this aspect is missing in Howard’s corpus, which could be attributed to the limited military role of Australia in the Iraq war. Bush portrays the American role as a hero in a rescue mission. Blair, on the other hand, describes the UK’s role as a helper who will help them to move towards democracy. Howard is not concerned in portraying the Australian role in the war. He focuses more on the Australian-American relationship. Bush and Howard use the POLITICS IS BUSINESS metaphor while none are found in Blair’s corpus. Bush and Blair use JOURNEY metaphors while none are used in Howard corpus.

A unique use of PERSONIFICATION that is not suggested by other studies, as long as I know, is suggested by this study: the use of BIRTH metaphors by Blair. Blair uses the BIRTH metaphor in contrast to its common use, which implies production and life. He manifests the negative side of the relationship between the Iraqi regime and terrorists, which can result in the birth of a catastrophe, implying destruction. Similar evidence of the use of BIRTH metaphors is found in Blair’s corpus which was studied by Charteris-Black (2011, p. 244):

33) Once chaos and strife have got a grip on a region or a country trouble will soon be exported…After all it was a dismal camp in the foothill of Afghanistan that gave birth to the murderous assault on the sparkling heart of New York’s financial center (Blair, 13 November 2001. Italics mine)

Charteris-Black did not give so much attention to the BIRTH metaphor as his strategy of analysis is to attribute the metaphor that may imply more than one metaphoric meaning to its more radical domain. In the case of the Birth metaphor, he suggests that it is a PERSONIFICATION.

There is a notable difference between how Bush and Howard use the POLITICS IS BUSINESS metaphor. Bush uses the metaphor to refer to previous experiences, assessing the gains
and costs of the war as well as balancing the moral book by making Iraq pay for its mistakes. On the other hand, Howard uses the metaphor only to refer to previous experiences and thus creates a suitable emotional atmosphere for his argument.

The three politicians rely on conceptual metaphors to make their argument more persuasive. They make use of THE-STATE-AS-PERSON to create the in-group-out-group schema. The statesmen attribute good qualities to the in-group in which their countries are situated to establish their integrity and ‘right intention’ while attributing bad qualities to the opponent in order to question their opponents’ integrity and ‘right intention’. Distinguishing between the good in-group and the bad out-group makes it possible for the politicians to arouse the feelings of fear and confidence in their audiences which could lead to persuasion. The use of THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario contributes to the politicians ‘right thinking’. By arguing that the war is a defensive act against a villain, the politicians might attempt to convince the audience of their rationality and ‘right intention’ especially when they state that the war is to prevent the villain from attacking their countries. Utilizing THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR scenario made it possible for all the three politicians to sell the war as an act of defense, which might be an attempt to ‘tell the right story’ as well as to ‘sound right’. Bush, Blair and Howard use THE RULER-FOR-STATE metonym in order to justify why they should stop the threat before attacking their countries which could be regarded as an attempt to ‘tell the right story’. Bush and Howard use metaphors from the BUSINESS domain which has the effect to show rationality as well as ‘having the right intention’. The use of JOURNEY metaphors helps Bush and Blair to manifest their ‘right thinking’ as well as ‘right intention’.

Some differences in how metaphors are used could be attributed to the different military contribution. There are some differences in the way the three politicians use the JOURNEY metaphor. This is due mainly to the realization of the different military contribution in the event of war. America is the leader, Britain is a leader but inferior to America, while Australia is a helper and a friend. Bush utilizes a vast number of the JOURNEY metaphors as his country is the leader of the war and the one who chooses the conflict in the first place. That is why it is rational that the US chooses which route to follow. This was not the case with the other two statesmen. When Blair refers to a JOURNEY, he means a long-term JOURNEY to set peace in the Middle East. Howard does not use the JOURNEY metaphor at all which again might be attributed to the Australian limited military role in the war.
This study suggests that Bush employs PERSONIFICATION and its subcategory, THE-STATE-AS-PERSON in order to distinguish between the good party and the bad one. By doing that he encourages the audience to sympathize with his argument and henceforth, accept it. Charteris- Black also suggests a finding which is similar to that found in the analysis. He suggests that Bush uses PERSONIFICATION to create a metaphoric battle between good and evil (Charteris-Black, 2011.p. 258). This study shows how Bush uses the assumed conflict between the in-group and the out-group in order to ‘sound right’ and gain the sympathy of the audience.

Ferrari (2007) studied how persuasion is emotionally effective in George W. Bush’s rhetoric. The study suggests that PERSONIFICATION is employed to persuade the audience. Persuasion was constructed on what she called the conflict frame. This frame is based on arousing different emotions (fear and confidence) with the aim to convince the audience. This finding coincide to what this study suggests.

The present study suggests that using PERSONIFICATION, more specifically, THE-STATE-AS-PERSON metaphor, helps Blair to create his conflict schema between the new world and the old one, which has the effect of making the argument emotive and more persuasive. A similar result is suggested by Charteris-Black (2011, pp.243-245).

The analysis suggests that Blair uses JOURNEY metaphors in order to describe two journeys, a short-term journey concerned with the Iraq war and the role of the UK in it and a long-term journey concerned with setting a road towards democracy in the Middle East. The study conducted by Charteris-Black (2011) suggests that Blair uses the conceptual metaphor, LONG-TERM PURPOSFUL ACTIVITIES ARE JOURNEYS in order to portray how the UK is setting a new map for peace in the Middle East. This assumption coincides with what our analysis suggests. In his study, Charteris-Black suggests that besides using familiar JOURNEY metaphors like path, road, destination and so on, Blair uses another special type of JOURNEY metaphors. He uses nominal phrases in which JOURNEY is qualified by a post modifier in phrases like: “Journey of renewal”. (Charteris-Black, 2011.p. 234) We have to keep in mind that Charteris-Black studied 14 speeches given by Blair while this study is examining only one speech, which could explain why there are differences in the suggested results.

When it comes to BUSINESS metaphors, Bush, as shown in the result section, uses metaphors from the BUSINESS domain in order to create a suitable emotion atmosphere by connecting his argument to previous social experiences. Bush uses the BUSINESS metaphor to
balance the moral book, and also to keep a tally of the gains and costs of the war in order to express his rationality and ‘right intention’. A similar study by Charteris-Black (2011) argues that Bush uses BUSINESS metaphors on the basis of moral account. According to him, Bush argument is rooted in the conceptual metaphor MORAL ACTIONS ARE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS (pp.266-267). This result coincides with what we found in this study.

As stated in the Introduction, the present study aims to be a complement to other studies exploring the cognitive role of conceptual metaphors in political discourse. The analysis supports other studies and even suggests more results such as showing how Blair uses the BIRTH metaphor to denote destruction. The study also shows that it is not only PERSONIFICATION that could be persuasive by arousing the feelings of fear and confidence but also using metaphors from the domain of BUSINESS could have the same effect.

The limitation of the data and the exclusion of some kinds of metaphors might call for other broader studies of how metaphors are used as a persuasive strategy in rhetoric. It is recommended to conduct a wider investigation in a larger corpus and relate the speeches concerning Iraq before and after 9/11 and how they differ in addressing the Iraqi issue. Another study exploring the cognitive use of metaphor in both the pro and anti-war discourse would be a rich addition to the field.
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Appendix

Appendix A

George W. Bush’s speech: Retrieved from
http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/03.17.03.html

My fellow citizens, events in Iraq have now reached the final days of decision. For more than a
decade, the United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm
the Iraqi regime without war. That regime pledged to reveal and destroy all its weapons of mass
destruction as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf War in 1991.

Since then, the world has engaged in 12 years of diplomacy. We have passed more than a dozen
resolutions in the United Nations Security Council. We have sent hundreds of weapons inspectors
to oversee the disarmament of Iraq. Our good faith has not been returned.

The Iraqi regime has used diplomacy as a ploy to gain time and advantage. It has uniformly
defied Security Council resolutions demanding full disarmament. Over the years, U.N. weapon
inspectors have been threatened by Iraqi officials, electronically bugged, and systematically
deceived. Peaceful efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime have failed again and again -- because we are
not dealing with peaceful men.

Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime
continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised. This regime has
already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

The regime has a history of reckless aggression in the Middle East. It has a deep hatred of
America and our friends. And it has aided, trained and harbored terrorists, including operatives of
al Qaeda.
The danger is clear: using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country, or any other.

The United States and other nations did nothing to deserve or invite this threat. But we will do everything to defeat it. Instead of drifting along toward tragedy, we will set a course toward safety. Before the day of horror can come, before it is too late to act, this danger will be removed.

The United States of America has the sovereign authority to use force in assuring its own national security. That duty falls to me, as Commander-in-Chief, by the oath I have sworn, by the oath I will keep.

Recognizing the threat to our country, the United States Congress voted overwhelmingly last year to support the use of force against Iraq. America tried to work with the United Nations to address this threat because we wanted to resolve the issue peacefully. We believe in the mission of the United Nations. One reason the U.N. was founded after the second world war was to confront aggressive dictators, actively and early, before they can attack the innocent and destroy the peace.

In the case of Iraq, the Security Council did act, in the early 1990s. Under Resolutions 678 and 687 -- both still in effect -- the United States and our allies are authorized to use force in ridding Iraq of weapons of mass destruction. This is not a question of authority, it is a question of will.

Last September, I went to the U.N. General Assembly and urged the nations of the world to unite and bring an end to this danger. On November 8th, the Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 1441, finding Iraq in material breach of its obligations, and vowing serious consequences if Iraq did not fully and immediately disarm.

Today, no nation can possibly claim that Iraq has disarmed. And it will not disarm so long as Saddam Hussein holds power. For the last four-and-a-half months, the United States and our allies have worked within the Security Council to enforce that Council's long-standing demands. Yet, some permanent members of the Security Council have publicly announced they will veto any resolution that compels the disarmament of Iraq. These governments share our assessment of the danger, but not our resolve to meet it. Many nations, however, do have the resolve and fortitude to
act against this threat to peace, and a broad coalition is now gathering to enforce the just demands of the world. The United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours.

In recent days, some governments in the Middle East have been doing their part. They have delivered public and private messages urging the dictator to leave Iraq, so that disarmament can proceed peacefully. He has thus far refused. All the decades of deceit and cruelty have now reached an end. Saddam Hussein and his sons must leave Iraq within 48 hours. Their refusal to do so will result in military conflict, commenced at a time of our choosing. For their own safety, all foreign nationals -- including journalists and inspectors -- should leave Iraq immediately.

Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them. If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you. As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free. In a free Iraq, there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms. The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraqi military to act with honor and protect your country by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attacked and destroyed. I urge every member of the Iraqi military and intelligence services, if war comes, do not fight for a dying regime that is not worth your own life.

And all Iraqi military and civilian personnel should listen carefully to this warning. In any conflict, your fate will depend on your action. Do not destroy oil wells, a source of wealth that belongs to the Iraqi people. Do not obey any command to use weapons of mass destruction against anyone, including the Iraqi people. War crimes will be prosecuted. War criminals will be punished. And it will be no defense to say, "I was just following orders."
Should Saddam Hussein choose confrontation, the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war, and every measure will be taken to win it. Americans understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past. War has no certainty, except the certainty of sacrifice.

Yet, the only way to reduce the harm and duration of war is to apply the full force and might of our military, and we are prepared to do so. If Saddam Hussein attempts to cling to power, he will remain a deadly foe until the end. In desperation, he and terrorists groups might try to conduct terrorist operations against the American people and our friends. These attacks are not inevitable. They are, however, possible. And this very fact underscores the reason we cannot live under the threat of blackmail. The terrorist threat to America and the world will be diminished the moment that Saddam Hussein is disarmed.

Our government is on heightened watch against these dangers. Just as we are preparing to ensure victory in Iraq, we are taking further actions to protect our homeland. In recent days, American authorities have expelled from the country certain individuals with ties to Iraqi intelligence services. Among other measures, I have directed additional security of our airports, and increased Coast Guard patrols of major seaports. The Department of Homeland Security is working closely with the nation's governors to increase armed security at critical facilities across America.

Should enemies strike our country, they would be attempting to shift our attention with panic and weaken our morale with fear. In this, they would fail. No act of theirs can alter the course or shake the resolve of this country. We are a peaceful people -- yet we're not a fragile people, and we will not be intimidated by thugs and killers. If our enemies dare to strike us, they and all who have aided them, will face fearful consequences.

We are now acting because the risks of inaction would be far greater. In one year, or five years, the power of Iraq to inflict harm on all free nations would be multiplied many times over. With these capabilities, Saddam Hussein and his terrorist allies could choose the moment of deadly conflict when they are strongest. We choose to meet that threat now, where it arises, before it can appear suddenly in our skies and cities.
The cause of peace requires all free nations to recognize new and undeniable realities. In the 20th century, some chose to appease murderous dictators, whose threats were allowed to grow into genocide and global war. In this century, when evil men plot chemical, biological and nuclear terror, a policy of appeasement could bring destruction of a kind never before seen on this earth.

Terrorists and terror states do not reveal these threats with fair notice, in formal declarations -- and responding to such enemies only after they have struck first is not self-defense, it is suicide.

The security of the world requires disarming Saddam Hussein now.

As we enforce the just demands of the world, we will also honor the deepest commitments of our country. Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty. And when the dictator has departed, they can set an extract to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

The United States, with other countries, will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land. And the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace.

That is the future we choose. Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent. And tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

Good night, and may God continue to bless America.
Appendix B

Tony Blair’s speech: Retrieved from
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/2870581.stm

1  On Tuesday night I gave the order for British forces to take part in military action in Iraq.
2  Tonight British servicemen and women are engaged from air, land and sea.
3  Their mission: to remove Saddam Hussein from power and disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass
destruction.
4  I know that this course of action has produced deep divisions of opinion in our country but I
know also the British people will now be united in sending our armed forces our thoughts and
prayers - they are the finest in the world and their families and all of Britain can have great pride
in them.
5  The threat to Britain today is not that of my father's generation.
6  'Brutal states'
7  War between the big powers is unlikely, Europe is at peace, the Cold War already a memory.
8  But this new world faces a new threat of disorder and chaos born either of brutal states like Iraq
armed with weapons of mass destruction or of extreme terrorist groups.
9  Both hate our way of life, our freedom, our democracy.
10  My fear, deeply held, based in part on the intelligence that I see
is that these threats come together and deliver catastrophe to our
country and our world.
These tyrannical states do not care for the sanctity of human life - the terrorists delight in destroying it.

Some say if we act we become a target the truth is all nations are targets.

Bali was never in the frontline of action against terrorism, America didn't attack al-Qaeda - they attacked America.

Britain has never been a nation to hide at the back but even if we were it wouldn't avail us.

Should terrorists obtain these weapons now being manufactured and traded around the world the carnage they could inflict to our economies, to our security, to world peace would be beyond our most vivid imagination.

'This threat is real'

My judgement as prime minister is that this threat is real, growing and of an entirely different nature to any conventional threat to our security that Britain has faced before.

For 12 years the world tried to disarm Saddam after his wars in which hundreds of thousands died.

UN weapons inspectors say vast amounts of chemical and biological poisons such as anthrax, VX nerve agent and mustard gas remain unaccounted for in Iraq.

So our choice is clear: back down and leave Saddam hugely strengthened or proceed to disarm him by force. Retreat might give us a moment of respite but years of repentance at our weakness would, I believe, follow.

It is true that Saddam is not the only threat but it is true also as we British know that the best way to deal with future threats peacefully is to deal with present threats with resolve.

Removing Saddam will be a blessing to the Iraqi people: four million Iraqis are in exile, 60% of the population dependent on food aid, thousands of children die every year through malnutrition and disease, hundreds of thousands have been driven from their homes or murdered.
I hope the Iraqi people hear this message. We are with you. Our enemy is not you but your barbarous rulers.

Our commitment to the post-Saddam humanitarian effort will be total.

We shall help Iraq move towards democracy and put the money from Iraqi oil in a UN trust fund so it benefits Iraq and no-one else.

Neither should Iraq be our only concern. President Bush and I have committed ourselves to peace in the Middle East based on a secure state of Israel and a viable Palestinian state.

We will strive to see it done. But these challenges and others that confront us: poverty, the environment, the ravages of disease require a world of order and stability.

Dictators like Saddam. Terrorist groups like al-Qaeda, threaten the very existence of such a world.

That is why I've asked our troops to go into action tonight.

As so often before on the courage and determination of British men and women serving our country the fate of many nations rest. Thank you.
Appendix C

John Howard’s speech: Retrieved from

http://australianpolitics.com/2003/03/20/war-is-right-lawful-howard.html

1 Good evening.
2 The Government has decided to commit Australian forces to action to disarm Iraq because we
3 believe it is right, it is lawful and it’s in Australia’s national interest.
4 We are determined to join other countries to deprive Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction, its
5 chemical and biological weapons, which even in minute quantities are capable of causing death
6 and destruction on a mammoth scale.
7 Iraq has been an aggressor in the past against its neighbours and even its own people. If Iraq is
8 allowed to keep these weapons not only might she use them again but moreover other rogue
9 countries will copy Iraq knowing that the world will do nothing to stop them.
10 And the more countries that have these weapons – countries run by despotic regimes – the greater
11 becomes the likelihood that these weapons will fall into the hands of terrorists. If that happens can
12 anyone doubt that the terrorists will use them whatever the cost might be?
13 The attacks on the 11th of September and in Bali showed that international terrorists have no
14 regard for human life no matter what the nationality of their victims may be.
15 Iraq has long supported international terrorism. Saddam Hussein pays $25,000 to each family of
16 Palestinian suicide bombers who wreak such murderous havoc in Israel. He has sheltered and
17 sponsored many terrorist groups.
18 International terrorism knows no borders. We have learnt that to our cost. Australia and
19 Australians anywhere in the world are as much targets as any other western country and its people.
20 Therefore the possession of chemical, biological, or even worse still, nuclear weapons by a
21 terrorist network would be a direct undeniable and lethal threat to Australia and its people.
22 That is the reason above all others why I passionately believe that action must be taken to disarm
23 Iraq. Not only will it take dangerous weapons from that country but it will send a clear signal to
24 other rogue states and terrorists groups like Al Qaeda which clearly want such weapons that the
25 world is prepared to take a stand.
There’s also another reason and that is our close security alliance with the United States. The Americans have helped us in the past and the United States is very important to Australia’s long-term security.

It is critical that we maintain the involvement of the United States in our own region where at present there are real concerns about the dangerous behaviour of North Korea.

The relationship between our two countries will grow more rather than less important as the years go by.

A key element of our close friendship with the United States and indeed with the British is our full and intimate sharing of intelligence material.

In the difficult fight against the new menace of international terrorism there is nothing more crucial than timely and accurate intelligence. This is a priceless component of our relationship with our two very close allies.

There is nothing comparable to be found in any other relationship – nothing more relevant indeed to the challenges of the contemporary world.

I know that some people are saying that what we have done makes it more likely that terrorists will attack Australia.

Australia has been a terrorist target at least since the 11th of September 2001.

Australia is a western country with western values. Nothing will or should change that. That is why we are a target.

Remember that bin Laden specifically targeted Australia because of our intervention to save the people of East Timor.

Does any Australian seriously suggest that if bin Laden’s warning had come before the East Timor action we should have caved in and changed our policy. That will never be the Australian way.

We believe that so far from our action in Iraq increasing the terrorist threat it will, by stopping the spread of chemical and biological weapons, make it less likely that a devastating terrorist attack will be carried out against Australia.

I want to assure all of you that the action we are taking is fully legal under international law. Back in the early 1990s resolutions were passed by the Security Council authorising military action against Iraq.
That action was only suspended on condition that Iraq gave up its weapons of mass destruction. Clearly we all know this has not happened. As a result the authority to take military action under those earlier resolutions has revived.

America’s critics both here and abroad have been both opportunistic and inconsistent. They know and admit that weapons inspectors only returned to Iraq because of the pressure of the American military build-up. Yet they have persistently criticised American policy.

Apparently they believe that a quarter of a million American, British and indeed Australian troops should stay in the desert doing nothing indefinitely. We all know that if the troops had been withdrawn Iraq would have immediately stopped its minimal co-operation with the inspectors.

Another point I’d make to you very strongly is that we’re not dealing here with a regime of ordinary brutality. There are many dictatorships in the world. But this is a dictatorship of a particularly horrific kind.

His is an appalling regime: its torture, its use of rape as an instrument of intimidation, the cruelty to children to extract confessions from parents. It is a terrible catalogue of inflicting human misery on a people who deserve much better.

This week, the Times of London detailed the use of a human shredding machine as a vehicle for putting to death critics of Saddam Hussein. This is the man, this is the apparatus of terror we are dealing with.

The removal of Saddam Hussein will lift this immense burden of terror from the Iraqi people.

Our argument is with Saddam Hussein’s regime. It is certainly not with Islam.

Australians of an Arab background or of the Islamic faith are a treasured part of our community. Over the weeks ahead and beyond we should all extend to them the hand of Australian mateship.

To those in the community who may not agree with me, please vent your anger against me and towards the government. Remember that our forces are on duty in the Gulf in our name and doing their job in the best traditions of Australia’s defence forces.

Can I say something that I know will find an echo from all of you whether or not you agree with the Government. And that is to say to the men and women of the Australian Defence Force in the Gulf – we admire you, we are thinking of you, we want all of you to come back home safe and sound. We care for and we anguish with your loved ones back here in Australia. Our prayers and our hopes are with all of you.

We now live in a world made very different by the scourge of international terrorism.
This has been a very difficult decision for the Government but a decision which is good for Australia’s long term security and the cause of a safer world.

Good night