

**Patterns of Manufacture:
A Corpus Linguistic Analysis of
The Methodology used to Disseminate Ideology
Within
A Presidential Speech for War**

Michael Post

**Module 4 Assignment
For
Corpus Linguistics July 2008**

**Master of Arts
In
Applied Linguistics**

CL/06/03

It is claimed that corpus research can assist studies of ideology in discourse. Give a demonstration of how this might be the case, pointing out the advantages and disadvantages of corpora to this kind of study. You may either (i) take an ideologically significant text and show how a corpus study can back up or challenge judgements made about it, for example by revealing hidden meanings or (ii) make a study of a group of ideologically significant keywords in one or more of the corpora in the Bank of English or (iii) compare how one or two ideologically significant lexical items are used in two contrasting corpora (e.g. the 'guard' and 'sunnow' corpora in the Bank of English).

Estimated word count excluding long quotes, figures, references, and appendixes: 4500

Centre for English Language Studies
Department of English
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM
Birmingham B15 2TT
United Kingdom

1. Introduction

Through Corpus Linguistics (CL) the salient features of a text can be unpackaged to decode the ideologies conveyed within the grammatical patterning and lexical choices of the discourse. In describing ideologies Van Dijk states:

Ideologies are basic frameworks of social cognition, shared by members of social groups, constituted by relevant selections of sociocultural values, and organized by an ideological schema that represents the self-definition of a group. Besides their social function of sustaining the interests of groups, ideologies have the cognitive function of organizing the social representations (attitudes, knowledge) of the group, and thus indirectly monitor the group-related social practices, and hence also the text and talk of members. (1995: 248)

By identifying the linguistic mechanisms through which ideology is constructed CL can make visible the methods authors employ to package representations of the world, whether consciously or unconsciously. Investigations into this hidden methodology entail understanding both the potential of language and its realization within a text (Stubbs, 1996: 97). This paper will demonstrate how corpus analysis can aid in revealing such hidden meanings within an ideologically significant text.

In the first section of this paper I will discuss the literature associated with CL. A brief account will be given of CL including the advantages and disadvantages of CL, previous studies on ideologically significant texts, the methodology associated with CL and the relevance of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to CL. In the second section I will analyze a political speech given by US President George Bush in 2002 detailing the

reasons why he and his administration believed the USA should go to war with Iraq. The analysis will present data of lexical choices, grammatical patterns and collocations gathered through use of a corpus and a concordancer. Using CDA I will interpret the implications of the data and discuss the linguistic mechanisms employed within the text to manufacture ideology and social representations of the world.

2. Background

2.1 What is a corpus

A corpus is a collection of authentic written or spoken language. However, attested data from a corpus can represent not only frequencies of usage within the language, but can also encode commonly accepted ideas within those frequencies and collocations. Sinclair (1991a: 17 cited in Stubbs, 1996: 174) states, “One of the principle uses of a corpus is to identify what is central and typical in the language...recurrent phrases which encode culturally important concepts.”

2.1.1 Disadvantages of Corpus Linguistics

While CL has numerous advantages there are still limitations to working within its parameters. One of the most obvious limitations is that while the sampled language is authentic it is not always a complete picture of language that is currently in use. Samples are analyzed for patterns, however, these patterns reflect only what has been collected.

Hunston (2000: 86) states:

Most writers agree that although corpus design is important, it is never possible to achieve accurate statistical sampling, and that what goes into a corpus depends most of all on what is available.

Secondly, a corpus provides information on whether word usage is frequent, rather than possible (Hunston, 2000: 112). Analyzing texts provides insight to frequency of language use. Making sense of the frequency and understanding the meanings behind patterned repetition and lexical choice must come from individuals with some acuity for the social contexts that shaped the language in the text and across other texts. Stubbs (1996: 236) states:

The problem for text and corpus analysis is to reconcile analyses of the details of individual texts, their context of production and reception, and intertextual patterns across large corpora.

2.1.2 Advantages of Corpus Linguistics

While there are limitations within the parameters of CL there are also advantages that can remove other limitations imposed by language in general. First, a corpus is much more reliable than native speaker intuition (Hunston, 2002: 20). By analysing the patterns of collocations and the semantic prosody embedded within lexical choices language can be categorized by what is frequent and what is novel to look for further meaning within patterns. Secondly, language patterns are easily discernable and various meanings identified with specific patterns or phrases within a corpus (Hunston, 2000: 29). Kennedy (1998: 4) states:

A corpus constitutes an empirical basic not only for identifying the elements and structural patterns which make up the systems we use in a language, but also for mapping out our use of these patterns.

Finally, CL can aid in deconstructing texts that rely upon the manipulation of language patterns to reproduce ideology. CL provides a framework for the methodology involved in gathering empirical evidence to demonstrate the hidden meanings involved in packaging social representations of the world. Stubbs (1996: 194), citing Hall (1982) states:

...ideology [is not an] intentional bias, but [a] reproduction of a dominant discourse, in which particular definitions and classifications acquire, by repetition, an aura of common sense, and come to seem natural and comprehensive rather than partial and selective...Unconstrained by conventional units such as books or authors...collocational software can provide empirical data for studying how objects of discourse are formed.

2.2 Corpus investigations of ideology

The use of a corpus has been incorporated by a number of significant studies to better understand the use of ideology within discourse. Studies utilizing corpora have been able to investigate areas of language within discourse that may not otherwise be manifest. For instance, a study by Stubbs (1996) suggests that texts contain cultural keywords. Hunston (2000: 89) states that these words are especially significant because they “capture an important social or political fact about a community. They are ‘culturally loaded’ in that they reveal the dominant ideology in the culture which has produced the corpus.” Stubbs states that through a corpus a more accurate depiction of how words are used can be

ascertained.

Another study by Flowerdrew (1997 cited in Hunston, 2002: 112) analyzes the speeches of the last British governor of Hong Kong, Chris Patten. Flowerdrew argues that through the use of lexical reiteration and patterning Patten was able to manufacture analogous hidden messages within the speech that portrayed the British rule of Hong Kong as one that was mythically benevolent.

In a study by Teubert (2000 cited in Hunston, 2002: 110-111) the language of Euroscepticism in Britain is analyzed for implicit messages. Teubert identifies the use of recurrent items, phrases and collocation to unpack the assumptions within the Eurosceptic discourse to reveal concealed messages packaged through the repetition of lexical items and the formation of patterns of association.

In each of the above examples the methodology of CL has been able to describe language because of the evidence made available through corpora.

2.3 Corpus methodology

Because language use does not transparently display its underlying meanings, methods of description and analysis are required to reveal these meanings (Stubbs, 1996: 93). As such, a corpus represents an individual's experience of language as mediated through intentional creative choice and unintentional routine based upon social conventions (Stubbs, 1996: 48). To make use of the sampled language within a corpus linguists use

concordance lines to gather together all instances of a word or phrase within a corpus. Patterns of usage are then analyzed that would normally be unobservable outside the corpus (Hunston, 2002: 9). To aid in this micro-level analysis across macro-level samples of language several methods of investigation are available for describing the linguistic features of texts.

2.3.1 Collocation

One of the most important methods of investigating language is the collocation. See Figure 1 below. Stubbs (1996:172) states, “The main concept is that words occur in characteristic collocations, which show the associations and connotations they have, and therefore the assumptions which they embody.” By analyzing the frequency of collocations and their distribution across texts the meanings they convey can be observed and their patterns categorized for comparison (Stubbs, 1996: 89).

Node word: immigrant
Main lexical collocates: program children entrepreneurial illegal smuggling

Figure 1: Collocations from US News in Bank of English.

2.3.2 Semantic prosody

In addition to the frequency with which lexical items may co-occur with one another as collocations is the tendency for words to co-occur with words that are evaluated as being either positive or negative. Sinclair and Louw (1991a and 1993 cited in Stubbs, 1996: 173) describe this collocational phenomenon as semantic prosody. Semantic prosody can be used to compare words in a text against the expectations of usage in a large corpus. A

feature of semantic prosody is that the positive or negative charge of a word often moves beyond single word boundaries. Mason (2006: 156) states that within a text semantic prosody can be used in subtle and implicit ways, often on a subconscious level to express evaluation of ideological propositions. See Figure 2 below.

Node word: immigrant
Main positive collocates: program children entrepreneurial
Main negative collocates: illegal smuggling

Figure 2: Semantic Prosody for top 5 lexical collocates of war from US News in Bank of English.

2.2.3 Grammatical Patterning and lexical reiteration

Through the use of grammatical patterning and lexical reiteration ideological positions can be conveyed implicitly throughout their distribution of a text. Representations of meaning can be selectively made through the choice of lexis and grammatical forms to accommodate one view of reality over another. Stubbs (1996: 92) states:

...if particular lexical and grammatical choices are regularly made, and if people and things are repeatedly talked about in certain ways, then it is plausible that this will affect how they are thought about...There are patterns which contribute to the meaning of texts but which are not open to direct observation...

2.3 CDA

CDA offers a Hallidayan approach to corpus analysis that views language as being inseparable from its socio-linguistic context, its mediation of ideology and its relation to

power structures within society (Orphin: 37-38). Crucial to CDA is the view that the choice of one word over another within a discourse can encode an ideological package of information to reveal a speaker's ideological stance towards a given topic. Orpin (2005: 37-38) states that a commonality between CL and CDA is that they each compare frequencies and analyze the syntagmatic framework of keywords. While CL is suited for the descriptions of collocation and the lexical reiterations of the keywords within a text, CDA can form perceptive insights into the methodology used to construct ideology across texts. Stubbs (1996: 92-93) states that:

It is necessary to identify the linguistic mechanisms which convey ideology...Ideology need not function at the level of conscious or intentional bias. But ways of expressing things are not natural. Once it is realized that choices have been made, it is also realized that other choices could be made, and that reality could be presented differently.

Additionally, Hunston (2002: 115) states that the manufacturing of ideology within a text is not interpreted from the single instance of a word, but rather from the “cumulative effect of many choices” the author makes in regards to the construction of the text and the ideology within its patterns and preferences of one word over another.

2.3.1 Semantics and Ideology

In *Discourse Semantics and Ideology* (1995) Van Dijk describes six evaluative propositions of ideology that constitute the interests of a group perpetuating ideology: identity/membership, tasks/activities, goals, norms/values, positions and resources. See Figure 3 below. This paper will incorporate these six propositions as a framework for

analyzing and classifying the data from the text of the speech by President Bush.

Evaluative proposition	Meaning
Identity/membership	Defining social categories as groups: Us vs. them
Tasks/activities	Expectations of the group
Goals	Group view of itself
Norms/values	Ideological criteria employed by group to judge its goals and tasks
Positions	Group definition of self in relation to other groups
Resources	Group access to social and/or symbolic/material resources

Figure 3: Van Dijk's evaluative propositions for the interests of group ideology.

3. Corpus Analysis

3.1 The text

On October 7th, 2002 President Bush gave a televised speech outlining the Iraqi threat to the United States. In this speech President Bush aims to link Iraq with acts of terrorism and the US war on terrorism. The speech was given a week before the U.S. Congress was to vote on a resolution authorizing the US military to enforce U.N. Security Council demands in Iraq. While it is President Bush who delivers the speech the actual authorship of the speech cannot be certain.

3.2 Frequency of words

The text contains 3366 tokens and 1015 types. First, using Concorde Pro, a concordance program for Macintosh, a list of all words from the text was compiled by frequency. Next, in addition to Iraq, as it is the central focus of the speech, 10 content words with the highest frequency were selected as keywords for further analysis within the text and against the US news subcorpora of the Bank of English. The US news subcorpora with 100,02,620 words, was selected because of its interconnection with politics and political discourse. Different word forms of each lemma were treated as separate word forms.

Keyword	Frequency count within text
Iraq	45
Weapons	32
Weapon	10
Regime	26
Regimes	2
Saddam Hussein	25
America	22
Iraqi	21
Nuclear	20
Our	20
World	19
People	15
Terror	15
Terrorism	3
Terrorist	7
Terrorists	9
Terrorizing	1

Figure 4: Frequency of keywords from text.

3.3 Evaluative propositions

Understanding the ideological surface propositions of a group entails identifying the underlying linguistic resources packaged within presuppositions of a text. Van Dijk (1995: 273) states:

Precisely because [presuppositions] pertain to knowledge or other beliefs that are not asserted, but simply assumed to be true by the speaker, they are able to 'introduce' ideological propositions whose truth is not uncontroversial at all. As in the case for implications, they allow speakers or writers to make claims without actually asserting them, and, moreover, take specific beliefs for granted although they might not be...Presuppositions are among the staple of ideological argument.

It is within these presuppositions that the evaluative propositions, which define a group's interests, can be applied to analyse linguistic expressions of the text which highlight specific social representations of reality while downplaying others (Martin, 1985 cited in Stubbs, 1996: 235). In the following section keywords from the text will be analysed based on Van Dijk's six evaluative propositions. These evaluative propositions will be applied as a framework to analyse the Bush administration's ideological stance towards itself and towards the government of Iraq.

3.3.1 Identity/membership

Defining social categories as groups

Saddam Hussein

Saddam Hussein is used within the article to personify the threat coming from Iraq. The threat is primarily articulated via three main semantic classifications throughout the text.

See Figure 5 below. The first classification evaluates the types of threat Saddam Hussein poses, while the second classifies what weapons and resources Saddam Hussein has in his possession and the third classifies how Saddam Hussein can use these weapons and resources to carry out this threat in the future. The stated threat, and its evaluation, is not that Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons, but that he is making them available to individuals and/or organizations outside of governments specifically involved in terrorism. The unstated presupposition is that government build-up of weapons is acceptable. However, as a method of modifying this presupposition President Bush labels Saddam Hussein a *homicidal dictator*. By doing so President Bush implies that Saddam Hussein is a maniac, rather than just a dictator. According to the Bank of English *homicidal* typically collocates with *maniac*. By choosing to collocate *dictator* with *homicidal* the writers of the speech seem to be expanding the type of threat posed by Saddam Hussein from one based on ideology, via dictatorship and possession of nuclear weapons to one based on sanity, via mania.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
Evaluation of Saddam Hussein	<p>Saddam Hussein is a threat</p> <p>Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator</p> <p>Saddam Hussein is harbouring terrorists</p> <p>Saddam Hussein is close to developing a nuclear weapons</p>	<p>N v n</p> <p>N v adj n</p> <p>N v adj n</p> <p>N v</p>
What Saddam Hussein is in possession of	<p>Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons</p> <p>Saddam Hussein also has experience...weapons</p> <p>Saddam Hussein still has chemical weapons</p> <p>Saddam Hussein had ordered his nuclear program</p> <p>Saddam Hussein `s links to int. terrorist groups</p>	<p>N v adj n</p> <p>N also v n</p> <p>N still v adj n</p> <p>N v his adj n</p> <p>N's n to adj n</p>

	Saddam Hussein `s regime Saddam Hussein `s terror and murder	N's n N's n and n
Possible future based on actions of Saddam Hussein	Saddam Hussein would be in a position to blackmail Saddam Hussein would be in a position to pass The stronger and bolder Saddam Hussein will become	N would v N would v Adj adj N will v

Figure 5: Example collocations of Saddam Hussein

Terror

Terror maintains negative semantic prosody throughout the speech except when used in reference to the US actions against it. See Figure 6 below. Two main patterns emerge from its usage in the text. The first pattern seems to incorporate terror as something to be possessed. Examples from the text include: *arsenal of terror*, *weapons of terror*, and *the instruments of terror*. Clearly weapons are the implied types of terror. However, in analyzing the pattern of NOUN+of+terror within the Bank of English the top collocates are:

- a ring of terror
- a campaign of terror
- Legacy of Terror
- champion of terror
- scale of terror
- a reign of terror
- judicious use of terror.
- vehicles of terror
- a History of Terror

This usage seems to imply that the most frequent uses of terror do not include weapons, but instead include people and their actions, not their weapons. Additionally, a second usage of terror is found within this classification. Examples include: *terror organization*, *a terror network*, *terror cells and outlaw regimes*. In these instances terror is part of

something larger that is assembling together. These examples seem to imply that unstable governments not only have access to weapons, but they have access to terror as a means of control. This seems to be a deliberate shift away from terrorist, which has no corpus collocation with government. A corpus search of terrorist+NOUN reveals *terrorist activities* as a top collocate. Activity does not have a negative semantic prosody. An additional corpus search of terror+NOUN reveals *terror attacks* as the top collocate. It is this usage of terror that the writers of the speech clearly aim to disseminate underneath the grammatical patterns and lexical choices.

The second pattern addresses terror as an idea. Examples include: *the war on terror* and *the war against terror*. It seems these are used as similar references to the US war on drugs and the ideology associated with drug use. A search within the Bank of English for war+on+NOUN shows *the war on drugs, the war on crime and the war on terrorism* as top collocates. This usage is also reiterated upon when President Bush says *Saddam Hussein...is addicted to weapons of mass destruction*. A search within the Bank of English for addicted+to+NOUN reveals *cocaine, drugs, sex and crack* as the top collocates, all embodying negative semantic prosody within their usage.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
Type of terror	Arsenal of terror Weapons of terror Instruments of terror The rule of terror and control A terror network terror cells and outlaw regimes	n of N n of N n of N n of N and n ADJ n ADJ n and adj n

	terror organization	ADJ n
America's actions against terror	The war against terror The war on terror The wider war on terror	n against N n on N adj n on N

Figure 6: Example collocations of terror

It seems evident that the speech uses both Saddam Hussein and terror as a means of defining identity. This is an identity layered around the physical threat of nuclear weapons and the ideological threat of terror. This usage of terror is marked in that it focuses only on feelings of fear, while the usage of terrorism focuses on violence as a means of achieving a political objective. Usage of Saddam Hussein is implemented as a method of demonstrating his controls over terror and his ability to produce actions of terror. Additionally, the US depicts itself as reacting to and fighting against terror. These patterns reinforce the USA as US and Saddam Hussein/Iraqi regime as THEM.

3.3.2 Tasks/activities

Expectations of the group

Weapons

The use of weapons within the text is clearly utilized as a means of reinforcing the threat from Iraq. Two patterns emerge which define weapons proliferation as part of the tasks involved with the government of Iraq. See Figure 7 below. The first pattern describes the types of weapons while the second pattern evaluates the type of threat posed by the weapons.

Semantic	Collocation from text	Grammatical
-----------------	------------------------------	--------------------

Classification		Pattern
Types of weapons	Chemical and biological weapons Weapons of mass destruction Atomic weapons biological weapons Chemical weapons Produce chemical and biological weapons Disperse chemical or biological weapons Building weapons of mass destruction Nuclear weapons Nuclear weapons program Reconstituting its nuclear weapons program	adj and adj N N of adj n adj N adj N adj N v adj and adj N v adj and adj N v N of adj n adj N adj N n v its adj N n
Evaluation of weapons	Terrible weapons Chemical weapons to kill Developing weapons of terror Develop even more dangerous weapons Advanced nuclear weapons Firing of weapons	adj N adj N v to-inf v N of n v even more adj N adj adj N n of N

Figure 7: Example collocations of weapons

3.3.3 Goals

Group view of itself

America

America is used within the text as part of three main semantic classifications of evaluation. These classifications evaluate the threat to America, America's response to this threat and an evaluation of un-American responses to any threat.

Within the first half of the speech America is utilized to overtly assess actions taken towards it. Lexical items collocate with America to reinforce associations of the atrocities

on 9/11 through collocates of *terror and suffering to America, danger is to America, and terrorist attacks on America*. See Figure 8 below. However, within this usage in the first half of the speech one pattern stands out in contrast to the evaluation of these actions towards America:

a grave threat to peace, and America's determination to lead the world in confronting that threat.

In this instance the actions of America towards this threat are nominalized as a means of continuing the focus on the threat and not on the actions of America. However, a corpus search of NOUN+determination reveals *self-determination* as one of the top collocates. It would seem clear that the speech nominalizes the actions of America as a means of packaging a core American value beneath the level of discourse. It is within this hidden meaning that the writers attempt to repackage the values of the American people as the will of the American people.

At the end of the speech America's actions are readdressed when President Bush states:

America speaks with one voice and is determined to make the demands of the civilized world mean something

It seems that in this instance the value associated with *self-determination* via *America's determination* has been repackaged as *America speaks with one voice*. In using *is determined* the writers of the speech again presuppose the will of Americans for the values of Americans.

In the second half of the speech the usage of America shifts towards evaluating America's response to the threat it perceives mounting against it. The verbs selected all have a positive semantic prosody, such as *hopes, wants, believes*. Such verbs are used as an overt method of stating the administrations desire to avoid war. However, the third pattern contrasts with this usage as it is employed as a means of articulating the acceptable, and desirable, actions of the Bush administration. President Bush states:

and through its inaction, the United States would resign itself to a future of fear.
 That is not the America I know.
 That is not the America I serve.
 We refuse to live in fear.

The speech clearly employs terror as a means of associating fear with the actions Iraq may take towards America. The President then stokes this fear created within the speech by castigating America if it does not take action. The presupposition is that there is a threat. The writers choose *resign*, which has a negative semantic prosody to signal that if America does not attack Iraq then any attacks on America or the world are the fault of America.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
Evaluation of actions to America	Could bring sudden terror and suffering to America To threaten America and the world Danger is to America Terrorist attacks on America attack America Those who hate America are willing	v sudden n and n to N v N and the N n v to N adj n on N v N those who v N v

Evaluation of actions of America	<p>America felt its vulnerability</p> <p>America must not ignore the threat</p> <p>America wants</p> <p>America is</p> <p>America hopes</p> <p>America believes</p> <p>America is a friend</p> <p>America speaks</p> <p>America's determination</p> <p>The use of America's military</p> <p>America speaks with one voice and is determined</p>	<p>N v its n</p> <p>N must not v the n</p> <p>N v</p> <p>N v</p> <p>N v</p> <p>N v</p> <p>N v a n</p> <p>N v</p> <p>N's n</p> <p>N of N n</p> <p>N v with one v and v v</p>
Evaluation of what America is not	<p>Not the America I know</p> <p>Not the America I serve</p>	<p>not the N I v</p> <p>not the N I v</p>

Figure 8: Example collocations of America.

People

Within the text two patterns emerge which packages people with actions outside of their control. In the first pattern the word people is primarily utilized within the speech to represent those who have suffered atrocities or have been killed. See Figure 9 below. In the second pattern people is collocated with Iraq to present their powerlessness against the Iraqi government.

Each of these instances uses people as a method of reinforcing America's view of itself: protector of the people of the world.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
-------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

People as dead or injured	killed or injured at least 20,000 people killed or injured nearly 900 people to kill thousands of people people who died in the attacks of September the 11th.	v or v at least # N v or v nearly # N v n of N N who v in the n
Iraqi people as powerless	Rather than providing for the needs of the Iraqi people will help the Iraqi people rebuild situation could hardly get worse, for world security and for the people of Iraq. Terrorizing his own people	Rather than v for the n of the adj will v the adj N v n could hardly v for n n and for the N of n v his own N

Figure 9: Example collocations of people.

Both people and America are implemented to reinforce notions of power. Within the micro-history of the text negative actions are taken towards people, while America takes positive actions to save people from these negative actions.

3.3.4 Norms/values

Ideological criteria employed by group to judge its goals and tasks

World

Three patterns emerge within the text that seem to blur the lines between America and the world. See Figure 10 below. The first pattern aligns American values with those of all other countries, the second pattern evaluates American actions as being synonymous with all other countries and the third pattern evaluates which countries are included in the world. Within the first pattern there is a presupposition that America should lead the world. Additionally, any dangers to America are also dangers to other countries. In the second pattern the world is evaluated for its past efforts to save Iraq from Saddam Hussein. Within the third pattern world collocates with *civilized* as an evaluation of

American values. A corpus search of civilized+NOUN reveals *civilized nations* as the top collocate. It seems that in evaluating world values as civilized and as that of its own America denies Iraq status as a legitimate nation. This usage seems to reinforce patterns of America responding to the needs of the world, thereby saving people from the threat of weapons and terror.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
Aligning world and American values	To lead the world Lead the world Entire world America and the world Dangers is to America and the world	to V the N Vthe N adj N n and the N n v to n and the N
Evaluation of actions of the world	The world has tried The world has also tried economic sanctions The world has tried limited military strikes The world has tried no-fly zones	N v v N v also v adj n N v adj adj n N v v adj n
Evaluation of who is part of the world	The civilized world The world community	adj N ADJ n

Figure 10: Example collocations of world.

Our

Three patterns are evident within the text which utilize our as a means of defending American values, evaluating who is entitled to these values and reinforcing authority. See Figure 11 below. In the first pattern our collocates with nouns of semantic prosody which represent positive American values. The selection of nouns with positive semantic

prosody clearly reinforces a hidden message that these values can be taken away by someone to whom they do not belong. The second usage evaluates the recipients of these values and to whom they do belong. Semantic prosody is again positive. The third usage introduces the only instance of a noun with negative semantic prosody, *enemies*. The usage of *our enemies* reinforces the American values that they do not have access to. Protection of both the values and the recipients is illustrated via *our security*.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
Defending perceived values	<p>Our age Our time Our freedom Our responsibilities Our courage Our actions</p>	<p>P-ADJ n P-ADJ n P-ADJ n P-ADJ n P-ADJ n P-ADJ n</p>
Who is entitled to perceived values	<p>Our citizens Our nation Our country Our allies Our side</p>	<p>P-ADJ n P-ADJ n P-ADJ n P-ADJ n P-ADJ n</p>
Defending perceived authority	<p>Our security Our enemies</p>	<p>P-ADJ n P-ADJ n</p>

Figure 11: Example collocations of our.

World and our seem to be utilized within the text to reinforce American values as the standards by which other countries should judge themselves. Additionally, their usage is implemented to assess the use of weapons as threat to these values.

3.3.5 Positions

Group definition of self in relation to other groups

Iraq

Three patterns of collocational usage stand out from Iraq as subject matter to serve the purposes of the authors of the text in their manufacturing of ideology. See Figure 12 below.

In the first pattern Iraq is used as the subject to demonstrate its active role in weapons proliferation. A corpus search of Iraq+VB reveals *sell* as one of the main collocates for Iraq. In this instance it is used for oil, not weapons. However, in the speech Iraq+VB is used via *rebuilding*, *reconstituting* and *training* to illustrate Iraq's weapons build-up.

A second pattern within the speech collocates Iraq with other lexical items to reinforce the ideological assumptions made by President Bush in the beginning of the speech that Iraq is a threat. Of significance is the fact that Iraq is not a threat in and of itself, but that the threat *comes from* Iraq. The threat, previously stated as nuclear weapons, is implied to be making its way to the US.

threat comes from Iraq
the threat from Iraq stands alone
the threat from Iraq could detract from the war against terror

The implied message seems to be that by not attacking Iraq an even greater danger than previous terrorist attacks may await Americans in the future.

The third pattern is evident in the last half of the speech when the semantic prosody of Iraq undergoes a transition from negative to positive via changes in its collocates. Within this pattern the threat from Iraq is no longer emphasized and instead the people of Iraq are foregrounded as a means of aligning American interests and theirs:

America is a friend to the people of Iraq
 The long captivity of Iraq will end, and an era of new hope will begin
 Iraq is a land rich in culture, resources, and talent
 Iraq people will be able to share in the progress and prosperity of our time
 a unified Iraq

This shift in choice seems to be an effort to substantiate the claims within other collocations of the speech that reinforce the values of the US and the “civilized world,” values which are being denied to the Iraqi people, but can be granted by the US.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
Iraq as government taking action	Iraq is exploring Iraq is developing Iraq has provided Iraq has also provided Iraq is continuing to Iraq has trained Iraq is reconstituting Iraq is rebuilding Iraq has attempted	N v v N v v N v v N v also v N v v N v v N v v N v v N v v
Iraq as threat	threat comes from Iraq the threat from Iraq stands alone the threat from Iraq could detract from the war against terror	n v from N n from N adj n n from N could v from the n against n
Iraq as threat	threat comes from Iraq the threat from Iraq stands alone the threat from Iraq could detract from the war against terror	n v from N n from N adj n n from N could v from the n against n

Iraq as people under threat	<p>for world security and for the people of Iraq.</p> <p>The dictator of Iraq is a student of Stalin</p> <p>America is a friend to the people of Iraq</p> <p>The long captivity of Iraq will end</p> <p>Iraq is a land rich in culture, resources, and talent</p> <p>Iraq's people will be able to share in the progress and prosperity of our time</p> <p>the dictator in Iraq</p>	<p>for adj n and for the N</p> <p>n of N v a n of n</p> <p>n v n to the n of N</p> <p>adj n of N will end</p> <p>N v n adj n in n n n</p> <p>N's n will be v v to-inf</p> <p>in the n and n of p-adj n</p> <p>n in N</p>
-----------------------------	---	---

Figure 12: Example collocations of Iraq.

Regime

The use of regime within the article appears to be straightforward in its assessment of the government in Iraq by classifying either as being the *Iraqi regime*, *Saddam Hussein's regime* or through the determiner *the regime*. It is used to describe the actions and nature of the government in Iraq that President Bush believes not only to be a threat, but a specific type of government. See Figure 13 below.

Corpus usage shows that regime is usually used with totalitarian governments, such as communist, Soviet and Nazi. However, in looking beyond the negative semantic prosody of regime there are two words it collocates with which are both positive: *gleefully celebrated*. As with *addicted to weapons of mass destruction* cited earlier, this usage seems to implicitly state that the dangers posed by Saddam Hussein are beyond control: he is unstable and will celebrate things sane people do not.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
Evaluating the type of government in Iraq	The Iraqi regime has violated the regime has produced the Iraqi regime has an opportunity to avoid conflict Saddam Hussein's regime gleefully celebrated the terrorist attacks on America. Alliance with terrorists could allow the Iraqi regime to attack America	adj N v v N v v adj N v n v n n's N adj v adj n on n n with n could v adj N v n
Whose regime	Saddam Hussein's regime	N's N
DWhich regime	The regime in Iraq	N in n

Figure 13: Example collocations of regime.

Iraqi

Iraqi is employed as part of two significant patterns within the text to define the government and the people of Iraq. The first pattern maintains negative semantic prosody with its collocates of *regime* and *dictator*. However, in the second pattern when used with *people*, *citizens*, *men*, *women* and *children* it takes on a positive semantic prosody. Each of the two patterns seems to reinforce the threat by Iraq/Saddam Hussein and the threat to Iraqi's and the rest of the world. See Figure 14 below.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
Defining Iraqi as regime/government	Iraqi regime Iraqi dictator	ADJ n ADJ n
Redefining Iraqi as	needs of the Iraqi people	N of ADJ n

people	lives of Iraqi citizens Iraqi men, women and children our allies will help the Iraqi people	N of ADJ n ADJ n n and n p-adj n will v ADJ n
--------	--	--

Figure 14: Example collocations of Iraqi.

Iraq, regime and Iraqi are clearly implemented to evaluate the threat in Iraq, articulate the American position against the Iraqi regime and state its desire to aid the Iraqi people. In defining what Iraq is America is able to define what it is not.

3.3.6 Resources

Group access to social and/or symbolic/material resources

Nuclear

Three patterns emerge from the usage of nuclear. See Figure 15 below. The first pattern collocates *nuclear* with *weapons* and the actions of *Saddam Hussein* via verbs such as *seeking* and *developing*. The second pattern evaluates the type of nuclear weapon in describing the weapons as *workable*, *advanced* and *extensive*. The final pattern illustrates nuclear power as being that of *Saddam Hussein*. However, two instances stand out: *nuclear holy warriors* and *nuclear mujahideen*. A corpus search of nuclear+NOUN indicates *facilities*, *missiles* and *weapons* as the main collocates. In all three instances nuclear collocates with a type of technology for delivering or developing nuclear power. However, in collocating *mujahideen* and *holy warriors* nuclear is used not with technical ability, but with individuals as a method of associating nuclear with representations of individuals involved in Islam and battle.

Semantic Classification	Collocation from text	Grammatical Pattern
Current actions of Saddam Hussein	Seeking nuclear weapons Developing nuclear weapons reconstituting its nuclear weapons program Pass nuclear technology to terrorists developing a nuclear weapon possessed a nuclear weapon	v ADJ n v ADJ n v ADJ n v ADJ n to n v ADJ n v ADJ n
Types of nuclear weapons	A workable nuclear weapon Advanced nuclear weapons development program Extensive nuclear weapons-related facilities	adj ADJ n adj ADJ n n n adj ADJ n n
Whose nuclear weapons	His nuclear program Its nuclear program His nuclear Mujahideen His nuclear Holy warriors	p- adj ADJ n p- adj ADJ n p- adj ADJ n p- adj ADJ adj n

Figure 15: Example collocations of nuclear.

The text employs nuclear as part of the resources within the threat that America must defend itself and the world from. Lexical choices such as holy warriors and mujahideen seem to be selected as a means of connecting this threat to terrorism by associations through Islam.

3.4 Summary of analysis

The aim of this study was to analyze via Corpus linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis the salient features of an ideologically significant text. By applying Van Dijk's six evaluative propositions to the lexical choices and grammatical patterns of the collocations, keywords from the text were categorized by semantic classifications for frequency and then analyzed for patterns through a concordance program. Selected items

were then analyzed for additional patterns and deeper meaning within the frequency of a corpus.

Assessing the ideological criteria of the text involved making judgements about why lexical items were selected as well as their associations with words in and outside of the text. In addressing the keywords of the text patterns emerged which revealed hidden meanings accessible through the positive and negative semantic prosody of the collocations.

4. Conclusion

Through Corpus linguistics the methods used to disseminate ideologies within discourse via grammatical patterning and lexical choice can be unpacked and analyzed for frequency to reveal hidden meaning. Language patterns are easily identifiable because of a corpus and various meanings can quickly be revealed as parts of specific patterns or phrases. However, while a corpus is more reliable than native speaker intuition in compiling patterns, it is the intuition of native speakers in analysing patterns of collocations and semantic prosody that is crucial to the success of the Corpus linguistics framework and the methodology involved in gathering empirical evidence. In understanding the production of ideology Corpus linguistics can aid in evaluating the principles behind the transmission of social representations of the world which not only reproduce dominant forms of discourse, but consciously and unconsciously depict versions of reality favourable towards a group's interests by manipulating choices within language patterns to reproduce ideology.

References

Flowerdew, L. (1998) 'Corpus linguistic techniques applied to text linguistics.' *System* 26: 541-552

Hunston, S. (2000) *Corpus Linguistics*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Hunston, S. (2002) *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kennedy, G. (1998) *An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics*. Essex: Longman.

Mason, O., Platt, R. (2006) 'Embracing A New Creed: Lexical Patterning and The Encoding Of Ideology'. *College Literature* 33.2: 154-170.

Orpin, D. (2005) 'Corpus Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis: Examining the ideology of sleaze'. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 10:1: 37-61

Stubbs, M. (1996) *Text and Corpus Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001) 'Critical Discourse Analysis.' In Tannen D., Schiffrin, D., and Hamilton, H., (eds.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006) 'Discourse and Manipulation.' *Discourse and Society* 17:2: 359-383.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995) 'Discourse Semantics and Ideology.' *Discourse and Society* 6:2: 243-289.

Software used in this study:

Concorder Pro-

<http://homepage.mac.com/fahrenba/programs/concorderPro/concorderPro.html>

General corpora used in this study:

Bank of English (Harper Collins Publishers; University of Birmingham)

Appendix 1:

Presidential Speech

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html>

President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat Remarks by the President on Iraq Cincinnati Museum Center - Cincinnati Union Terminal Cincinnati, Ohio

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all. Thank you for that very gracious and warm Cincinnati welcome. I'm honored to be here tonight; I appreciate you all coming.

Tonight I want to take a few minutes to discuss a grave threat to peace, and America's determination to lead the world in confronting that threat.

The threat comes from Iraq. It arises directly from the Iraqi regime's own actions -- its history of aggression, and its drive toward an arsenal of terror. Eleven years ago, as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf War, the Iraqi regime was required to destroy its weapons of mass destruction, to cease all development of such weapons, and to stop all support for terrorist groups. The Iraqi regime has violated all of those obligations. It possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons. It is seeking nuclear weapons. It has given shelter and support to terrorism, and practices terror against its own people. The entire world has witnessed Iraq's eleven-year history of defiance, deception and bad faith.

We also must never forget the most vivid events of recent history. On September the 11th, 2001, America felt its vulnerability -- even to threats that gather on the other side of the earth. We resolved then, and we are resolved today, to confront every threat, from any source, that could bring sudden terror and suffering to America.

Members of the Congress of both political parties, and members of the United Nations Security Council, agree that Saddam Hussein is a threat to peace and must disarm. We agree that the Iraqi dictator must not be permitted to threaten America and the world with horrible poisons and diseases and gases and atomic weapons. Since we all agree on this goal, the issue is : how can we best achieve it?

Many Americans have raised legitimate questions: about the nature of the threat; about the urgency of action -- why be concerned now; about the link between Iraq developing weapons of terror, and the wider war on terror. These are all issues we've discussed broadly and fully within my administration. And tonight, I want to share those discussions with you.

First, some ask why Iraq is different from other countries or regimes that also have terrible weapons. While there are many dangers in the world, the threat from Iraq stands alone -- because it gathers the most serious dangers of our age in one place. Iraq's weapons of mass destruction are controlled by a murderous tyrant who has already used chemical weapons to kill thousands of people. This same tyrant has tried to dominate the Middle East, has invaded and brutally occupied a small neighbor, has struck other nations

without warning, and holds an unrelenting hostility toward the United States.

By its past and present actions, by its technological capabilities, by the merciless nature of its regime, Iraq is unique. As a former chief weapons inspector of the U.N. has said, "The fundamental problem with Iraq remains the nature of the regime, itself. Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator who is addicted to weapons of mass destruction."

Some ask how urgent this danger is to America and the world. The danger is already significant, and it only grows worse with time. If we know Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons today -- and we do -- does it make any sense for the world to wait to confront him as he grows even stronger and develops even more dangerous weapons?

In 1995, after several years of deceit by the Iraqi regime, the head of Iraq's military industries defected. It was then that the regime was forced to admit that it had produced more than 30,000 liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents. The inspectors, however, concluded that Iraq had likely produced two to four times that amount. This is a massive stockpile of biological weapons that has never been accounted for, and capable of killing millions.

We know that the regime has produced thousands of tons of chemical agents, including mustard gas, sarin nerve gas, VX nerve gas. Saddam Hussein also has experience in using chemical weapons. He has ordered chemical attacks on Iran, and on more than forty villages in his own country. These actions killed or injured at least 20,000 people, more than six times the number of people who died in the attacks of September the 11th.

And surveillance photos reveal that the regime is rebuilding facilities that it had used to produce chemical and biological weapons. Every chemical and biological weapon that Iraq has or makes is a direct violation of the truce that ended the Persian Gulf War in 1991. Yet, Saddam Hussein has chosen to build and keep these weapons despite international sanctions, U.N. demands, and isolation from the civilized world.

Iraq possesses ballistic missiles with a likely range of hundreds of miles -- far enough to strike Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey, and other nations -- in a region where more than 135,000 American civilians and service members live and work. We've also discovered through intelligence that Iraq has a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles that could be used to disperse chemical or biological weapons across broad areas. We're concerned that Iraq is exploring ways of using these UAVS for missions targeting the United States. And, of course, sophisticated delivery systems aren't required for a chemical or biological attack; all that might be required are a small container and one terrorist or Iraqi intelligence operative to deliver it.

And that is the source of our urgent concern about Saddam Hussein's links to international terrorist groups. Over the years, Iraq has provided safe haven to terrorists such as Abu Nidal, whose terror organization carried out more than 90 terrorist attacks in 20 countries that killed or injured nearly 900 people, including 12 Americans. Iraq has also provided safe haven to Abu Abbas, who was responsible for seizing the Achille Lauro and killing an American passenger. And we know that Iraq is continuing to finance

terror and gives assistance to groups that use terrorism to undermine Middle East peace.

We know that Iraq and the al Qaeda terrorist network share a common enemy -- the United States of America. We know that Iraq and al Qaeda have had high-level contacts that go back a decade. Some al Qaeda leaders who fled Afghanistan went to Iraq. These include one very senior al Qaeda leader who received medical treatment in Baghdad this year, and who has been associated with planning for chemical and biological attacks. We've learned that Iraq has trained al Qaeda members in bomb-making and poisons and deadly gases. And we know that after September the 11th, Saddam Hussein's regime gleefully celebrated the terrorist attacks on America.

Iraq could decide on any given day to provide a biological or chemical weapon to a terrorist group or individual terrorists. Alliance with terrorists could allow the Iraqi regime to attack America without leaving any fingerprints.

Some have argued that confronting the threat from Iraq could detract from the war against terror. To the contrary; confronting the threat posed by Iraq is crucial to winning the war on terror. When I spoke to Congress more than a year ago, I said that those who harbor terrorists are as guilty as the terrorists themselves. Saddam Hussein is harboring terrorists and the instruments of terror, the instruments of mass death and destruction. And he cannot be trusted. The risk is simply too great that he will use them, or provide them to a terror network.

Terror cells and outlaw regimes building weapons of mass destruction are different faces of the same evil. Our security requires that we confront both. And the United States military is capable of confronting both.

Many people have asked how close Saddam Hussein is to developing a nuclear weapon. Well, we don't know exactly, and that's the problem. Before the Gulf War, the best intelligence indicated that Iraq was eight to ten years away from developing a nuclear weapon. After the war, international inspectors learned that the regime has been much closer -- the regime in Iraq would likely have possessed a nuclear weapon no later than 1993. The inspectors discovered that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, had a design for a workable nuclear weapon, and was pursuing several different methods of enriching uranium for a bomb.

Before being barred from Iraq in 1998, the International Atomic Energy Agency dismantled extensive nuclear weapons-related facilities, including three uranium enrichment sites. That same year, information from a high-ranking Iraqi nuclear engineer who had defected revealed that despite his public promises, Saddam Hussein had ordered his nuclear program to continue.

The evidence indicates that Iraq is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program. Saddam Hussein has held numerous meetings with Iraqi nuclear scientists, a group he calls his "nuclear mujahideen" -- his nuclear holy warriors. Satellite photographs reveal that Iraq is rebuilding facilities at sites that have been part of its nuclear program in the past. Iraq has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes and other equipment needed for

gas centrifuges, which are used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons.

If the Iraqi regime is able to produce, buy, or steal an amount of highly enriched uranium a little larger than a single softball, it could have a nuclear weapon in less than a year. And if we allow that to happen, a terrible line would be crossed. Saddam Hussein would be in a position to blackmail anyone who opposes his aggression. He would be in a position to dominate the Middle East. He would be in a position to threaten America. And Saddam Hussein would be in a position to pass nuclear technology to terrorists.

Some citizens wonder, after 11 years of living with this problem, why do we need to confront it now? And there's a reason. We've experienced the horror of September the 11th. We have seen that those who hate America are willing to crash airplanes into buildings full of innocent people. Our enemies would be no less willing, in fact, they would be eager, to use biological or chemical, or a nuclear weapon.

Knowing these realities, America must not ignore the threat gathering against us. Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait for the final proof -- the smoking gun -- that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud. As President Kennedy said in October of 1962, "Neither the United States of America, nor the world community of nations can tolerate deliberate deception and offensive threats on the part of any nation, large or small. We no longer live in a world," he said, "where only the actual firing of weapons represents a sufficient challenge to a nation's security to constitute maximum peril."

Understanding the threats of our time, knowing the designs and deceptions of the Iraqi regime, we have every reason to assume the worst, and we have an urgent duty to prevent the worst from occurring.

Some believe we can address this danger by simply resuming the old approach to inspections, and applying diplomatic and economic pressure. Yet this is precisely what the world has tried to do since 1991. The U.N. inspections program was met with systematic deception. The Iraqi regime bugged hotel rooms and offices of inspectors to find where they were going next; they forged documents, destroyed evidence, and developed mobile weapons facilities to keep a step ahead of inspectors. Eight so-called presidential palaces were declared off-limits to unfettered inspections. These sites actually encompass twelve square miles, with hundreds of structures, both above and below the ground, where sensitive materials could be hidden.

The world has also tried economic sanctions -- and watched Iraq use billions of dollars in illegal oil revenues to fund more weapons purchases, rather than providing for the needs of the Iraqi people.

The world has tried limited military strikes to destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities -- only to see them openly rebuilt, while the regime again denies they even exist.

The world has tried no-fly zones to keep Saddam from terrorizing his own people -- and in the last year alone, the Iraqi military has fired upon American and British pilots more

than 750 times.

After eleven years during which we have tried containment, sanctions, inspections, even selected military action, the end result is that Saddam Hussein still has chemical and biological weapons and is increasing his capabilities to make more. And he is moving ever closer to developing a nuclear weapon.

Clearly, to actually work, any new inspections, sanctions or enforcement mechanisms will have to be very different. America wants the U.N. to be an effective organization that helps keep the peace. And that is why we are urging the Security Council to adopt a new resolution setting out tough, immediate requirements. Among those requirements: the Iraqi regime must reveal and destroy, under U.N. supervision, all existing weapons of mass destruction. To ensure that we learn the truth, the regime must allow witnesses to its illegal activities to be interviewed outside the country -- and these witnesses must be free to bring their families with them so they all beyond the reach of Saddam Hussein's terror and murder. And inspectors must have access to any site, at any time, without pre-clearance, without delay, without exceptions.

The time for denying, deceiving, and delaying has come to an end. Saddam Hussein must disarm himself -- or, for the sake of peace, we will lead a coalition to disarm him.

Many nations are joining us in insisting that Saddam Hussein's regime be held accountable. They are committed to defending the international security that protects the lives of both our citizens and theirs. And that's why America is challenging all nations to take the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council seriously.

And these resolutions are clear. In addition to declaring and destroying all of its weapons of mass destruction, Iraq must end its support for terrorism. It must cease the persecution of its civilian population. It must stop all illicit trade outside the Oil For Food program. It must release or account for all Gulf War personnel, including an American pilot, whose fate is still unknown.

By taking these steps, and by only taking these steps, the Iraqi regime has an opportunity to avoid conflict. Taking these steps would also change the nature of the Iraqi regime itself. America hopes the regime will make that choice. Unfortunately, at least so far, we have little reason to expect it. And that's why two administrations -- mine and President Clinton's -- have stated that regime change in Iraq is the only certain means of removing a great danger to our nation.

I hope this will not require military action, but it may. And military conflict could be difficult. An Iraqi regime faced with its own demise may attempt cruel and desperate measures. If Saddam Hussein orders such measures, his generals would be well advised to refuse those orders. If they do not refuse, they must understand that all war criminals will be pursued and punished. If we have to act, we will take every precaution that is possible. We will plan carefully; we will act with the full power of the United States military; we will act with allies at our side, and we will prevail. (Applause.)

There is no easy or risk-free course of action. Some have argued we should wait -- and that's an option. In my view, it's the riskiest of all options, because the longer we wait, the stronger and bolder Saddam Hussein will become. We could wait and hope that Saddam does not give weapons to terrorists, or develop a nuclear weapon to blackmail the world. But I'm convinced that is a hope against all evidence. As Americans, we want peace -- we work and sacrifice for peace. But there can be no peace if our security depends on the will and whims of a ruthless and aggressive dictator. I'm not willing to stake one American life on trusting Saddam Hussein.

Failure to act would embolden other tyrants, allow terrorists access to new weapons and new resources, and make blackmail a permanent feature of world events. The United Nations would betray the purpose of its founding, and prove irrelevant to the problems of our time. And through its inaction, the United States would resign itself to a future of fear.

That is not the America I know. That is not the America I serve. We refuse to live in fear. (Applause.) This nation, in world war and in Cold War, has never permitted the brutal and lawless to set history's course. Now, as before, we will secure our nation, protect our freedom, and help others to find freedom of their own.

Some worry that a change of leadership in Iraq could create instability and make the situation worse. The situation could hardly get worse, for world security and for the people of Iraq. The lives of Iraqi citizens would improve dramatically if Saddam Hussein were no longer in power, just as the lives of Afghanistan's citizens improved after the Taliban. The dictator of Iraq is a student of Stalin, using murder as a tool of terror and control, within his own cabinet, within his own army, and even within his own family.

On Saddam Hussein's orders, opponents have been decapitated, wives and mothers of political opponents have been systematically raped as a method of intimidation, and political prisoners have been forced to watch their own children being tortured.

America believes that all people are entitled to hope and human rights, to the non-negotiable demands of human dignity. People everywhere prefer freedom to slavery; prosperity to squalor; self-government to the rule of terror and torture. America is a friend to the people of Iraq. Our demands are directed only at the regime that enslaves them and threatens us. When these demands are met, the first and greatest benefit will come to Iraqi men, women and children. The oppression of Kurds, Assyrians, Turkomans, Shi'a, Sunnis and others will be lifted. The long captivity of Iraq will end, and an era of new hope will begin.

Iraq is a land rich in culture, resources, and talent. Freed from the weight of oppression, Iraq's people will be able to share in the progress and prosperity of our time. If military action is necessary, the United States and our allies will help the Iraqi people rebuild their economy, and create the institutions of liberty in a unified Iraq at peace with its neighbors.

Later this week, the United States Congress will vote on this matter. I have asked

Congress to authorize the use of America's military, if it proves necessary, to enforce U.N. Security Council demands. Approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable. The resolution will tell the United Nations, and all nations, that America speaks with one voice and is determined to make the demands of the civilized world mean something. Congress will also be sending a message to the dictator in Iraq: that his only chance -- his only choice is full compliance, and the time remaining for that choice is limited.

Members of Congress are nearing an historic vote. I'm confident they will fully consider the facts, and their duties.

The attacks of September the 11th showed our country that vast oceans no longer protect us from danger. Before that tragic date, we had only hints of al Qaeda's plans and designs. Today in Iraq, we see a threat whose outlines are far more clearly defined, and whose consequences could be far more deadly. Saddam Hussein's actions have put us on notice, and there is no refuge from our responsibilities.

We did not ask for this present challenge, but we accept it. Like other generations of Americans, we will meet the responsibility of defending human liberty against violence and aggression. By our resolve, we will give strength to others. By our courage, we will give hope to others. And by our actions, we will secure the peace, and lead the world to a better day.

May God bless America.