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Denne masteroppgaven undersøker to hovedproblemstillingar, gjennom analyse av innrammingsbruk i taler holdt av de Amerikanske presidentene Bush Jr. og Obama. Problemstilling 1 var å undersøke om bruken av innramming som retorisk grep ser ut til å være gjort bevisst av presidentene. Ifølge George Lakoff, som er en ledende ekspert på området, var politikere fra det Republikanske partiet tidlig ute med forskning på, og bevisst bruk av, innramming. Politikere fra det Demokratiske partiet, derimot, adopterte tidlig de samme innrammingene som Republikanerne. Dermed foregikk diskusjonen på Republikanernes premiss. Hvis innramming brukes bevisst av politikere er det viktig at de som gir politikere makt, borgerne, er bevisst hvordan og hvorfor innramming brukes. Dermed har man muligheten til å gjøre opprør mot innramningen som blir presentert. På den måten kan man se flere sider av saken. Problemstilling 2 var å undersøke om innrammingsene presidentene brukte var i samsvar med prinsipper som stammer fra typisk konservative (Republikanske) og progressive (Demokratiske) verdier.

Resultatene av analysen viser at presidentene bruker forskjellige innramminger ved de fleste tema, i samsvar med hypotesen presentert i oppgaven. Dette stemmer ikke for temaet utenrikspolitikk, hvor blant annet KRIG innramningen blir brukt av begge presidentene. Analysen viser også at de fleste innrammingsene samsvarer med typiske konservative og progressive verdier. Dette er også i stor grad i samsvar med hypotesen. Men nok en gang stemmer ikke dette for temaet utenrikspolitikk, hvor begge presidentene bruker innramninger som virker som de stammer fra motstandernes verdisystem.
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1 Introduction

‘Emotions are not separate from reason, but they are the foundation of reason because they tell us what to value’ (Brooks 2011: 9.05). This quote is in contrast to what the average person thinks of when it comes to human reasoning, where the typical idea is that humans are able to forego their emotions, and make entirely rational decisions based on facts alone. This idea plays an important role for those whose livelihood is dependent on persuading people one way or another, which for the purpose of this thesis are politicians. Politicians are typically in a constant struggle for approval on an array of topics, from taxes to themselves personally. For politicians it is important to know how to reach their constituencies, and sway those who can be swayed in the direction they want. In the last 20 years, the unconscious and framing as political tools have gained awareness.

One of the political researchers that has had an important effect on communication strategies in American politics is the conservative political consultant Frank Luntz. Frank Luntz changed the conservative communication strategies, through creation of a list of words that work, and words that do not work. According to Luntz, in communication it is important to remember, ‘It’s not what you say, it’s what people hear’ (Luntz 2007: ix). The idea is that in communication, what one person says and what another person interprets can be entirely different things. Therefore, it is important for those whose job it is to communicate with the public to be aware of this, either in order to avoid misunderstanding as much as possible, or to influence how the audience interprets what is being said.

Framing, which is the main concept being dealt with in this thesis, can be said to structure thought. According to Lakoff (2004), frames structure the way we see the world, while the use of a specific word can activate a particular frame in one’s mind. This happens without one being consciously aware of it, i.e. it takes place in one’s unconscious. Therefore, understanding framing and communication is not only important for those who wish to have their message heard, but also for those who the message is directed towards. By being aware of frames and how they structure our understanding, people may be more likely to take a minute and think about how and why something moves us unconsciously, and how certain arguments are made.

George Lakoff has already been mentioned, and he will have a prominent role in the thesis, since he is one of the most prominent researchers in the field of framing. He has played an important role in bringing the concept of framing to the limelight, and for bringing
awareness of the concept, and its importance, to the Democratic Party. Because of this importance, a substantial amount of George Lakoff’s research will be presented in this thesis, and certain aspects of his research will be analyzed. Examination of earlier research on framing shows that frame analysis on media is much more prevalent than research on politicians and political speeches.

In this thesis, the concept of framing will be examined theoretically, and analysis of which frames are employed on a series of topics in presidential speeches by President Bush Jr. and President Obama will be undertaken. The analysis will be a qualitative study of the frames used by the presidents, and they will be compared to each other, and compared to Lakoff’s (2006) ‘the nation as family’ theory to examine if he is correct or not in his assumptions. There has been little analysis of frames in presidential speeches since George Lakoff became known through mainstream media. According to Lakoff’s research (2006), progressives would employ the same frames as conservatives on many issues, not understanding the importance of framing, thereby not giving themselves a chance in discussions and debates. Therefore, this thesis will attempt to examine if progressives have taken the concept to heart and changed the way they communicate.

There are two main research questions that this thesis will attempt to answer:

1. Do Presidents Obama and Bush Jr. use similar frames when speaking of similar topics?
2. Are the frames used in accordance with ‘typical’ democratic/republican values, i.e. do they conform to Lakoff’s ‘strict father’ and ‘nurturing parent’ theory?

There are also two hypotheses that are formulated in the thesis (see section 5.3):

1. That the frames employed by Presidents Bush Jr. and Obama will be different.
2. The frames employed by President Bush Jr. and President Obama will conform to Lakoff’s ‘the nation as family’ theory.

In order to grasp the potential importance of frame analysis, and to understand the analysis, theoretical information regarding language theory will be presented. The theoretical

---

1 See section 3.2.4.1.
information is important in understanding how people interpret language, and how people reason on important issues, which are important ‘functions’ of frames with regard to politics. Thereafter an overview of established theory on framing will be presented. Finally, in the empirical section, the reader will find an analysis of the presidential speeches and comparison of the frames used by President Bush Jr. and President Obama.
2 Background Information

The main focus of this thesis is the use of framing in political speeches. In order to obtain an understanding of the underpinnings of framing, we will examine the philosophical linguistic theories that are at the base of framing theory in section 2.1. Next, in section 2.2, an examination of political speeches and the importance they play for politicians, and why presidential speeches are worth examining, will be presented. Many of the basic components and language philosophies that will be outlined play an important part for how and why framing plays an important role for presidential speeches. These components will be examined in order to better understand the fundamentals of framing and how a deliberate use of frames in political speeches has the power to affect voters.

2.1 Philosophy and meaning

At its most fundamental level, it could be said that framing has to do with how we understand the world around us (Lakoff 2006). Therefore, framing is closely linked to how individuals interpret meaning. The philosophical ‘choices’ one has made regarding meaning, either consciously or unconsciously, play an important role in how people understand what others say. The philosophical assumptions one has adopted, either consciously or unconsciously, color the way one views the world, which in turn impacts the choices one makes. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1999: 9), ‘Living a human life is a philosophical endeavor. Every thought we have, every decision we make, and every act we perform is based upon philosophical assumptions so numerous we couldn’t possibly list them all’.

Why should we be concerned with philosophy in a linguistic paper? When making philosophical commitments, either consciously or unconsciously, certain conclusions follow (Janicki 2006). According to Lakoff and Johnson (1999), most philosophical commitments regarding linguistics have throughout the ages been based on a priori philosophy rather than empirical study. These assumptions have had a major impact on the field of linguistics and shaped how language is viewed. With regard to meaning, a person’s philosophical commitment can radically influence how one views the link between words and what they stand for. First, classic philosophical ideas will be examined, before moving towards more contemporary theories of meaning. It is important to note that many laypeople view ‘meaning’ in much the same way as earlier philosophers, which leads to people understanding
what is being said in different ways, and not understanding the mechanisms at play in political speeches.

2.1.1 Impact of the classics

According to Modrak (2001), Aristotle has only made one explicit attempt to define meaning:

Spoken words then are symbols of affections of the soul … and written words are symbols of spoken words. And just as written letters are not the same for all humans neither are spoken words. But what these primarily are signs of, the affections of the soul, are the same for all, as also are those things … of which our affections are likenesses (1).

Even though this is Aristotle’s only explicit attempt at defining meaning, he seems to have played a large role in influencing later philosophers and linguists with regard to meaning. According to Kretzmann, Aristotle’s attempt to define meaning is ‘the most influential text in the history of semantics’ (1974: 3). It would seem that Aristotle’s theory of meaning has had far reaching implications influencing people’s view of meaning over two thousand years after his death. We will therefore examine Aristotle and his views on language and meaning.

Aristotle writes that both written and spoken words differ between people. Aristotle points out the fact that humans use different written and spoken words across languages. He then says that words are ‘affections of the soul’. Affections of the soul can be viewed as mental images, the images that come to mind when we use a certain word. To follow the argument made, the words used in languages are arbitrary, but the mental images, or ‘affections of the soul’, are according to Aristotle the same for all users of language. Aristotle’s idea correlates with a core or essence that is shared between speakers, regardless of what language is used.

Aristotle claimed that the relationship between words and meaning was conventional, but insisted on the universality of the aforementioned mental images. Aristotle understood that words were designated to their referents by way of convention, but through convention the images that language users assign to words are universal (Modrak 2001). Words, though arbitrary, refer to real objects and the object’s characteristics or essence. This would mean that words themselves do not carry essences, but the real world objects they refer to do. In this way the conventional use of a word gives rise to what certain people see as the ‘essence’ of a word, which is the subjective defining characteristics of the object, but Aristotle seems to have viewed the characteristics as definitive and objective. Aristotle defined essences as the
attributes of the physical object, i.e. the qualities that cause the physical object to be what it is. If the qualities are removed or altered, the physical object would cease to be (Modrak 2001). For example, what is the essence of a human? It has been stated that rational thought is essential to being human (Cohen 2014). The fact that most humans have two eyes, for example, is not essential to humanness. Consider a child born with Cyclopia, which is a condition where the child is born with only one eye that is usually centered in the area of the bridge of the nose. Most people would still consider the child human, therefore having two eyes is not essential to being human. Consider on the other hand a person without the capacity for rational thought. Many would label that person in a way that takes away their humanness. Hearing of a person that has been in an accident referred to as being in a ‘permanent vegetative state’, many would view this as an instance where the real person is dead, while only the body lives on. This is an example that surfaces occasionally with regard to the discussion of euthanasia.

2.1.2 Abstract language

Throughout history a lot has been said, discussed, and fought over with regard to language. According to Janicki (2010), one of the views on language that most people agree upon is that language can be seen as a symbolic system. What does it mean that language is symbolic and what can it mean for communication?

Imagine you are late for work one morning, and run out of the house in a hurry. You get on the bus and realize that you forgot your keys at home, and you know your roommate will not be home until late in the evening. You call your roommate who has not yet left, and ask if he can put your keys in the mailbox. Eight hours later you get off work and are looking forward to relaxing at home. When you check the mailbox you see that your roommate has put the wrong set of keys in the mailbox; you are not able to get in. What might have happened? To answer this question we must first consider different levels of abstraction. Hayakawa (1964) proposed that we can compare different levels of abstraction to the rungs or levels of a ladder. The lower you are on the ladder of abstraction, the closer you are to the real world, so we can think of the lowest rung of the ladder as the closest to non-verbal reality. But even though you are close to non-verbal reality, you are still abstracting, and while using language you cannot get off the ladder. The higher you are on the ladder of abstraction the more abstract the language used is. Imagine you ask someone what phone they have. At the lowest level on the abstraction ladder, your interlocutor would show you their phone. If we
move up the ladder of abstraction they might answer ‘Samsung Galaxy S4’. If you have heard of the model and have seen it you will have a good idea of what their phone looks like. But there are still some details you do not know, e.g. the color of the phone or if it has a screen protector. But you could also get an answer such as ‘a smartphone’. In that instance we have moved even further up the ladder of abstraction. To gain information from such a statement you have to make a few inferences. You know your interlocutor most likely has a newer phone, that the phone most likely has Wi-Fi, can connect to social media applications and so on. But you do not know what make the phone is, what size the phone is, and so on. When people hear ‘smartphone’ the picture that comes to mind to most will be the one they are most frequently exposed to.

Returning to the example of the keys and roommate, if you have more than one keychain and want your roommate to put your keys in the mailbox, you might have to find a way to lower the level of abstraction so that you both understand the same thing. The roommate in question might pick the first set of keys he sees and think ‘that’s that, job well done’. If you instead ask your roommate to leave your set of keys with the blue tape on it in the mailbox, chances are much higher that you will find the correct set of keys in your mailbox.

When communicating, either through written, spoken, or sign language, the speaker always abstracts and the listener must use a measure of guesswork to understand what information their interlocutor is trying to convey. That means that whenever we use language there is a possibility of misunderstanding. Even though we use abstract language when we communicate, we can minimize misunderstandings by lowering the level of abstraction.

2.1.3 Experience and meaning

There are close to 200,000 words in the second edition of the Oxford English Dictionary, many more words than most people have in their linguistic arsenal. This means that in any given communicative situation there is a chance you will encounter a word that is new to you, or that you encounter a word where you are unsure of the meaning ‘normally’ ascribed to it. When you also take into account that most words can have more than one meaning it becomes apparent that orientating yourself in the linguistic landscape can be challenging. If we think about how we use words and interpret their meaning when communicating we might be able to minimize misunderstanding.
Regardless of the fact that language systems are arbitrary, language users are still able to communicate mostly efficiently. If there was no social agreement on what words mean, communication would become difficult to say the least. We can say that words are symbols, and these symbols refer to something in the real world, be it physical objects, feelings, abstract concepts and so on (Janicki 2010). So the fact that the word ‘shoe’ refers to what you wear on your feet is based on people agreeing that the symbol ‘shoe’ refers to what is used to protect your feet. All language we use is abstracted to different degrees. An example would be the word ‘dog’ which refers to such physically different animals as Chihuahuas and Great Danes. If a person tells you they are afraid of dogs, chances are they are not afraid of all dogs, but instead of certain races or dogs over a certain size.

Consider how a toddler learns to use language. The child hears a word from someone, usually parents, and through experience the child maps experiences onto the word, and in that way connects the label to the referent. Imagine a mother with her toddler, pointing to herself saying ‘momm’ over and over. That this is the first word many children say is not an accident, which is often the word they have the most experience with through their parents. If we move away from toddlers, most people hear or read words they are unfamiliar with on a regular basis. You meet a balloonist who tells you he almost crashed and had to jettison his sandbags last week. If you are unfamiliar with the word ‘jettison’ you might not understand what he is talking about. Your friend explains that it means he had to throw his sandbags out of the balloon. Later you hear about an aircraft jettisoning fuel before landing; at this point you can most likely understand what is meant by ‘jettison’ in the situation, namely that the aircraft had to dump fuel before landing. At this point you have had a few experiences with the word, and map them onto your mental image of the word.

Many people have a different view of how meaning is created. Many see the process of communication as transporting something from one person to another, also known as ‘the conduit metaphor’ (Reddy 1979). According to this view, the speaker or writer encodes meaning onto words and phrases, and it is expected that the listener or reader extracts the same meanings. If this was how language worked, we would always understand each other and misunderstandings would not occur. But as we have all experienced, that is not the case. We are often misunderstood, and we often misunderstand others. In most cases we are unaware of the misunderstandings, which can lead to conflict, or we think that we or our interlocutor is wrong in their language use. People expect language to work as a container:
you put a certain meaning into the container, and through communication expect your interlocutor to open the container and extract the same ‘thing’ you put in. According to Lee (2001), the conduit metaphor is deeply imbedded in our culture, which can be seen in statements such as ‘the idea was hard to get across’.

2.1.4 Universals

One of the ‘great’ philosophical questions is on the existence of universals. Ross (1951) writes on ‘the theory of Ideas’:

The essence of the theory of Ideas lay in the conscious recognition of the fact that there is a class of entities, for which the best name is probably ‘universals’, that are entirely different from sensible things. Any use of language involves the recognition, either conscious or unconscious, of the fact that there are such entities; for every word used, except proper names --- every abstract noun, every general noun, every adjective, every verb, even every pronoun and every preposition --- is a name for something of which there are or may be instances. The first step towards the conscious recognition of this class of entities was, if we may believe Aristotle, taken by Socrates when he concentrated on the search for definitions; to ask for the meaning of a general word was a step from the mere use of such a word towards the recognition of universals as a distinct class of entities (225).

Ross states that universals are abstract. Every word used, except proper names, is a name for something that has instances. An example would be the universal ‘phone’, while a specific Samsung Galaxy S4 is a particular of the universal ‘phone’. The particular phone is what has been called an ‘instance’ in the quote above. To use another example, consider a car with four wheels. Even though the wheels might look the same and be of the exact same model each wheel is in its own way different from the rest, e.g. the grooves on two tires can be very similar but will most likely never be exactly the same. Each tire can be seen as a particular that in some way relates to the universal concept of wheel.

This thesis we will adhere to the theory of ‘conceptualism’. In this theory there are no generalities. Instead, one has abstract concepts that are created in the mind of the language user (McLeod & Rubenstein 2005, accessed 12 April 2014). The language user learns the concept ‘redness’, for example, and creates his own version of the concept based on his experiences. So for the language user red apples are red because they conform to his or her concept of ‘redness’. How then are language users able to understand each other when concepts are based on the individual’s experiences? People create concepts through their experience with language use, and the use of language is based on social convention. So even
though the concepts of two people will never be exactly the same, they will usually be similar enough to avoid confusion, as long as they are based on what is socially accepted language use. The discussion regarding universals is about how we can explain similar qualities shared between particulars. If we see the relationship between particulars as something outside of the real world with universal validity, or as something constructed by the individual, it will influence how we view words, their meaning, and the objects they stand for.

2.1.5 Prototype theory of the concept

In order to function in the world, people must, and do, use concepts to categorize the world around them. Through interaction with the world people categorize the pieces of the world they experience (Lakoff 1982). In classic categorization theory categories were viewed as clear-cut; something was either in or outside a category, with no room for borderline cases. This is not to be a discussion of categorization theory; this thesis follows ‘the prototype theory of the concept’.

According to ‘the prototype theory of the concept’ (Janicki 2006), we have a mental image of a prototype for the labels we have given the pieces of the world around us. For each category, people have an image of what represents the ‘prototype’ of the category. This means people categorize based on how closely the something one is attempting to categorize resembles the prototype of the category. Thinking of the word ‘car’, any given person will likely have a mental image, i.e. prototype, of a four wheeled vehicle of some kind that they have had some sort of experience with. Most of the time this does not pose a problem, but when borderline cases are encountered it might be difficult to agree what prototype the borderline case adheres to. This is not to say that one person is right and the other is wrong, but it can lead to misunderstanding. Imagine being shown a new Microsoft Surface tablet, which has a removable keyboard. If you have never seen one before you might categorize it as a computer, while your friend categorizes it as a tablet, which could be said is a fairly new ‘category’. Online, people differentiate between tablets with an attachable keyboard, and computers with a removable keyboard. If you adhere to a non-essentialist (see 2.1.7) philosophy you might not give much thought to if the device is categorized as a computer or a tablet. If you on the other hand adhere to an essentialist philosophy you might feel that differentiating between the two, or creating a new category, is of importance.
2.1.6 Linguistic relativity

The ‘theory of linguistic relativity’, also known as the ‘Sapir-Whorf hypothesis’, is a theory that can polarize the linguistic community to this day. Whorf (1956) stated, very simplified, that one’s linguistic system in the mind influences one’s conceptual system. This would mean that language determines our worldview. Many of the claims made by Whorf were based on his study of Native-American groups and their languages, where he found that their conceptual systems often differed from those of the majority population, and attributed the differences to their linguistic system. Who is to say language influences the conceptual system, instead of the conceptual system influencing language? Even though the theory, that is attributed Whorf, has largely been refuted (Alford 2011), Whorf has influenced many later researchers. One of these is Slobin, who coined the term ‘thinking for speaking’.

‘Thinking for speaking’ refers to how people use language to converse about the world around them. When speaking, and subsequently while listening, one must mobilize a ‘special form of thought’ (Slobin 1987). Slobin states that ‘a particular utterance is never a direct reflection of “objective” or perceived reality or of an inevitable and universal mental representation of a situation’ (1987: 435). This is illustrated by the fact that one situation can be described in a multitude of different ways. Slobin goes on to define ‘thinking for speaking’, stating that “‘Thinking for speaking” involves picking those characteristics that (a) fit some conceptualization of the event, and (b) are readily encodable in the language’ (1987: 435). Following Slobin, one could conclude that language does not dictate conceptualization, instead that through the process of using language one’s linguistic system influences what characteristics of an event one focuses on. The use of language, which is based on our experiences, means that the differences between languages, as well as differences between users of the same language, influence conceptualization. This has implications for framing, as the specific language used can influence different interpretations of the same event.

2.1.7 Essentialism

Two of the main philosophical stances regarding the relationship between words and their meaning will be labeled ‘essentialism’ and ‘non-essentialism’ in this thesis. Most people are not aware of their philosophical grounding with regard to meaning. Nonetheless the philosophical stance adopted will unconsciously influence the way we perceive words and
meaning. The discussion of essentialism and non-essentialism is a discussion on how meaning is created, how language relates to the world, and how we communicate with each other.

According to Janicki (2006), essentialism is often understood as ‘[…] the belief in the existence of one correct meaning of words and in the power of definitions that give us ultimate information about the essence of the things to which the words defined refer’ (7). As we can infer from this, those adhering to an essentialist point of view see definitions as important. When you define a word you define its meaning. You can picture two people arguing over a certain definition, both trying to ‘win’ and get the other person to agree with their definition. An example many people might have experienced in their lives would be arguments about what color a certain object has, e.g. is the car across the street red or burgundy?

There are two main ‘versions’ of essentialism, overt and covert essentialism. Overt essentialism can be seen as corresponding with the definition used above regarding essentialism to a higher degree than covert essentialism. Overt essentialist phrases are likely to be clearly distinguishable and can often be turned into or are posed as ‘what-is’ questions (Janicki 2006). Someone asking a ‘what-is’ question is often searching for one unambiguous answer, such as the answer to ‘What is humanity?’ or ‘What is freedom?’. People following this type of philosophy most likely believe they know what the real meanings of words are. Words do not mean what they mean to the language users, but instead the meaning is believed to be known by a select few, e.g. their preacher, philosopher, teacher or parent (Janicki 2006).

According to Hallet (1991: 28), general essentialistic theories are on the decline, but he also states that ‘essentialistic thinking has been far commoner than the formulation of explicit, general essentialistic doctrines … More extensive, more diffuse, and less obvious, hence less exposed to effective criticism, this underlying essentialism may longer survive the surface variety’. Even though essentialism as linguistic theory might not be as prevalent as before, it seems that it is prevalent in actual language use. This might be seen in covert or hidden essentialism. Here essentialistic thought may be just as prevalent, but less salient as with overt essentialism. For example, in America, there has in recent years been a discussion or question that has been repeated, i.e. Can Muslims be good Americans? The answer that is often given by those skeptical of Islam is that Muslims cannot be both good Muslims and Americans. This question, and answers given, is an example of covert essentialism. Without using trigger words such as what is and essential, clear assumptions of what it means to be a good
American and what it means to be Muslim, are provided. Another example would be in a statement such as ‘We have not yet found evidence of life in the universe’. Here, the term ‘not yet’ plays an important part, making it clear that given enough time, life in the universe will be found. The statement could be reworded ‘Even though we have not found life in the universe, we know it is out there’.

This is not to say that definitions are useless. Instead of seeing a definition of a word as the same as the words meaning, we can use working definitions that are fruitful for our task at hand, such as in a research paper. The researcher in such a situation chooses to use the definition seen to fit his agenda. In such instances it is important for the researcher to make clear that the definition that has been chosen is one of several definitions available, but the researcher has chosen the particular definition that fits his or her task.

With regard to framing, which is discussed extensively in the next chapter, it can be argued that one can have essentialist or non-essentialist view of frames, i.e. one frame is essentially correct, and trying to change the frame is a form of lying or spin. An example, which will reappear in the next chapter, is the WAR frame, found in the phrase ‘war on terror’. With an essentialist view one would think the frame is inherently correct, and the only term applicable to the situation. With a non-essentialist point of view, one might consider other frames, and see that there might be several that could ‘fit’ the situation. For example one might feel the CRIME frame or the CONFLICT frame also have merit.

In this thesis a non-essentialist worldview is adopted, which implies that it is through one’s personal experience that one interprets both words and the world around oneself. In this thesis ‘the prototype theory of concept’ is adhered to, which can be seen in theories regarding neuroscience discussed in chapter 3, pertaining to the cognitive unconscious and networks of association.

2.2 Summary

In section 2.1 we have examined what could be called the ‘philosophical backbone’ of framing. It has been shown that language is a symbolic system, used to communicate about our experience of the world. Any use of language is an abstraction of the real world, but one can communicate at different levels of abstraction. And the meaning one assigns to a particular word or phrase is not universal, but differs from person to person based on their
experiences mapped onto the words used. These differences will be more prevalent the higher the language used is on the ‘ladder of abstraction’.

We have also examined how people understand the world around them. Based on experience, people ‘cut-up’ and categorize the world around them as they experience it. People have a ‘prototype’ of the categories they have in their mind, which helps one make sense of the world. At the same time, one’s linguistic system influences one’s conceptual system, which will later in this thesis be shown to be one of the main effects of framing. Essentialism has also been discussed, which has to do with the belief in absolutes, i.e. words and concepts can be defined in one *essentially* correct way. Here meaning is not seen as something subjective for the language user, but something that is either objectively correct or incorrect. This is also true for what people see as a correct or incorrect use of frames.
3 Framing

Framing is closely tied to meaning. Frames play a part in all language use on some level, at interplay with meaning at both the semantic and pragmatic level. People have for centuries dwelled on the question of how we understand the world around us, and how language, as a tool, is used to communicate apropos their worldly experiences. Frames can be said to structure the way we view the world, leading one to notice certain details, while overlooking others. Frames influence what prototypes and concepts that are invoked, influencing discussions and the conclusions made.

Frames, and the effects of framing, will be shown to play an important role in how one understands the world. We have seen that people ‘cut-up’ and categorize the world around them in relation to one’s experience of the world. Frames will be shown to play a role in how one interprets the world, by structuring the information gained through experience in the world. But it will also be shown that depending on one’s experiences, frames may structure one’s interpretation in a different way from what the ‘framer’ intended, since there is no single essentially correct interpretation of a frame. Through experience of a particular frame, often through repetition in the media, the frame becomes mainstream, or ‘common sense’. This means that for the majority of a population their experiences are similar with regard to a particular frame, where the frame structures the way a particular situation is interpreted similarly by the majority. Since there are no universals that are identical for everyone, employing frames where people have similar prototypes may lead to similar interpretations, while employing abstract frames where people’s prototypes typically differ may lead to different interpretations structured by the frame.

3.1 What is framing

The concept of framing is not new, but it gained national prominence in the early 2000s because of George Lakoff. George Lakoff, who has by some been dubbed ‘the father of framing’ (Bai 2005), has done extensive work on framing and the opportunities framing holds for the political sphere. There are, of course, many other important researchers that have conducted research on framing. Following is an examination of different researchers’ definitions of frames and framing.

One of the early pioneers in the examination of framing and meaning was Charles Fillmore, who dubbed this area of research ‘frame semantics’ (Fillmore 1982). ‘Frame
semantics’ offered, according to Fillmore, ‘a particular way of looking at word meaning’ (1982: 111). Fillmore (1982) defines a frame as:

> ‘any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any one of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits; when one of the things in such a structure is introduced into a text, or into a conversation, all of the others are automatically made available’ (111).

This system of concepts Fillmore referred to as ‘scenes’, where the use of a particular verb could highlight different aspects of the scene. It is through the understanding of the components of the ‘scene’ that the language user interprets meaning. Here, scene and frame refer to the same concept.

A classic example is the COMMERCIAL EVENT frame (Fillmore 1982), which includes the participants ‘the buyer’ and ‘the seller’, as well as what is to be traded, i.e. ‘the money’ for ‘the goods’. In this example use of different verbs about the interaction of a certain commercial event highlight different aspects or perspectives. Use of the verb ‘buy’ highlights the actions of ‘the buyer’ with respect to ‘the goods’, while masking ‘the money’ and ‘the seller’. Use of the verb ‘sell’, on the other hand, highlights the actions of ‘the money’ and ‘the buyer’. Finally, the verb ‘pay’ focuses on the actions of ‘the buyer’ with respect to ‘the money’ and ‘the seller’, while masking ‘the goods’. Experience with such a frame is, according to Fillmore, paramount in understanding the verbs used. The frame is what structures the meaning of the words, while the words evoke the frames.

While Fillmore’s research was centered at the sentence level, Goffman, who was a predecessor of Fillmore, examined how frames structure people’s interaction with the world by studying various institutions (Lakoff 2006). Goffman states that frames have to do with the organization of experience (1974). In all situations people play a certain ‘role’, where one’s role influences the social rules one must follow within the frame. In any given situation, when one recognizes, or thinks one recognizes a certain scene, one’s recognition of the roles within the scene structure the way one interacts, i.e. what role one adopts and how one behaves. In his example of the HOSPITAL frame, knowledge of the frame helps one understand the role of doctors versus that of the nurses or the janitor. For example, the patient knows the doctor will not bring dinner, the nurse will not give a diagnosis, and it is no use asking the janitor for pain medication. Another example is the CLOTHING STORE frame. After walking into a clothing store, the customer does not walk up to the first person and ask for help. The
customer’s knowledge of the frame says that an employee will, once free, greet the customer and enquire if help is required. In a different store, such as a grocery store, the role of the employees is different, therefore the role of the customer changes. In this instance the customer is likely to have to make an effort to receive help from an employee.

With Goffman and Fillmore as an influence, Lakoff continued research on frames, fusing frame theory with the political sphere. Lakoff defines frames as:

mental structures that shape the way we see the world … they shape the goals we seek, the plans we make, the way we act, and what counts as good or bad outcome of our actions … You can’t see or hear frames … When you hear a word, its frame (or collection of frames) is activated in your brain (Lakoff 2004: preface xv).

In Lakoff’s view, certain concepts are through experience hardwired into our brains. This means that use of a specific word, or sets of words, automatically creates a certain set of connotations in the mind of the listener. At the fundamental level frames allow humans to understand reality. ‘Frames facilitate our most basic interactions with the world - they shape the way we reason, and they even impact how we perceive and how we act’ (Lakoff 2006: 25).

Following Lakoff’s argument, frames shape the way humans view the world. According to Keren (2011), framing concerns the way ‘something’, e.g. narrative, discourse etc., is produced and the meaning that evolves from said production. To picture this in terms of something more tangible, one can think of the same picture placed in different frames, where each frame shows a different amount or aspect of the picture. Moving away from semantic framing, to framing of issues or concepts, Chong and Druckman (2007) state that the premise for frame theory are the different perspectives one can view an issue, and the different values conjured by changing perspectives. According to Chong and Druckman, framing ‘… refers to the process by which people develop a particular conceptualization of an issue or reorient their thinking about an issue’ (2007: 104). This aspect of framing will be examined more closely in section 3.1.2.

3.1.1 Framing and meaning

As earlier noted, ‘framing’ and ‘meaning’ are closely related. To understand a word, action or a concept, a certain amount of background knowledge is needed. The frame is the background knowledge which facilitates and structures interpretation (Lee 2001). Lee states that frames have both a conceptual and cultural dimension. Take the word ‘mother’ for example. On the
conceptual dimension, ‘mother’ contrasts with ‘father’ by certain semantic features such as ‘female’. However, on the cultural dimension, ‘mother’ covers other associations that might be difficult to pinpoint, and may even differ between people within the same culture. Examples of this could be ‘protective’, ‘nurturing’ and so on. For example, two friends are talking on a Monday morning, when one says to the other, ‘it’s time to start my weekend’. To understand this statement the interlocutor needs both conceptual and cultural knowledge. The conceptual knowledge needed to understand ‘weekend’ is that it refers to the end of a seven-day cycle, the days which we call Saturday and Sunday (Fillmore 1982, Lee 2001). The cultural knowledge needed is the cultural pattern of the typical work week, where 5 days are allocated work, while 2 days are allocated to one’s personal life. To understand the example, one must have even more cultural knowledge. One must know that some people live their lives with a different week-cycle. With this information the interlocutor trying to analyze the sentence may infer that the friend works outside the normal week-cycle, works weekends, and has just reached the days allocated to personal life, i.e. the friend has a few days off. The word ‘weekend’ evokes the frame, while the context (that it is Monday) allows the interlocutor analyzing the sentence to pick the suitable information made available by the frame.

3.1.2 Framing and the cognitive unconscious

The way framing works is closely related to ‘the prototype theory of the concept’, outlined in the last chapter, and to what Lakoff refers to as the ‘cognitive unconscious’ (2004). What has been outlined so far in this chapter is not something people are conscious of most of the time. When using language, the system of listening, analyzing, responding, etc., mostly takes place below the level of consciousness. The ‘cognitive unconscious’ can be defined as the processes that take place below the level of consciousness, i.e. are inaccessible to awareness and control (Lakoff & Johnson 1999). The amount of processes that take place below the level of consciousness is thought to be approximately 95 percent, and is thought to shape and structure all conscious thought. In this way all ‘… knowledge and beliefs are framed in terms of a conceptual system that resides mostly in the cognitive unconscious’ (Lakoff & Johnson 1999: 10).

Categorization is mainly a product of unconscious reasoning. Most of our categories are formed unconsciously through our experiences in the world, and play an important part (Lakoff & Johnson 1999). The prototypes that form the basis of the categories are neural
structures, which allow humans to do inferential or imaginative tasks relative to categories. This means the neural make-up of the brain plays an important role in reasoning. A large portion of the reasoning humans do is prototype-based reasoning, which means it forms the basis for much of humans’ conscious reasoning (Lakoff & Johnson 1999).

Frames are a part of the cognitive unconscious, where they in part structure ideas and concepts, shape the way people reason and impact how people perceive and act (Lakoff 2006). According to Kihlstrom (1987), research has shown that mental functions can be affected, even when what causes the affect cannot be perceived consciously. The fuzzy lines of categories and prototypes are one of the reasons why frames have the effects that they do, where different frames can lead to different inferences in the cognitive unconscious. How categories and prototypes are ‘activated’ in the unconscious, and the role frames play in structuring ideas and concepts, is related to how human brains unconsciously make connections, which we may call networks of association.

3.1.3 Networks of association

We examine networks of association not just because of the implications they have for the activation of categories and prototypes, but also the important role played in the activation of emotions. The importance emotion plays in the political sphere is outlined later in this chapter. Networks of association can be explained as ‘bundles of thoughts, feelings, images, and ideas that have become connected over time’ (Westen 2007: 3). Given time or repetition, or given an especially important experience of some kind, associations can be made between many different networks. Most humans have likely experienced an emotional association to a song, e.g. a song from one’s youth that was listened to in the park with a summer fling. A song like that is likely to conjure positive emotions of some kind.

To explain networks of association more clearly it might be rewarding to investigate how some cognitive scientists view the storage of memories. According to Westen (2002) and LeDoux (1999), knowledge resides in networks of neurons. When the network of neurons is activated, so is a representation of what knowledge is ‘stored’ in the network. When ‘something’ is perceived, a network of neurons is activated. When we think back to, or are reminded of a certain instance, the same neurons are reactivated. In this way the ‘something’ is reactivated as a memory and/or an emotion.
To continue the thread of examining how the brain works, we can say that groups of neurons may become connected, forming networks. A word, ‘apple’ for example, has many associations to it. People often share many of the same associations, especially within a given culture. If asked to say the first word that comes to mind when they hear the word ‘apple’, many Americans are likely to respond with ‘pie’. The neurons that are activated by ‘apple’ activate networks of neurons that are associated with it. The neurons that activate first ‘hold’ the words that first come to mind when primed, and these are most likely words that are often seen together, or that the person has had an emotional reaction to. It is possible to compare networks of association to how the search engine ‘Google’ gives users search suggestions. When a word, part of a word, or phrase, is typed into the search engine, the user receives suggestions for the search. Google’s ‘experiences’, i.e. earlier search history, is stored in a database. A certain word, or phrase, activates the words or phrases that most often accompany them by analyzing earlier search history. The search engine can be seen as a brain, connected through servers and databases (neurons), where one word activates another based on the experience of earlier searches, in much the same way the neurons in the brain are activated by a word, phrase, picture, song, etc., through the mapping of experiences. This example can be seen as a metaphor for how different frames activate different networks in the human brain. Through careful consideration of what words to use, frames can be used to manipulate which networks of association are activated, thereby structuring ideas and concepts, shaping the way people reason and impact how people perceive and act.

The former example, however, does not take into account the importance of emotion. According to LeDoux (1999), emotions are closely tied in with networks of association. One of the cues that activates networks of neurons are emotional states. While trying to access a certain memory, which is the activation of associative networks, an activation of the same emotional state one was in may help activate the networks of neurons where the memory is stored. This can also work in the opposite direction, where a memory can trigger a certain emotional state.

3.1.4 Negating frames

Another concept tied to the cognitive unconscious is that of negating frames. Words evoke frames, which also happens if one tries to negate a frame, such as President Nixon during the Watergate scandal. President Nixon appeared on television and told the nation, ‘I am not a crook’. Nixon did not try to reframe the event by evoking new frames, i.e. using different
words; instead he tried to negate the frame. By using the word ‘crook’, even though it was prefaced by ‘not’, he evoked the same frame and everyone thought of him as a crook (Lakoff 2004).

This is important especially for those situations when trying to argue a point or gain recognition for certain views. Do not use ‘the other side’s’ language, for that will evoke their frames (Lakoff 2004). Evoking frames, even if one is trying to negate it, reinforces the frame in the cognitive unconscious. The word evokes the frame by activating a network of neurons which in turn activates other networks of association. One way Lakoff explains this is by the example ‘don’t think of an elephant’ (2004: 3). In one of the courses he teaches, Lakoff asks his students to not think of an elephant, which he states no one has been able to do. Instead, when told not to think of an elephant, the word elephant activates neurons and networks of association. Hearing the word elephant elicits certain information, which differs between people, such as large, grey, trunk, Africa, and so on.

3.1.5 Metaphor and framing

One way of framing certain concepts, especially highly abstract concepts, is by using metaphors. Metaphors can be defined as a ‘device that involves conceptualizing one domain of experience in terms of another’ (Lee 2001: 6). Metaphors often involve conceptualizing something high on the ladder of abstraction with something on a lower rung, i.e. speaking of one concept in terms of another. Consider the well known metaphor from the movie ‘Forrest Gump’, i.e. ‘Life is like a box of chocolates’. In this metaphor, the abstract concept of ‘life’ is compared to the less abstract concept of ‘a box of chocolates’. In the movie, Forrest Gump explains the metaphor for the viewers by saying ‘You never know what you’re gonna get’. This is a metaphor that highlights the surprising nature of life while bringing something complex, i.e. life, down to a more relatable level, i.e. a box of chocolates.

Metaphors can be viewed not only as explanations of one concept as if it were another. Certain metaphors, which we will call ‘conceptual metaphors’ (Semino 2008), are expressions that show that we think of one thing in terms of another. Semino defines conceptual metaphors as ‘systematic sets of correspondences, or ‘mappings’, across conceptual domains, whereby a ‘target’ domain […] is partly structured in terms of a different ‘source’ domain’ (5). According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), our conceptual system is paramount in defining our reality, and this conceptual system is largely metaphorical, where our conceptual
metaphors are based on bodily experiences. A metaphor such as ‘He is not part of our group’ derives from the conceptual metaphor SOCIAL GROUPS ARE CONTAINERS (60), where ‘containers’ is the source domain and ‘social groups’ is the target domain. Certain social groups can be difficult to access, and this may be linked to the conceptual metaphor. For someone to be in a group, someone else has to be outside the group. The SOCIAL GROUPS ARE CONTAINERS metaphor allows people to distance themselves from others, which can lead to an ‘us’ and ‘them’ view of the world.

Metaphors have been found to be a good tool with regard to framing. The metaphor one chooses to use has consequences for what aspects are foregrounded and which are left in the background (Semino 2008), which means metaphors can function as frames. According to Feldman, metaphors in politics are typically structured in the following way: ‘[abstract issue] is [a concrete thing]’ (2007: 10). An example of this is the metaphor used by representatives of the US government after 9/11. The initial frame used by US administration officials was that of CRIME, where the perpetrators had to be ‘brought to justice’, with associations to words such as ‘court’, ‘trial’, ‘sentencing’ etc. This frame was later replaced by WAR, with the repetitive use of the metaphor ‘the war on terror’, which builds on the conceptual metaphor TERRORISM IS WAR. This metaphor hides the fact that ‘terror’ and ‘terrorism’ are highly abstract concepts, not military entities one can wage war against. By framing the situation as a ‘war’ the possibilities of sending troops, invasions and special presidential powers were opened up (Lakoff 2008). A phrase such as ‘terrorists have declared war on America’ builds on the same conceptual metaphor. This metaphor laid way for Homeland Security and other measures to be put in place to ‘defend’ America. It can be argued that framing the situation in the USA as a war made people more accepting of security measures that rein in certain freedoms, e.g. with regard to closed-circuit television in public places, and more recently, acceptance of the NSA’s information gathering.

3.2 Framing in politics

Feldman defines framing in the context of politics as ‘The presentation of political ideas and principles so as to encourage one interpretation over another’ (2007: 2). Since the relationship between words and meaning is arbitrary, and there is no essentially correct interpretation of words, it is possible to encourage people’s interpretation of a given issue. In the realm of politics it is important to gain support for your ideas and ideologies while undermining those of your opponents. Politicians are in a constant struggle for power and relevance, and the
main instrument used to gain this is that of language. To become successful in the world of politics one needs to gain support, which is measured by votes. Politicians are therefore in a constant battle for the voters’ stamp of approval for themselves, their political party, their ideologies, and specific political ideas. In democratic systems politicians receive power from the population they represent. But we could say, especially with regard to politics in the USA, that there is an increasing amount of scrutiny put on individual politicians, instead of the individual’s politics. A characteristic of political discourse is its attempt to sway the audience to accept one’s point of view and to identify with the speaker, i.e. persuade the listener (Jucker 1997). The upcoming sections examine how voters’ reason and the role framing can play in the political game.

3.2.1 Politics and emotion

In today’s political landscape emotion is very important for voters when deciding who to vote for, even though it is mostly in the cognitive unconscious. Westen (2007) claims that a common misconception people have regarding how the mind works is the idea of a dispassionate mind. This is the idea that people make decisions by evaluating the facts at hand, weighing them, and coming to the most logical argument through reasoning. This is an idea that compels many people, especially in the Western world. People often see themselves as advanced creatures, different from other animals that use their instincts to guide them. The thought of suppressing one’s emotions and instincts, and instead relying on ‘cold hard facts’, is an idea that appeals to many people. But this is an idealistic view of the mind, which is not in agreement with reality. The brain is an extremely complex organ, with a large network of cells working together to create our experience of the world.

In the USA, party affiliation is important for how people tend to vote. A large part of the population votes based on what party they identify with, often following in the footsteps of their family. Lehrer (2009: 196) refers to voters with strong party affiliation as ‘a case study in how not to form opinions’, claiming that their mental debates are very hard to influence, since they have already made up their minds as to what to believe. According to Westen (2007), we can roughly divide the political landscape in the USA in three, where one-third identify as Republicans, one-third identify as Democrats, and one-third that can swing both ways. This means politicians need to sway the voters in the middle to amass enough votes. But if the theory of the dispassionate mind is a myth, how do voters decide who to vote for? The short answer is emotion! Emotion is more important in persuasion than people wish
to give it credit for. Emotion is always present and cannot be turned off by the flick of a switch. A person’s emotions are there, hand-in-hand with reason. This is not to say that reason and logic are unimportant in people’s political decision making, instead emotion and reason are at work together. It could be said that a successful candidate can play to the voter’s emotional and rational mind.

3.2.2 How do voters reason?

In order to understand why framing is important an examination of how voters reason is important. Framing is not discussed specifically, but employment of specific frames can be seen as a tool to manipulate the reasoning of voters’, especially at the unconscious level.

As stated earlier, successful political candidates must compel to the voter’s emotions and rationality. According to Westen (2007), the sequencing of components in a political speech used to reach out to the voters is important. For a voter to make a decision based on reason, the voter must have an incentive to make a decision. If the argument does not resonate with the voter by causing emotions such as interest, enthusiasm, fear, anger, and contempt, the voter will not be motivated to pay attention to the argument or to make a decision about the issue. But if voters feel that it has implications for themselves and those around them, they are more likely to pay attention and to make an effort in understanding the argument(s) made.

Emotions are not only important for catching the attention of voters. Emotions also play an important role in the decision making of voters. According to Lehrer (2009), emotions also play an important while engaged in what people think of as rational reasoning. Lehrer (2009) states that:

‘[…] the mind is composed of a messy network of different areas, many of which are involved with the production of emotion. Whenever someone makes a decision, the brain is awash in feeling, driven by its inexplicable passions. Even when a person tries to be reasonable and restrained, these emotional impulses secretly influence judgment’ (5).

It has already been shown that emotions play an important role in influencing our views on an unconscious level, but emotions also influence people’s conscious reasoning process, which clearly goes against the idea that people can suppress their feelings entirely, basing decisions on reason that is entirely based on rational thought.

Based on his studies, Westen (2007) states that the most powerful way to reach out to voters is through combining emotion and reason, and preferably in the following sequence:
First one should lead with something that compels to the voter’s emotions. The next step for a candidate would be to contrast oneself with the other candidate(s), in an attempt to create emotional resonance with the voters, while creating emotional dissonance with the other candidate(s). First after engaging voters emotionally should candidates describe how they might fix the problem, through rational argumentation. Finally, candidates should return to emotion in their closing remarks, in this way making the most of the emotional and rational connection.

Closely linked to emotion in US politics is morality. Lakoff (2008) states that ‘politics is about moral values’ (43). Political leaders base their politics and their right to govern on the concept that they are moral, therefore employing frames that posit themselves as moral, while positing one’s political adversary as immoral. And in presenting one’s values for emotional resonance with voters, emotional constituencies are formed.

3.2.3 Emotional constituencies

Emotions, which are formed in the cognitive unconscious, play an important role in reaching potential constituents. Westen (2007) defines emotional constituencies as groups of voters with the same emotional response on a given subject. The emotional responses people have to discourse on a given subject are closely linked to people’s values, where appealing to core values is an effective way to elicit emotional responses. By using words or phrases that elicit certain emotions, political candidates may sway voters without rational argument. According to Westen (2007), emotional associations are feelings that are elicited by ideas and images. A substantial amount of human behavior can be said to be a product of the activation of emotion laden networks of association, and the activation of the aforementioned networks often happens outside of awareness. The importance of emotional associations has to do with the role emotion plays in swaying voters. Westen (2007) states that the best predictor of a successful political candidate is the ability to elicit positive emotions. If the candidate does not elicit positive emotions, or even worse, elicits negative emotions, voters will not be receptive to the candidate’s message. The emotions elicited can color the way a voter interprets data, follows arguments, and comes to conclusions. Emotional associations can be
activated both in and outside of awareness, which has been found through research on subliminal stimulation. For example, emotional associations can be seen in Freudian slips\(^2\).

An important factor in eliciting emotions is the employment of frames. Framing a debate highlights certain aspects of the issue while ‘hiding’ others. One of the most salient debates in the media these days relates to if and/or how humans are causing adverse effects on the environment, i.e. ‘global warming’. This debate is also clear across partisan lines, where, in the USA, Democrats often argue that global warming is real, while Republicans often argue the opposite. In addition there is a clear difference in how the issue is framed, the two most salient frames being GLOBAL WARMING and CLIMATE CHANGE (Schuldt et.al. 2011). ‘Global warming’ focuses on an increasing temperature, while ‘climate change’ focuses on temperature changes. Both terms refer to the same thing, an increase in the average atmospheric temperatures, melting of the polar ice caps, and adverse changes to the world’s climate. With regard to people who identify themselves as Republicans, Schuldt et.al. (2011) found that which frame is employed plays an important role in how research subjects responded to the legitimacy of global climate change. 56 % of respondents who identified as Republicans doubted global warming, while 60,2 % of respondents who identified as Republicans believed climate change to be real. One of the reasons for this is most likely that the word ‘warming’. Global ‘warming’ is disproven each time there is a cold spell. The word ‘warming’ also gives connotations to something good, i.e. warmer weather. Many people have a difficult time seeing how a slight increase in temperature can have a negative impact, since warm weather is seen as a positive. Therefore certain people do not see the discussion as important, since even if global warming was real, it would not matter. Climate change, on the other hand, is harder to argue against. Fluctuations in temperature and erratic natural conditions, such as the drought in Texas, have been heavily documented and are not as easily ‘disproven’ as ‘global warming’. This explanation is set at the rational level, but most of rational thought is in actuality based in the cognitive unconscious.

The former example argues for how frames play an important role in eliciting emotions and influencing reason. According to Lehrer (2009), this is not only true when frames work on the unconscious level. Lehrer, when writing of a particular framing experiment, stated that

\(^2\)Freudian slips are when ‘a person means to say one thing but another active network interferes, leading to an elision of the networks’ (Westen 2007: 84).
all research subjects showed emotional biases in the study, but some research subjects were better at regulating their emotions in the decision making progress. In the same study, it was also found that those who were able see through the different framings of an issue, i.e. understood that the two descriptions that were given were identical, but worded differently, were still influenced by their emotions.

### 3.2.4 Deep frames and surface frames

The frames that have been used as examples so far, such as ‘the war on terror’ are what Lakoff (2006) refers to as surface frames. Surface and deep frames work on different ‘levels’, where surface frames resonate with and activate deep frames. Deep frames are embedded deep in the core of humans, i.e. in their values. Deep frames are ‘[…] the most basic frames that constitute a moral worldview or a political philosophy’ (Lakoff 2006: 29). Crompton (2010: 42) defines frames as ‘cognitive structures held in long-term memory that contain particular values’. The deep frames one holds are the most basic value-laden frames, which are ‘stored’ in the cognitive unconscious. The result of evoking deep frames is then linked to evoking emotions. But there is a difference between deep frames and values. Crompton (2010: 46) explains the difference thusly: to ‘find’ one’s values one can ask the question ‘what is important to me?’, while to ‘find’ one’s deep frames one can ask the question ‘how do I understand the world?’. A successful deep frame appeals to a certain set of values while inhibiting opposing sets of values.

Surface frames evoke deep frames. For surface frames to be effective, they need to be linked to a deep frame. Surface frames are the frames that are evoked by the words that are used, while deep frames are the value-laden frames that the surface frames evoke. For example, a deep frame Crompton (2010) mentions is the SELF INTEREST frame. In this frame, which may be seen as a very common deep frame in American society, the importance of looking out for oneself and family is at the fore. The surface frame TAX RELIEF is one that evokes the SELF INTEREST frame. The word ‘relief’ evokes a schema where somebody is in a predicament, and needs to be helped from an affliction, which in this case is paying taxes (Lakoff 2004). This is a frame President Bush Jr. began using during his first term in office. At the surface level the term evokes associations to a ‘hero’, who helps the afflicted, where anyone who is against ‘tax-relief’ becomes the bad guy. Therefore, when Democrats spoke up against ‘tax-relief’, they had already lost the debate. Instead they should have
reframed the issue to evoke a deep frame in accordance with their values, e.g. the COMMON INTEREST frame, by framing the issue as cuts in public service for example.

Consequently, embedding deep frames in society that contain one’s values is important for politicians. Deep frames are deeply ingrained in people, but they are changeable. According to Lakoff (2006) embedding deep frames is a long-term project. To do this one must repeat frames that resonate with people’s values and principles over and over again. Through repetition, words, phrases, and frames become ‘common sense’. If only one frame is perpetuated, with no alternative frame, it becomes ‘common sense’.

3.2.4.1 Nurturing parent vs. strict father model

Having introduced deep frames, focus will shift to what might be the most important deep frames with regard to American politics. Lakoff (2006) states that most people have an unconscious metaphor at the fundamental level with regard to America, and that is the NATION AS FAMILY metaphor. ‘… the nation-as-family metaphor structures entire worldviews, organizing whole systems of frames in our brains’ (Lakoff 2006: 49). This metaphor shows itself in words and phrases such as: ‘the founding fathers’, ‘motherland’, and ‘shipping or sons and daughters off to war’. The political beliefs people hold are structured by idealized representations of the family. Most people’s first encounter with being governed is in the family setting. Parents are there to protect their children, give them rules to abide by, keep them clothed and fed, teach them about the world, and in general make decisions on their behalf, because parents know best (Lakoff 2006). The NATION AS FAMILY metaphor forms the basic frame for how both Democrats and Republicans view the nation. Then why do Democrats and Republicans seem to differ on many issues regarding the nation, when the underlying deep frame is the same? According to Lakoff (2006), this has to do with different views of the family, i.e. the ‘nurturing parent’ and the ‘strict father’ models.

The nurturing parent model bases itself on the belief that parents’ primary duty is providing love and nurture to their children, which involves empathy and responsibility (Lakoff 2006). According to Lakoff (2006: 52ff) there are four core political principles that follow from the nurturing parent model:

[1] ‘The common good principle’ states that for individual well-being, the common good is necessary. Common wealth is pooled, through various taxations, to provide for everyone. This common wealth provides protection, allows for fulfillment of life, creates opportunities,
creates certain freedoms (such as freedom from want, e.g. social security), and promotes fairness and equality. The goal of the common good is then to create prosperity and foster community.

[2] ‘The expansion of freedom principle’ has traditionally led to the demand of fundamental freedoms, such as workers’ rights, voting rights, civil rights, public education, and so on.

[3] ‘The human dignity principle’ forms the basis for many political arguments. With ‘the human dignity principle’ as a basis one would feel that securing certain rights, food, shelter, education, and health care, is paramount. This leads to, for example, arguments against torture, arguments for programs to provide for the poor, and arguments for women’s rights.

[4] ‘The diversity principle’, is an ethic of diversity in communities, schools, workplaces, and the market. This principle has to do with the principles that are against the effects of discrimination, which have at times (and to some degree still) been prevalent in American society. Market diversity has to do with providing protection in various market areas, where surplus or production in one area can make up for shortages in another area. This could be in the market of energy, agriculture, music, and so on.

These principles form the basis for many of the Democrats’ policies and programs, and can be seen in the way they speak about the world.

The strict father model is based on the assumption that the world is a dangerous place with many evils, and life is a constant competition with winners and losers. In this model moral right and wrongs are perceived as clear-cut, where the ‘strict father’ is the moral authority of the family. Here being moral is being obedient to the father, while being immoral is disobeying the father. People are not born inherently good, but must instead be disciplined to learn right from wrong, i.e. ‘tough love’. The key points following this model are authority and control. According to Lakoff (2006: 57ff), there are four core political principles that follow from the strict father model:

[1] ‘The moral authority principle’ states that morality comes from being obedient towards legitimate moral authorities. Legitimate authorities can be God, the law, the president, parents, teachers, and so on.

[2] ‘The individual responsibility principle’ states that individuals are responsible for their own destiny. Those who succeed have deserved it, while those who fail have deserved to fail.
[3] ‘The free-market principle’ states that the free market is a mechanism of freedom, since wealth can provide many freedoms. Government should not interfere with the free market, since that would be constricting personal freedom. Following this principle regulation, workers’ rights, taxation, and class-action lawsuits interfere with the free market and are a problem in society.

[4] ‘The bootstraps principle’ states that everyone, no matter the situation, can pull themselves up by ‘their bootstraps’ with enough discipline. Those who have fallen behind can thank themselves and are not deserving of help from the government. Following this principle charity should be the responsibility of individuals and not the government.

These principles form the basis for many of the Republicans’ policies and programs, and can be seen in the way they speak about the world.

3.2.4.2 Biconceptualism

As noted above, the deep frames that form the basis for reasoning in the American political system stem from THE NATION AS FAMILY metaphor. The two different models of the family lay the foundation for the opposing worldviews of Democrats and Republicans. This is a simplification, as is most explanations of how people think and reason. In reality, people do not adhere to one clear-cut worldview. Many Democrats hold views that stem from the strict father model, while many Republicans hold views that stem from the nurturing parent model. This happens in the cognitive unconscious, so people are largely unaware of this (Lakoff 2008).

To explain this further it can be said that one might live most of one’s life by one moral system, while employing another moral system in other areas of one’s life. The moral systems stemming from the worldviews discussed can exist in the same brain, where they inhibit each other and structuring different areas of experience (Lakoff 2006). Biconceptualism does not only apply to voters, but also to politicians. Most American presidents, from both political parties, implement policies that stem from different moral systems. An example is President Obama’s continuation of President Bush Jr.’s policies regarding Guantanamo Bay, which can very much be seen as stemming from a worldview based on the strict father model, since it seems to be based on control and authority rather than empathy.
3.2.5 Value systems and framing

As has been discussed, values are an important factor for voters when deciding political allegiances. Crompton (2010) states that the activation of certain values promotes behavior associated with said values, while oppressing behavior associated with opposing values. In this way, politicians should be aware of which values certain frames promote. To achieve the results they desire, politicians should employ frames that increase the importance of values in accordance with their goals, while employing frames that decrease the importance of values that do not conform to their goals.

According to Crompton (2010), the values people hold are organized in consistent and meaningful patterns. Some values are compatible with each other, i.e. it is easy to think about them at the same time, while other values are not compatible, i.e. thinking of one excludes the other. Rasinski (1989) found that people answered research questions regarding public spending differently depending on how the research questions were worded. Approximately 65 percent of respondents felt not enough money was spent on ‘helping the poor’, while approximately 23 percent felt not enough money was being spent on ‘welfare’. The connotations the words hold and the values that are conjured lead to a dramatic difference in the answers given by respondents.

3.3 Framing in the media

In today’s society people are constantly bombarded with persuasive arguments. Access to the Internet in the USA has become common, the average household in the USA has close to three television sets, there are thousands of newspapers, and most people have access to the radio. Therefore, it can be said that the media plays a large part in people’s life. Because of its prominence in people’s lives, one could say the media has a lot of power in influencing people’s thoughts and ideas in many areas of life. And many media outlets have an agenda of some sort, e.g. Fox News is a conservative news channel.

One of the most important and effective ways for politicians to have their frames become mainstream is to get media outlets to spread them. In that way the frames are legitimized and seem objective to the audience. Especially if the frames are adopted across the ‘media world’, and not just by conservative or liberal media outlets. News stories are presented in such a way that they seem balanced and objective to viewers. The discussion of ‘what is news’ and what ideas should be presented have been led by few large media outlets.
And these media outlets are in large owned by few individuals or organizations. These mass-media organizations are focused on revenue, and not on what is in the public’s interest.

In the last few years the emergence of ‘new-media’ has had an effect on the media-world. This is in large thanks to the Internet. Online resources such as ‘the Huffington Post’ or YouTube channels such as ‘the Young Turks’ are challenging traditional media outlets. This is media that is not controlled by an organization with an agenda. That is of course not to say that new-media outlets do not have an agenda. It could be said that any organization has a philosophy of some kind that forms their outlook on the world and how and what news and ideas are presented. But many of the new-media outlets are raising questions that are not given attention on the traditional networks. According to Lakoff (2008), the political discourse in the media is dominated by conservative ideas and language. To exemplify this Lakoff brings up instances of conservative language used every day in the media. These are phrases such as ‘illegal immigrants’, ‘war in Iraq’, ‘supporting the troops’, and so on. Lakoff (2008: 269) wants journalists to be ‘aware when they are using politically motivated frames, and … discuss the alternative framings of the issues’.

With regard to media and propaganda, radio and television have been seen as important actors in spreading domestic and international propaganda. The attractiveness of television, geared with its mass accessibility, gives one the opportunity to propagandize under the guise of entertainment (Jowett & O'Donnell 2011). What topics gain entry into everyday television, and what topics are exempt from television, is intentional. Between the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), the ‘needs’ of advertisers, and executive decisions, what topics are presented and how they are presented is dictated with an agenda. This is something that most new-media does not have to relate to. For example, before she began working as an anchor on the online news channel ‘the Young Turks’, Ana Kasparian worked for CBS radio in the news department. According to her, British petroleum (BP) was for a period one of the largest advertisers of CBS. Therefore CBS had to tread carefully after the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. This is an example of the power advertisers have on what is presented in the media. They had to report on the spill, as it was one of the biggest ‘natural’ disasters in recent memory, but the spin on it was in such a way that they did not lose the revenue that BP brought in (Rogan 2013). People tend to think of the news as objective and a slice of the most important happenings in the world, without thinking of the constraints that influence what is presented on the news, and how it is presented.
3.4 Summary

The role played by framing in language cannot be understated. Frames are part of one’s conceptual system, playing a part both in how meaning is created in the brain, and how one understands the world. Depending on how one uses frames, a scene based on one’s experiences with the world is invoked, highlighting certain aspects, while masking others. Frames invoke background information which allows us to interpret what is being said or written, based on our experiences. This takes place largely in the cognitive unconscious, which means that one is not aware of the processes taking place. In the cognitive unconscious, prototypes and categories that are linked are activated, structuring understanding and eliciting emotions.

In the cognitive unconscious, when networks of neurons are activated, knowledge stored in the brain is activated. These networks are created through our experiences, and can be activated by words, phrases, pictures, songs, and so on. In this way, framing something in a particular way activates certain networks, and inhibits the activation of other networks. Even if one tries to negate a frame, the frame is still evoked, activating networks of neurons and eliciting the emotions connected to the networks.

An important tool of framing is the use of metaphors. Conceptual metaphors are part of one’s conceptual system, and play a part in how one understands reality. Framing an issue through a specific conceptual metaphor rather than another may lead to a specific understanding of the world. For example the conceptual metaphor NATION AS FAMILY plays an important role in the expectations one has to government, and what role the government should play in people’s lives.

People’s moral worldview and political philosophies are structured through deep frames. Deep frames are linked to the values people find to be important in life, and how these values can be perpetuated in the real world. Examples of two opposing deep frames are ‘the self-interest frame’ and ‘the common-interest frame’. Through the application of surface frames one can activate the desired deep frames. One of the most important deep frames is one that has already been mentioned, the metaphorical NATION AS FAMILY frame. This frame forms the basis of most of Democrats’ and Republicans’ political principles, but differs in their idealization of the family model, i.e. the nurturing parent model and strict father model. Most people hold certain views that stem from different moral systems, here referred
to as ‘biconceptuals’. One may prioritize one moral system in one aspect of life, while prioritizing another moral system in other aspects of one’s life.

The voter’s reasoning is largely based on emotions. For a politician to be successful he or she must be able to elicit emotions in the voters. There are constituencies of voters who have the same emotional responses on a given subject. The activation of emotion laden networks of association in large part structures human behavior, no matter how ‘rational’ one actually thinks one is. People often think they are rational beings, while in fact there is evidence that humans are very much emotional beings.

Politicians may ‘force’ their frames on the public through the media. By getting the media to repeat one’s frames, they become mainstream. When a frame is repeated often enough without being challenged, the frame becomes ‘common sense’. Media plays an important role in how people view the world, and for politicians embedding one’s frames in media discourse is important.
4 Presidential Speeches

Politicians can be seen as professional persuaders. Their job is in many respects to persuade voters to adopt their perspective, be it on whom to vote for, or on other important issues. According to Eshbaugh-Soha (2010: 1) speeches are vital for presidential governance. ‘Speeches inform others of presidents’ policy preferences and allow them to meet public expectations’. Presidents have also in recent years been more inclined to appeal to the public. Eshbaugh-Soha (2010) explains this inclination based on changes in the bargaining climate in Washington, where public support has become increasingly important in meeting policy goals. Since the topic of this thesis is framing in presidential speeches, it is appropriate to examine political speeches and how speeches can be employed as a tool to persuade the public. In today’s political landscape, speeches have become an increasingly important tool in the president’s repertoire (Teten 2003).

4.1 Persuasive language

Use of language by politicians is often related to persuasion. This aspect is especially clear during election campaigns when politicians are trying to persuade the electorates to vote for them. If we return to Aristotle, it is fruitful to examine Aristotle’s three modes of persuasion. The first mode is by appeal to a person’s reason (logos), second is by appeal to a person’s emotions (pathos) and the third is the appeal of the speaker’s personality or character (ethos) (Jucker 1997). In trying to persuade others, the persuading party may use one or more of the tools. We can say that in American political discourse all three modes are employed. Speakers often attempt to appeal to logos by use of rational arguments, often trying to make their arguments seem to rely entirely on logos. But we can also find traces of pathos and ethos in rational arguments. Politicians’ use of value-heavy keywords is one way to appeal to pathos. The involvement of celebrity speakers and experts, as well as the importance of the individual politician in today’s political landscape, are examples of appeal to ethos.
Successful arguments rely on all three modes of persuasion. According to Croft (The Freethinkers’ Political Textbook, accessed 15 April 2014), the importance of having a clear argument supported by evidence which appeals to a person’s reason (logos) has been shown in numerous studies. Equally important in persuading people is their emotional response to the argument and speaker’s character. Croft (The Freethinkers’ Political Textbook, accessed 15 April 2014) states that arguments that fail to address pathos and ethos lead the audience to ask two questions: ‘Who the hell are you, and why should I care’. People often feel that one should only appeal to logos in arguments. Appealing to ethos and pathos can be seen as trying to manipulate people, and straying from the ‘facts’. Emotion is considered something you feel, which can block, and has no place in, rational thought.

4.2 Inaugural address

The inaugural address has been held by every president since President Washington (JCCIC, accessed 14 May 2014)\(^3\), and is held during the swearing in ceremony of the president. Today, the president holds the inaugural address after taking his oath as newly elected president. Inaugural addresses are normally quite ceremonial, focusing more on ‘general reflection on the past and its unification with the present’ instead of partisan position and issue proposition (Teten 2003: 336). Today most presidents present their vision of America and make their goals for the nation known in their inaugural address (JCCIC, accessed 14 May 2014). The inaugural address is suitable for comparison since all presidents hold them, regardless of the political climate and what is happening in the world. All presidents have held one inaugural address, while those who have been reelected to a second term have held two.

4.3 State of the Union address

The state of the union address has its roots in the Constitution, and is held annually, originally as an update to congress. Since President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the state of the union address has been held yearly, and since President Truman, the state of the union address has been televised. Since then, the state of the union address took on a new form, evolving from a Congressional update, to an appeal to the public regarding program proposals and legislative

\(^3\) JCCIC, the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, has been responsible for the planning and execution of swearing-in ceremonies. See http://www.inaugural.senate.gov/.
action. The state of the union address is an arena for presidents to ‘[...] convey their thoughts, propose their own programs, communicate with the public, and set the stage for the year to come’ (Teten 2003: 335). The state of the union address is suitable for comparison since all presidents hold them, regardless of the political climate and what is happening in the world. Throughout his presidential career President Bush Jr. has held eight state of the union addresses, while President Obama has held six state of the union addresses.

4.4 Importance of media

With regard to political speeches, the media plays an important role. Very few people have the opportunity to watch Inaugural addresses and state of the union addresses in person. Instead most people view them through the lens of the media, either live on television or later through media reports on the main points of the address. Because of this, the media becomes an important factor in how the public access and view the presidential address. This has also changed the importance of presidential speeches compared to the pre-television era. Most presidential speeches are now broadcast live on television, reaching millions of people both nationally and internationally. After and/or during speeches the media, through discussions, reports, editorials, and so on, influence public opinion regarding the speech held by the president. Therefore it is important for the president to not only attempt to influence the public through the speech, but also the media. Most presidential speeches, even if viewed live, will have some form of media commentary to go with it (Schaefer 1997).

4.5 Summary

In this section, the importance of presidential speeches has been examined, along with an examination of politicians’ overall goals with public discourse. Politicians can be seen as being in a constant battle to persuade the public, ultimately to gain or stay in a position of power. For sitting presidents the goal can be said to involve either personal ratings, party ratings, or to persuade voters on specific issues. Presidential speeches are an important tool for presidents to incorporate, as public appeals become increasingly important in swaying voters.

The inaugural address is held after every successful presidential election, which means an inaugural address is held every four years. Both President Bush Jr. and President Obama were reelected, which means they both held two inaugural addresses. The state of the union address, on the other hand, is held once every year. It is rooted in the constitution, and is
meant to be a comment to Congress on the state of the union in the last year. Both addresses are delivered by all presidents, regardless of the political climate and what is happening in the world.
5 Method

The theoretical background presented earlier in this thesis is necessary to garner an understanding of how frames can potentially influence one’s conceptual system. It should, however, be noted that framing is the basis of the analysis, and this is the focus of the empirical section.

5.1 Material and Method

Speeches by the Republican President Bush Jr. and the Democratic President Obama were selected as the focus of this thesis. There were mainly three reasons for this. Firstly, in reading earlier literature, especially by Lakoff (2004, 2006, 2007, 2008) and Feldman (2007), many examples of analysis of framing in speeches by various presidents has been presented. Framing in the speeches of Presidents Bush Jr. and Obama, being the most recent and current presidents, have not been thoroughly examined. Seeing as most of the analysis of presidential speeches encountered was from before the inauguration of President Bush Jr., it was decided that the best course of action was to examine speeches by President Bush Jr. and President Obama.

Secondly, an examination to discover if similar topics or events were referred to using the same frames by both President Bush Jr. and President Obama was undertaken. According to Lakoff (2004), Republicans have been much better at framing than Democrats have, where Democrats have parroted the frames used by Republicans. After presidential candidate John Kerry lost the election against President Bush Jr., George Lakoff made framing a hot button topic for Democrats. This motivated an examination to determine if President Obama used the same frames as President Bush Jr., or if Democrats had begun consciously employing frames of their own.

Thirdly, it was deemed necessary examine speeches of presidents that were close in time. This is especially important in the case of President Bush Jr. and President Obama since they are the only two presidents in the post 9/11 era, where many new frames regarding international relations, national security, terrorism, and so on, began to be utilized in political language. Especially with regard to topics such as those just mentioned, analysis of speeches from before and after 9/11 would not be compatible for comparison. However, the current material includes one speech which is pre-9/11, namely the Inaugural address of President Bush Jr. from 2001.
Considering the maximum length of the thesis and the time constraints, the thesis will focus on 10 speeches by two presidents: five speeches by President Bush Jr. and five speeches by President Barack Obama. Both presidents’ Inaugural addresses have been chosen, along with three of their State of the Union addresses. The reason for this is that they are the only nationwide speeches held by every president, which means that they were not event specific. The choice was also made to include three speeches from the presidents’ first term, and two speeches from the presidents’ second term. The speeches chosen are as follows:

**President George Bush Jr.:**

- Inaugural Address (2001) - B1
  - January 20th 2001
  - 113 lines
- Inaugural Address (2005a) - B2
  - January 20th 2005
  - 146 lines
- State of the Union Address (2003) - B3
  - January 29th 2003
  - 393 lines
- State of the Union Address (2004) - B4
  - January 20th 2004
  - 369 lines
- State of the Union Address (2005b) - B5
  - February 2nd 2005
  - 356 lines

**President Barack Obama:**

- Inaugural Address (2009) - O1
  - January 20th 2009
  - 163 lines
- Inaugural Address (2013) - O2
  - January 21st 2013
  - 146 lines
- State of the Union Address (2011) - O3
5.2 Research questions

The goal of the empirical study constituting part of this thesis is to analyze the use of frames in speeches by President Bush Jr. and President Obama. More specifically, what this study attempts to address can be summed up in the following research questions:

1. Do Presidents Obama and Bush Jr. use similar frames when speaking on similar topics?
2. Are the frames used in accordance with ‘typical’ democratic/republican values, i.e. do they conform to Lakoff’s strict father and nurturing parent theory?

5.3 Hypotheses

Earlier analyses of framing in political speeches have shown that Democrats to a large degree used the frames of their Republican counterparts. George Lakoff brought the importance of framing to the attention of the Democratic Party, particularly the importance of re-framing issues and not parroting the frames of the opposition. Therefore, one would expect less adoption of ‘Republican’ frames in speeches by a Democratic president, and instead see use of different frames regarding similar topics. This was the motivation for the formulation of hypothesis 1, which states:

Similar topics will be framed differently in speeches by President Bush Jr. and President Obama.

Earlier in this thesis, Lakoff’s theory of ‘deep frames’ and the importance of the NATION AS FAMILY metaphor has been outlined (2006). This theory will be examined to investigate if the frames used conform to the strict father or nurturing parent models and the principles outlined by Lakoff (see 3.2.4.1). The motivation for the formulation of hypothesis 2
is the belief that frames can point to one’s basic values, and the belief in the basic value system presented by Lakoff. Hypothesis 2 states:

The frames used will conform to Lakoff’s theory, i.e. President Bush Jr.’s frames will be in congruence with the strict father model, while President Obama’s frames will be in congruence with the nurturing parent model.

5.4 Process

The first task in the analysis of the presidential speeches was to identify and select the topics. This was done by close-reading of the speeches. The next step was to analyze how the topics were framed, which was done by looking for expressions that were highly value-laden and used to explain the topic. It should be noted that this method, which seems to be the most widespread method of analysis, is very subjective and researcher dependant, since no objective criteria can be used. Thereafter, the frames were analyzed to examine if they conformed to Lakoff’s strict father and nurturing parent models.

5.5 Coding system

In order to provide the reader with the easiest access to the speeches being analyzed, they have been given identifying codes and numbered lines. The speeches by President Bush Jr. have been numbered B1 - B5, while the speeches by President Obama have been numbered O1 - O5. For example, a notation such as ‘B1 - 56’ refers to line 56 in President Bush Jr.’s Inaugural address from 2001. All speeches can be found in the Appendix.

5.6 Topics

In this thesis four topics have been selected. The topics were chosen after a cursory analysis of the speeches, based on what topics were found in speeches by both presidents. The topics chosen for analysis are:

1: Economy

2: Health care

3: Foreign policy

4: Gay marriage.
5.7 Why frame analysis?

For voters, in order to avoid or beware of manipulation, it is important to understand how and why politicians communicate in the manner they do. Through the analysis of the speeches of President Bush Jr. and President Obama, we can see how frames are used both by different presidents, and by changes in use of frames within a president’s two terms. Seeing how important emotion and the cognitive unconscious are for the voters’ decision making, it is important to understand how frames can be used to influence voters’ unconscious. In this manner it might be possible to analyze which deep frames the president may be triggering.
6 Analysis

In the analysis section of this thesis the reader will find an overview of the topics with an analysis of the frames used with each topic. In later stages there will be room for comparisons of the frames employed by Presidents Bush Jr. and Obama.

6.1 President Bush Jr.

It may be prudent to remember that inaugural addresses are commonly not arenas for proposing policy; instead they are often arenas for general reflection on the past and its unification with the present. The inaugural address is also an arena for presidents to present their vision of America and make their goals for the nation known. The state of the union address, on the other hand, often appeals to the public regarding program proposal and legislative action.

6.1.1 Topics

In this section, the frames employed for the earlier mentioned topics will be presented. The topics and corresponding frames will be listed in sections 6.1.1.1 to 6.1.1.4, while they will be discussed in the context of the speech in section 6.1.2. The frames below are presented in a particular fashion. The frames that are presented with the all-black bullet points are superordinate frames, while the frames that are presented with the white bullet-points and indented are subordinate frames. This means the superordinate frame influences the subordinate frame.

6.1.1.1 Economy

- FREE MARKET
  - STAGNATION
  - PEOPLE AS INVESTORS
  - RELIEF
  - DISCIPLINE

6.1.1.2 Health Care

- HEALTH CARE IS A PRODUCT
  - CHOICE
- WORKING SYSTEM
6.1.1.3 Foreign Policy

- FEAR
  - EVIL
  - WAR
    - Negates CRIME
    - OFFENSE IS DEFENSE
    - AMERICA IS ADULT
  - FREEDOM IS PEACE

6.1.1.4 Gay Marriage

- MARRIAGE IS A PILLAR OF SOCIETY
  - MARRIAGE UNDER ATTACK
  - ACTIVIST JUDGES
  - TRADITION IS GOOD

6.1.2 Discussion

Having listed the frames employed by President Bush Jr., the next step is to examine the frames in the context of the speeches they were found.

6.1.2.1 Economy

For any president the economy is a topic that can hardly be avoided. This is especially true for the speeches chosen in this thesis, since within the timeframe of the speeches, from 2001 until 2014, there have been several recessions.

The main frame employed by President Bush Jr. is that of the FREE MARKET. The idea of the free market is deeply rooted in the American culture, and is an important component in people’s understanding of capitalism. It is important to understand the overarching frame before moving to the underlying frames that build upon the FREE MARKET frame. This is a frame that is embedded in American culture, and comes to the fore as long as the economy is mentioned. In American society, many people see the free market as an important moral system, in line with ‘nature’. According to Bassiry and Jones (1993), the
‘classical capitalism’ system based on Smith’s theories is a moral system meant for the betterment of everyone. Smith’s theories came as a reaction to the mercantilist-based economy of the time, which was based on maximizing the power of the nation-state. In Smith’s ‘version’ of capitalism, power is removed from the grips of the nation-state, and instead handed to the consumer. In the free-market frame, the self-interest of the individual is a positive which ultimately works for the greater good of society. When markets are opened for ‘free’ trade, supply and demand is the ‘invisible hand’ that creates the largest amount of wealth for the society, with the power firmly held in the hands of the consumers, in theory at least. The ‘invisible hand’ is seen as a force of nature, something ‘natural’ that, if left alone, will regulate itself for the good of society. But the economic realities of today are very different than they were in the time when Smith formulated his theories. One could say that today, large corporations have taken over the role of the nation-state in the mercantilist era, and once again removed the power from the consumer.

Self-interest of the individual, and its importance for the frame, cannot be understated. The example used by Smith is that of the butcher (Bassiry & Jones 1993). He does not butcher animals with the goal of helping people, instead the goal is to make money and feed himself and his family. But in looking out for his own self-interest, he looks out for the interest of his customers. If the quality of his meat is poor, or if he charges too much money, people will bring their business somewhere else. In this way the market regulates itself, for the best of the community. There are several relevant examples that can be found in the speeches of President Bush Jr. The examples often conjure lower-tier frames that work within the FREE MARKET frame.

[1] And we will reduce taxes to recover the momentum of our economy and reward the effort and enterprise of working Americans (B1 - 57).

[2] We must have an economy that grows fast enough to employ every man and woman who seeks a job. After recession, terrorist attacks, corporate scandals, and stock market declines, our economy is recovering (B3 - 27).

[3] All these proposals are essential to expand this economy and add new jobs, but they are just the beginning of our duty. To build the prosperity of future generations, we must update institutions that were created to meet the needs of an earlier time (B5 - 68).
In example [1], the economic problem is viewed through the STAGNATION frame, which is evoked implicitly. Keywords in example [1] are ‘recover’ and ‘momentum’. By using the phrase ‘recover the momentum’, one is likely to infer that the economic system is not broken. Instead it has stagnated and requires a nudge to continue its growth. The word ‘recover’ leads one to infer that the economy had momentum, which gives hope that the system can resume its momentum, given a nudge. In example [1], the nudge is reduced taxes. President Bush Jr. does not say anything about whom the tax reduction will benefit, except ‘working Americans’. This is clearly in line with the FREE MARKET frame, in which the government is to step back and allow the ‘invisible hand’ to do its work. And the way to get the ‘invisible hand’ going is to increase demand by putting more money in the hands of the consumer. In example [2] the STAGNATION frame is evoked implicitly through use of the word ‘recovering’, in a similar fashion as example [1]. The STAGNATION frame is also evoked implicitly in example [3]. Through use of the phrase ‘update institutions that were created to meet the needs of an earlier time’ one can infer that the entire economic system is stagnate and in need of an update.

Another lower-tier frame to be found, which is represented by a metaphor, is that of PEOPLE AS INVESTORS. The PEOPLE AS INVESTORS frame works in congruence with the STAGNATION frame. In this frame, the economy has stagnated and needs a nudge through investment. As a solution President Bush Jr. evokes the PEOPLE AS INVESTORS frame, in which more money in the pockets of the public is the goal. PEOPLE AS INVESTORS is an important sub-frame of the FREE MARKET frame, where it is the people and the businesses, without government intervention, that lay the foundations for the best economic system.

[4] The economy grows when Americans have more money to spend and invest (B3 - 33).

[5] Americans took those dollars and put them to work, driving this economy forward (B4 - 174).

[6] And we will reduce taxes to recover the momentum of our economy and reward the effort and enterprise of working Americans (B1 - 57).

In example [4], the PEOPLE AS INVESTORS frame is evoked explicitly through use of the word ‘invest’, where this investment is portrayed as a solution to the stagnate economy. The solution is to put more money in the hands of the American people, where they as consumers
can nudge the economy forward. In example [5], THE PEOPLE AS INVESTORS frame is evoked implicitly, and is portrayed as successful, by stating the economy has moved forward. In example [6], the PEOPLE AS INVESTORS frame is evoked implicitly, through connecting ‘reducing taxes’ and ‘recovering the momentum of our economy’. The PEOPLE AS INVESTORS frame as a solution relies on the premise that more money in people’s pockets equals more money spent on goods, while in reality a large amount of the money might be saved or invested in non-US markets.

In the PEOPLE AS INVESTORS frame implemented by President Bush Jr., people need to find themselves with increased spending power, where tax relief is revealed as the means to put more money in the hands of the people. The RELIEF frame is implemented with regard to taxation as an important tool for the economy. In the RELIEF frame, the word ‘relief’ causes one to think of someone, or something, that is burdened and requires relief. Relief is seen as something wholly positive.

[7] The tax relief is for everyone who pays income taxes, and it will help our economy immediately (B3 - 41).

[8] And because you acted to stimulate our economy with tax relief, this economy is strong and growing stronger (B4 - 169).

[9] Our agenda for jobs and growth must help small-business owners and employees with relief from needless Federal regulation and protect them from junk and frivolous lawsuits (B4 - 220).

In all three examples the frame is evoked explicitly through use of the word ‘relief’. In examples [7] and [8], the burden put on the ‘investors’ is that of taxation. This puts a burden on the economy, which needs investments to grow. Being against ‘relief’ can then be seen as immoral, wishing a burden upon others. In example [9], a burden has been placed on small-business owners and employees. It is the small-business owners and their employees who, along with the ‘investors’, move the economy forward. Federal regulation, which is in opposition to the ‘free market’, is the burden that needs to be removed.

Another frame employed by President Bush Jr. is the DISCIPLINE frame, especially in conjunction with government spending and regulation. As has been noted earlier, within the FREE MARKET frame, government intervention is seen as a negative that puts a burden on
the economy. To explain this frame, it should be noted that many conservatives are inherently afraid of ‘big government’. The idea is that government’s ‘natural’ inclination is to continuously grow, spending more and more money, and infringing on freedom. Therefore, if government can show some self control, or discipline, the people can put that money to work the ‘natural’ way.

[10] The best way to address the deficit and move toward a balanced budget is to encourage economic growth and to show some spending discipline in Washington, DC (B3 - 54).

[11] These numbers confirm that the American people are using their money far better than Government would have, and you were right to return it (B4 - 178).

[12] The principle here is clear: Taxpayer dollars must be spent wisely or not at all (B5 - 36).

In example [10], the discipline frame is explicitly expressed, through the use of the word ‘discipline’. Discipline is valued positively in American society. If Washington does not show ‘spending discipline’, they show wastefulness, which is negative. By employing the DISCIPLINE frame, President Bush Jr. makes cuts to government programs a positive, since the discipline has to come at the expense of something. In example [11], the DISCIPLINE frame is evoked implicitly, by portraying the Government as not having discipline. If government is given more money, it will be spent, even if spending the money is unwise. Example [12] follows the same principle as [11]; here President Bush Jr. is adamant that government should be frugal with the money received from taxes. At the same time, President Bush Jr. implies that taxpayer dollars have been spent unwisely, which points to a lack of discipline. Here, the frame is also evoked implicitly.

6.1.2.2 Health Care

The debate regarding health care in American has a tendency to polarize the public, stirring emotion in those who take part in the debate. In general, it can be said that President Bush Jr.’s goal was keeping the health care system with minimal changes.

The superordinate frame employed by President Bush Jr. with regard to health care is the metaphor HEALTH CARE IS A PRODUCT. When health care is framed as a product, certain assumptions follow. Products are typically sold on the ‘free market’, where producers and consumers meet, and not to be provided by the government. The free market is viewed as a morally positive system that works for the ‘greater good’ of society, by promoting
innovation and providing the best balance between the needs of the consumer and the needs of the private companies that provide the product, which in this case is health care. Since health care is seen as a product, that means the health care provider is a business.

[1] By keeping costs under control, expanding access, and helping more Americans afford coverage, we will preserve the system of private medicine that makes America’s health care the best in the world (B4 - 279).

[2] The American system of medicine is a model of skill and innovation, with a pace of discovery that is adding good years to our lives (B3 - 65).

[3] […] we must make health care more affordable and give families greater access to good coverage and more control over their health decisions (B5 - 52).

In examples [1] and [3], the HEALTH CARE IS A PRODUCT frame can be seen clearly, but implicitly. Here President Bush Jr. discusses health care by using pricing strategies, i.e. lower costs plus higher sales equals more profit. In this way, it should be in the interest of the provider of the product to keep cost low, while still working on advancing medical research. In example [2] the frame is evoked implicitly. It is as if President Bush Jr. has created a commercial for the ‘American system of medicine’, where he clearly states that the American ‘product’ is ‘adding good years to our lives’. One of the positives of the free market, in the conservative view, is that it promotes skill and innovation, and therefore any change to the current system will be at the expense of skill and innovation.

There are several lower-tier frames that President Bush Jr. conjures in his speeches. One that comes up is the CHOICE frame, where the importance of personal choice is emphasized. Having the opportunity to choose is ‘naturally’ controlled through the free market, where the ‘invisible hand’ influences the best product at the best price, and having the personal freedom to choose is seen as an important societal value.

[4] Instead, we must work towards a system in which all Americans have a good insurance policy, choose their own doctors, and seniors and low-income Americans receive the help they need (B3 - 70).

[5] On the critical issue of health care, our goal is to ensure that Americans can choose and afford private health care coverage that best fits their individual needs (B4 - 267).
[6] […] we must make health care more affordable and give families greater access to good coverage and more control over their health decisions (B5 - 52).

In examples [4] and [5], the CHOICE frame is evoked explicitly with use of the word ‘choose’. In example [4] ‘choose’ relates to choosing one’s own doctor, while in example [5] ‘choose’ relates to the choice of health care coverage in general. Involved in the CHOICE frame is the freedom of the individual, and here the importance of choosing for oneself without government interference is emphasized. In example [6], the CHOICE frame is evoked implicitly through the use of the phrase ‘control over their health decisions’. Having control of one’s health decisions implies that one is free to make decisions, and not do what has been decided by the government. If the current system accommodates choice, then a change to the system is infringing on people’s rights, and is immoral.

Another frame found in the speeches of President Bush Jr. is the WORKING SYSTEM frame. Since the system itself is in working order, an overhaul of the entire system is not needed. Instead the system may need some minor changes or updates, especially with regard to making the product more affordable. The WORKING SYSTEM frame is often used in conjunction with the aforementioned CHOICE frame, and the PROGRESS frame, which will be examined next.

[7] The American system of medicine is a model of skill and innovation, with a pace of discovery that is adding good years to our lives (B3 - 65).

[8] By keeping costs under control, expanding access, and helping more Americans afford coverage, we will preserve the system of private medicine that makes America’s health care the best in the world (B4 - 279).

[9] I ask Congress to move forward on a comprehensive health care agenda with tax credits to help low-income workers buy insurance, a community health center in every poor county, improved information technology to prevent medical error and needless costs, association health plans for small businesses and their employees, expand health savings accounts, and medical liability reform that will reduce health care costs and make sure patients have the doctors and care they need (B5 - 54).

The WORKING SYSTEM frame is evoked implicitly in each of the examples. In example [7], President Bush Jr. states what he sees as the best and most important aspects of the
American health care system, thereby invoking the WORKING SYSTEM frame. The same can be said of example [8], where President Bush Jr. states clearly that the American health care system is ‘the best in the world’. If one were to attempt to revamp the health care system, a regression of the system would take place, which of course is seen as a negative. Within the frame, trying to revamp the system is clearly seen as a negative. The system itself is seen as ‘the best in the world’, where the only negative is the fact that not everyone has coverage. Therefore within the frame, the only strategy is to work towards increasing coverage, since revamping the system will make health care services worse. In example [9], the WORKING SYSTEM frame is evoked not through praise of the current system, but instead by examining what aspects of the current system need improvement. Instead of wishing to change the system, President Bush Jr. mentions what parts of today’s system need improvement, i.e. the system is in working order, but needs to be updated to play a role in a changed society.

Another frame that President Bush Jr. evokes is the PROGRESS frame. As seen in example [9], health care cost is seen as too high, and a part of the system in need of improvement. One of the main arguments against the current health insurance system in the USA today is the fact that the cost of health care has skyrocketed in recent years, making health coverage too expensive for many citizens. Therefore the PROGRESS frame is used as part of the explanation for one of the negatives of the current system, the message being that one should work towards stifling the rate of increase in health care costs. The PROGRESS frame is also employed to make a claim for the positives of the current system, where President Bush Jr. makes claims about the correlation between the system and progress made in the field of medical research. This aligns with the idea held by many Americans; that the American health care system is superior to other systems in the world.

[10] The American system of medicine is a model of skill and innovation, with a pace of discovery that is adding good years to our lives (B3 - 65).

[11] Amazing medical technologies are improving and saving lives. This dramatic progress has brought its own challenge, in the rising costs of medical care and health insurance (B4 - 245).

[12] By keeping costs under control, expanding access, and helping more Americans afford coverage, we will preserve the system of private medicine that makes America’s health care the best in the world (B4 - 279).
In example [10], the PROGRESS frame is evoked implicitly through the use of the phrase ‘skill and innovation’ and the word ‘discovery’. In this example, President Bush Jr. equates progress to the American system, which may lead one to dissociate progress in the medical field with other systems on health care. In example [11], the PROGRESS frame is evoked explicitly through the use of the word ‘progress’. Here, progress in the field of medicine is portrayed as the main reason for the rising costs in medical care. This becomes a tool to build up the WORKING SYSTEM frame, since progress in the field of medicine, which saves lives, is more important than money. If cost were rising at an alarming rate, without positives for society, that would be an indicator of a broken system. In example [12], we can see the PROGRESS frame, which is evoked implicitly, and the WORKING SYSTEM frames at play together. Example [12] plays off of example [11], where the PROGRESS frame already has been established. The current system of health care in America is trumpeted as ‘the best in the world’, and through the use of the WORKING SYSTEM and PROGRESS frames, the discussion moves from changing the system, to preserving the system.

Finally, President Bush Jr. evokes the BIG GOVERNMENT frame. The government is viewed with suspicion by many Americans, and especially voters who align with the political right do not trust the government with their health. Even though he is part of the government, President Bush Jr. evokes the negative BIG GOVERNMENT frame.

[13] These problems will not be solved with a nationalized health care system that dictates coverage and ration care (B3 - 68).

[14] A Government-run health care system is the wrong prescription. By keeping costs under control, expanding access, and helping more Americans afford coverage, we will preserve the system of private medicine that makes America’s health care the best in the world (B4 - 279).

In example [13], the BIG GOVERNMENT frame is evoked implicitly through the use of the word ‘nationalized’. In this example, the nationalized health care system is portrayed as a system that takes away one’s right to choose, and that the quality of care would be reduced. It is not mentioned here, but this is something that is believed by many Americans. Being government run, many would believe that they would not receive the same care, since the government is in the businesses of saving money. In example [14], President Bush Jr. states that government health care is a bad idea. The American system is touted as ‘the best in the world’; therefore ‘a Government-run health care system’ must be worse. The BIG
GOVERNMENT frame is evoked implicitly through use of the phrase ‘Government-run health care system’.

6.1.2.3 Foreign policy

The third topic up for examination has been called ‘foreign policy’. The focus is on the USA’s part on the world stage, which between 2001 and 2013 has a lot to do with the ‘wars’ in Afghanistan and Iraq and fighting terrorism. The FEAR frame can be said to be reinforced constantly in the USA. Whenever a news story on terrorism or on the situation in the Middle East is run, the FEAR frame is reinforced.

Another frame evoked on the topic foreign policy is the EVIL frame. Evil is possibly the ultimate negative to be found in the world, and removing evil from the world may be the most positive thing one can do. This, of course, does not highlight the fact that ‘evil’ is not something tangible that we can all agree on, and there are no absolute evils. What one person sees as evil may differ greatly from another person.

[1] For as long as whole regions of the world simmer in resentment and tyranny, prone to ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder, violence will gather and multiply in destructive power and cross the most defended borders and raise a mortal threat (B2 - 15).

[2] And this Nation is leading the world in confronting and defeating the manmade evil of international terrorism (B3 - 179).

In example [1], President Bush Jr. evokes the EVIL frame implicitly through use of phrases such as ‘simmer in resentment and tyranny’, and ‘ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder’. President Bush Jr. portrays the entire Middle East as a breeding ground for all that is evil, and if nothing is done it will have an adverse effect on the world, with violence hitting even ‘the most defended borders’. Therefore, cleaning out the breeding ground for evil is a positive, something that is beneficial for those who need defending, while also being beneficial for those who live in the ‘evil’ regions. In example [2], the frame is evoked explicitly, through use of the word ‘evil’. In the example, international terrorism is called a manmade evil, which obviously would be positive to defeat: It is hard to argue the point that ‘the manmade evil of international terrorism’ should be given free reign. But the frame hides the fact that international terrorism is not a country, single group, or a person, and that international terrorism can most likely never be eradicated.
Another important frame for the topic is the WAR frame. The FEAR frame is constantly reinforced, especially as the building block of the WAR frame. The word ‘war’ conjures the picture of two armies in uniform meeting on the battlefield, even though in this case that is far from the truth. Framing the situation as a war allows the President certain powers which he does not have in times of peace. Also, having already evoked the EVIL frame, the idea of something as horrible as war becomes more positive, since the goal is eradication of EVIL.

[3] There are days when our fellow citizens do not hear news about the war on terror. There’s never a day when I do not learn of another threat or receive reports of operations in progress or give an order in this global war against a scattered network of killers. The war goes on, and we are winning (B3 - 182).

[4] As we gather tonight, hundreds of thousands of American service men and women are deployed across the world in the war on terror. By bringing hope to the oppressed and delivering justice to the violent, they are making America more secure (B4 - 7).

[5] Pursuing our enemies is a vital commitment of the war on terror, and I thank the congress for providing our service men and women with the resources they have needed. During this time of war, we must continue to support our military and give them the tools for victory (B5 - 218).

In each of the examples, the WAR frame is evoked explicitly through use of the word ‘war’. President Bush Jr. reinforces the WAR frame several times in example [3]. To keep up support for the ‘war’, even though it may have lost its focus in the media, President Bush Jr. is letting the American people know that the ‘war’ is ongoing. In example [3], the ‘war’ is against a ‘scattered network of killers’, which is undoubtedly seen as positive by many. ‘Scattered network of killers’ creates different connotations than ‘army’, where it is one’s ‘job’ or ‘duty’ to fight. In example [4], the phrase ‘war on terror’ is used, invoking the WAR frame. The enemy is portrayed similarly in both example [3] and [4]. In example [4], the enemy is portrayed as ‘the violent’. Violence is clearly a negative that should be eradicated from the world, thereby creating a narrative where the ‘war’ is justified. The WAR frame is evoked in example [5] through use of the phrase ‘war on terror’, and ‘during this time of war’. The phrase ‘the war on terror’ can be seen as a phrase to justify the military action, while the
phrase ‘during this time of war’ gives the impression that military action is temporary, and that the American people just need to give their unconditional support for a short time.

President Bush Jr. also attempts to evoke the WAR frame, while negating the CRIME frame. The CRIME frame was implemented early after 9/11, before being discarded in favor of the WAR frame (Feldman 2007).

[6] I know that some people question if America is really in a war at all. They view terrorism more as a crime, a problem to be solved mainly with law enforcement and indictments. [...] The terrorists and their supporters declared war on the United States, and war is what they got (B4 - 115).

In example [6] the CRIME frame is evoked through the use of the word ‘crime’. In this example, President Bush Jr. gives an explanation of why the CRIME frame is incorrect, by stating that war was declared by the ‘terrorists and their supporters’, invoking the WAR frame. If someone declares war, one has to answer the declaration to defend oneself. For some though, it is quite possible that the CRIME frame stuck. In this instance President Bush Jr. evokes both frames, and for some the CRIME frame may have trumped the WAR frame, even though President Bush Jr. attempts to negate the frame, which as we have seen earlier is difficult and possibly impossible.

In the attempt to gain the American public’s support of military force, President Bush Jr., evokes the metaphorical OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame. When talking about ‘defense’ and ‘threats’, the idea of 9/11 is evoked, which again evokes the FEAR frame. Being able to defend oneself against attack is taken for granted, therefore employing the OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame can gain support for use of military force.

[7] As we fight this war, we will remember where it began: Here, in our own country. This Government is taking unprecedented measures to protect our people and defend our homeland (B3 - 201).

[8] Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late (B3 - 340).
[9] Our greatest responsibility is the active defense of the American people. Twenty-eight months have passed since September the 11th, 2001 - over 2 years without an attack on American soil (B4 - 27).

Firstly, in example [7], President Bush Jr. evokes the idea of 9/11 and the FEAR frame, while implicitly invoking the OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame. The idea is that the terrorists hate America and its’ values, and want to cause the end of the nation, therefore defense is needed. In this case, President Bush Jr. is taking ‘unprecedented measures’ to defend the USA. Taking measures to protect your country is something positive, even if those ‘unprecedented measures’ is the invasion of several countries and war. In example [8], President Bush Jr. makes an argument against those who wish for more restraint with the use of force. He states that the bad guys do not give a warning before they attack, so if one waits before attacking it will be too late. Therefore the best course of action becomes a preemptive war, invoking an idea of striking before it is too late, which implicitly evokes the frame. The point is also made in such a way that anyone who is in disagreement President Bush Jr.’s logic seems foolish. Finally, in example [9], the OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame is evoked explicitly through the use of the phrase ‘active defense’, which is portrayed as the reason why there have not been attacks on US soil since 9/11. In this case, ‘active defense’ refers to offense. Here the case is made that the USA sending their military to fight in the Middle East is the reason why there have not been more attacks on US soil.

Another argument made by President Bush Jr. on the topic of ‘foreign affairs’ is by invoking the metaphorical FREEDOM IS PEACE frame. Freedom, which is a value that plays a very important role in the USA, is often portrayed as the ‘savior’ of all conflict, and the value that leads to peace. The assumption is that if everyone gained freedom, the world would be a peaceful place.

[10] The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world (B2 - 21).

[11] Our aim is a democratic peace, a peace founded upon the dignity and rights of every man and woman. America acts in this cause with friends and allies at our side, yet we understand our special calling: This great Republic will lead the cause of freedom (B4 - 163).
And because democracies respect their own people and their neighbors, the advance of freedom will lead to peace (B5 - 244).

In example [10], President Bush Jr. evokes the idea that freedom in the USA is under attack, and the only way to counter this is by promoting freedom in the world. In this example, the terms ‘freedom’ and ‘liberty’ are used more or less as synonyms, referring to the important and deeply ingrained American values. The term ‘expansion of freedom’ is positive and invokes positive connotations, even though the term in this instance refers to attacking or war, in this example the frame is evoked explicitly through use of the words ‘freedom’ and ‘peace’. In both examples [11] and [12], the FREEDOM IS PEACE frame is evoked explicitly through use of the words ‘freedom’ and ‘peace’. Both examples paint war and invasion as the road to peace in the world.

The final frame that will be presented on this topic is the metaphorical AMERICA IS ADULT frame. This frame has been used as a response to those who have been against the way President Bush Jr. moved forward with plans, particularly in Iraq, without the support of the United Nations. The frame emphasizes that America will do what ‘needs to be done’, no matter what the rest of the world thinks. America is not a child that must listen to its ‘parents’, but instead is an adult makes its own decisions.

All free nations have a stake in preventing sudden and catastrophic attacks. And we’re asking them to join us, and many are doing so. Yet the course of this nation does not depend on the decisions of others. Whatever action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the American people (B3 - 249).

From the beginning, America has sought international support for our operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, and we have gained much support. There is a difference, however, between leading a coalition of many nations and submitting to the objections of a few. America will never seek a permission slip to defend the security of our country (B4 - 141).

In both examples [13] and [14], the AMERICA IS ADULT frame is evoked implicitly by stating that America is not dependent on the decisions of anyone regarding the safety of the American people. In example [14], President Bush Jr. makes seeking approval to defend it country sound silly and childish by using the phrase ‘permission slip’, which children use at school.
6.1.2.4 Gay Marriage

The topic of gay marriage is one that causes emotions to run high in the USA. The concept of gay marriage is one that goes against typical conservative Christian values, and something President Bush Jr. was clearly against.

The superordinate frame employed by President Bush Jr. on the topic of gay marriage is the metaphorical MARRIAGE IS A PILLAR OF SOCIETY frame. The frame and the arguments used often have a base in religious values. The frame emphasizes the status quo, and leads one to believe marriage is an important institution in society, while downplaying the fact that in what way marriage is important for society is not mentioned.

[1] Because marriage is a sacred institution and the foundation of society, it should not be redefined by activist judges (B5 - 162).

[2] A strong America must also value the institution of marriage. I believe we should respect individuals as we take a principled stand for one of the most fundamental, enduring institutions of our civilization (B4 - 316).

[3] Our Nation must defend the sanctity of marriage (B4 - 325).

By employing words such as ‘sacred’ and ‘foundation’ in example [1], the phrase ‘fundamental, enduring institutions’ in example [2], and ‘sanctity’ in example [3], the importance of marriage for society is emphasized. In examples [1] and [2], the frame is evoked implicitly through use of phrases calling marriage a ‘sacred institution and the foundation of society’, and ‘one of the most fundamental, enduring institutions of our civilization’. At first glance, and especially for conservative Christians, marriage may be seen as an important institution, since marriage is the basis for the family in the Christian tradition. The frame emphasizes the importance of marriage without giving any mention of why it is an important institution.

A frame often employed and tied closely to the MARRIAGE IS A PILLAR OF SOCIETY frame is the MARRIAGE IS UNDER ATTACK frame. Here, marriage, which has already been portrayed as one of, or the, most important institution in society, is under attack. The word ‘attack’ gives connotations to something negative and aggressive, which merits an aggressive and emotional response.
[4] Our nation must defend the sanctity of marriage (B4 - 325).

[5] Congress has already taken a stand on this issue by passing the Defense of Marriage act, signed in 1996 by President Clinton. That statute protects marriage under Federal law as a union of a man and a woman and declares that one State may not redefine marriage for other States (B4 - 318).

[6] For the good of families, children, and society, I support a constitutional amendment to protect the institution of marriage (B5 - 163).

In all three examples, the MARRIAGE IS UNDER ATTACK frame is evoked implicitly. In example [4], the word ‘defend’ evokes the MARRIAGE IS UNDER ATTACK frame. What is interesting regarding this example is that President Bush Jr. states that the sanctity of marriage needs defending. ‘Sanctity’ is a term often used by Christians, and for many people may give connotations to other terms such as ‘holiness’, ‘purity’, ‘saintliness’, and ‘sacred’, making it sound like something that is important to defend, without stating what sanctity is and why it needs to be defended. In example [5], the MARRIAGE IS UNDER ATTACK frame is evoked by mentioning the ‘Defense of Marriage act’. As in the last example, the word ‘defend’ evokes the attack frame. The frame is further reinforced through the use of the word ‘protects’, which depicts marriage as something vulnerable that needs to be defended from attack. In example [5], with the mention of the law that ‘protects’ marriage and the mention of Congress and President Clinton, the issue is portrayed as an attack on the Law, on the lawmakers, and democracy. In example [6], the MARRIAGE IS UNDER ATTACK frame is evoked through the word ‘protect’, where the institution of marriage is portrayed as so important and vulnerable that a constitutional amendment is needed to protect it.

A frame that follows the MARRIAGE IS UNDER ATTACK frame is the ACTIVIST JUDGE frame. The activist judges are part of the attack on marriage. Judges are part of the court system, where laws are ultimately interpreted, and set precedent for similar cases. The law, however, is by many seen as something that allows only one objectively correct interpretation, especially those who follow an essentialist worldview. Within this frame, activist judges are judges who, instead of being objective and interpreting the law ‘correctly’, let their personal views cloud their judgment at the expense of marriage. But the ACTIVIST JUDGE frame downplays the idea of the ‘living constitution’, which is the foundation of the Supreme Court. The living constitution philosophy states that it is the duty of judges to
reinterpret the constitution as times change, and there is no objectively correct interpretation. It should be noted that for many people, the word ‘activist’ gives negative connotations to someone on the fringes of society.

[7] Activist judges, however, have begun redefining marriage by court order, without regard for the will of the people and their elected representatives (B4 - 322).

[8] Because marriage is a sacred institution and the foundation of society, it should not be redefined by activist judges (B5 - 162).

[9] Because courts must always deliver impartial justice, judges have a duty to faithfully interpret the law, not legislate from the bench (B5 - 175).

In both examples [7] and [8], the ACTIVIST JUDGE frame is evoked explicitly through the use of the phrase ‘activist judges’. In example [7], the activist judge is juxtaposed with ‘the will of the people and their elected representatives’, where the activist judge is attempting to ‘redefine marriage’ for the benefit of the few, and to the detriment of the people and the elected representatives. In example [8], the point that marriage should not be redefined is based on the alleged importance of marriage in society, which can be seen on the discussion of the same example in example [1]. Lastly, in example [9], President Bush Jr. evokes the ACTIVIST JUDGE frame implicitly by stating that certain judges ‘legislate from the bench’. The court system is an important institution in society, and people must be able to trust that the courts give unbiased and impartial judgment, which is the goal. But there is no single impartial, objective interpretation of the law.

Finally, we will examine one of the frames often employed with regard to the topic of gay marriage, and is often evoked in American society. The TRADITION IS GOOD frame emphasizes that traditions gain a place in society for a reason; they are inherently good and need to be protected. This, of course, does not take into account the fact that an opposite frame is often employed, which is the INNOVATION IS GOOD frame, where anything new is seen as an improvement over the old and outdated. This frame will not be discussed further, but is mentioned in order to show how conflicting frames may lead to similar inferences. One can choose which frame to use with regard to a given subject, and the frame is likely to evoke positive connotations.
[10] I believe we should respect individuals as we take a principled stand for one of the most fundamental, enduring institutions of our civilization (B4 - 316).

[11] Because marriage is a sacred institution and the foundation of society, it should not be redefined by activist judges (B5 - 162).

[12] The same moral tradition that defines marriage also teaches that each individual has dignity and value in God’s sight (B4 - 327).

In examples [10] and [11], the TRADITION IS GOOD is evoked implicitly through the use of words and phrases such as ‘fundamental’, ‘enduring’, ‘sacred’, and ‘foundation of society’. These are words that give positive connotations, but do not in fact say anything about how the tradition of marriage is a ‘foundation of society’. In example [12], President Bush Jr. evokes the TRADITION IS GOOD frame implicitly by stating that ‘the moral tradition that defines marriage’ is the same tradition that ‘teaches that each individual has dignity and value in God’s sight’. In this example, religion and religious reasoning is imposed. Tradition is not only presented as something good, but in example [12] implies that changing one tradition would erase another tradition, i.e. that the individual ‘has dignity and value in God’s sight’.

6.2 President Obama

6.2.1 Topics

6.2.1.1 Economy

- FAIR MARKET
  - BROKEN SYSTEM
  - FAIRNESS
  - GOVERNMENT AS INVESTOR

6.2.1.2 Health Care

- HEALTH CARE IS AN INALIENABLE RIGHT
  - FAIRNESS
  - FREEDOM FROM WANT
  - BROKEN SYSTEM

6.2.1.3 Foreign Policy
• FEAR
  o WAR
    ▪ OFFENSE IS DEFENSE
    ▪ RESPONSIBLY LEAVING
    ▪ TOUGH DIPLOMACY

6.2.1.5 Gay marriage

• EQUALITY
  o LOVE
  o OUTSIDER
  o VALUE TO SOCIETY

6.2.2 Discussion

Having looked at the frames employed by President Obama, the next step is to look at the frames in the context of the speeches they were found.

6.2.2.1 Economy

The superordinate frame evoked on the topic of economy is similar to the frame evoked by President Bush Jr., i.e. the FREE MARKET frame, except the frame shifts the focus of the discussion slightly. The frame employed by President Obama will here be referred to as the FAIR MARKET frame. As earlier mentioned, the free market holds a special place in American society, where the ‘invisible hand’ works its magic to create the best economic environment for everyone involved. In the progressive fair market, there seems to be less of an illusion as to how the free market works in practice. In the FAIR MARKET frame, there are certain conditions that need to be in place for the free market to work the way it ‘should’, which is done through government intervention when necessary in order to create as close conditions to those of the theoretical ideal of the free market. That means attempting to create conditions for perfect competition, making sure neither buyer nor seller is too powerful, discouraging collusion, and so on.

[1] Together, we discovered that a free market only thrives when there are rules to ensure competition and fair play (O2 - 26)
[2] Our free enterprise system is what drives innovation. But because it’s not always profitable for companies to invest in basic research, throughout our history, our Government has provided cutting-edge scientists and inventors with the support they need (O3 - 94).

[3] It’s not fair when foreign manufacturers have a leg up on ours only because they’re heavily subsidized (O4 - 112).

In example [1], the FAIR MARKET frame is evoked implicitly through use of the phrase ‘free market’ juxtaposed with regulations to ensure ‘fair play’. Competition and fair play are important aspects of the conservative FREE MARKET frame, but according to President Obama, they are not naturally to be found in the free market, instead one needs rules to create conditions in which the market works as intended. In example [2], the FAIR MARKET frame is evoked implicitly through use of the phrase ‘free enterprise’ along with an explanation of how the government encourages innovation, providing fairly for the good of everyone in the market. Therefore, once again, government intervention is needed to create the free market conditions needed to promote innovation. In example [3], the FAIR MARKET frame is evoked explicitly through the use of the word ‘fair’, along with the words ‘manufacturers’ and ‘subsidized’. Subsidies could typically be seen as one of the methods to create ‘fair’ conditions on the free market, which is done in the USA with products such as corn. But in this instance the subsidized goods of another country lead to problems for the USA.

Secondly, following the FAIR MARKET, President Obama employs the BROKEN SYSTEM frame. Within this frame, instead of viewing the economic system as a stagnate system, there are more serious problems with regard to the economic situation that need to be addressed.

[4] Our economy is badly weakened, a consequence of greed and irresponsibility on the part of some, but also our collective failure to make hard choices and prepare the Nation for a new age (O1 - 14).

[5] For example, over the years, a parade of lobbyists has rigged the Tax Code to benefit particular companies and industries. Those with accountants or lawyers to work the system can end up paying no taxes at all (O3 - 246).
We should start with our Tax Code. Right now companies get tax breaks for moving jobs and profits overseas. Meanwhile, companies that choose to stay in America get hit with one of the highest tax rates in the world (O4 - 84).

In example [4], the BROKEN SYSTEM frame is evoked implicitly. President Obama states that the ‘economy is badly weakened’, because the system is in need of fixing. According to President Obama, the nation has failed to prepare for the future, which has led the system to break down. The system has been weakened because of ‘greed’ and ‘irresponsibility’, which are factors that need to be fixed to get the system in working order again. In examples [5] and [6], the BROKEN SYSTEM frame is evoked implicitly through focus on the problems that are found in the economic systems, in both cases regarding the Tax Code. In both examples, those who attempt to take advantage of the system are rewarded, while those who do their part are ‘punished’. If the economic system allows people to take advantage of it, then clearly the system is broken. In example [5], the frame is also evoked through use of the word ‘rigged’. A system that is rigged gives connotations to a system where few are able to ‘win’ big, while the rest come out as losers.

Thirdly, President Obama evokes the FAIRNESS frame. The idea of fairness is important in the USA, and it is an important component of the American Dream narrative. The common belief with regard to personal economics in the USA is that if one is compensated appropriately compared to how much work one puts in. The idea is that the ‘playing field’ is level for everyone; therefore it is only skill and hard work that separates an economic ‘winner’ from an economic ‘loser’. Since this is not the case, the FAIRNESS frame hints towards a dying American Dream when employed to the topic of economics.

For we, the people, understand that our country cannot succeed when a shrinking few do very well and a growing many barely make it (O2 - 48).

We can either settle for a country where a shrinking number of people do really well while a growing number of Americans barely get by. Or we can restore an economy where everyone gets a fair shot and everyone does their fair share and everyone plays by the same set of rules (O4 - 33).

Americans understand that some people will earn more money than others, and we don’t resent those who, by virtue of their efforts, achieve incredible success. That’s what America is
all about. But Americans overwhelmingly agree that no one who works full-time should ever have to raise a family in poverty (O5 - 258).

In example [7], President Obama implicitly evokes the FAIRNESS frame by invoking the image of a growing economic divide. According to President Obama, a ‘shrinking few’ are able to succeed, while a ‘growing many’ are barely able to make it, which is unfair, and not a part of the typical American Dream narrative. In example [8], the image of an economic divide is invoked in the same fashion as example in example [7]. The example also evokes the FAIRNESS frame explicitly, through the use of phrases such as ‘fair shot’, ‘fair share’, and ‘everyone plays by the same set of rules’. Finally, in example [9], the FAIRNESS frame is evoked implicitly, through juxtapositioning the American Dream and the realities of the economic system. President Obama begins by explaining the basics of the American Dream, possibly to make sure his opponents cannot easily portray him as too radical or a communist. President Obama suggests that people understand that there are social differences, and that some people deserve to achieve more by ‘virtue of their efforts’. But that is not the backbone of the economic divide. Instead President Obama moves on to state that someone who works full time, i.e. is not lazy, should have to raise a family in poverty.

Finally, we come to another frame employed with regard to the topic of economy, which is the metaphorical GOVERNMENT AS INVESTOR frame. In this frame, money spent by the government is viewed as investing in the economy, instead of being viewed as wasted. In the GOVERNMENT AS INVESTOR frame, the investment is money spent on projects that create jobs, such as infrastructure and tax relief for small businesses.

[10] All these investments, in innovation, education, and infrastructure, will make America a better place to do business and create jobs (O3 - 243).

[11] Tear down regulations that prevent aspiring entrepreneurs from getting financing to grow. Expand tax relief to small businesses that are raising wages and creating good jobs (O4 - 193).

[12] Moreover, we can take the money we save from this transition to tax reform to create jobs rebuilding our roads, upgrading our ports, unclogging our commutes, because in today’s global economy, first-class jobs gravitate to first-class infrastructure (O5 - 90).
In example [10], the GOVERNMENT AS INVESTOR frame is evoked explicitly through the use of the word ‘investment’. Through investing money, the government has the opportunity to create jobs, and raise the American economy. In this example, investment is equated with creating a better place to do business and creating more jobs, which means a strengthened economy. In example [11], the GOVERNMENT AS INVESTOR frame is evoked implicitly. In this example, money not coming in to the government is equated with money spent, which could be seen as investment. In this example, the government ‘invests’ in small businesses that are raising wages and creating new jobs in order to allow the economy to grow. Finally, in example [12], President Obama evokes the GOVERNMENT AS INVESTOR implicitly by stating what infrastructure could be built with government money, i.e. a government investment. This investment is equated with job creation, which is the backbone of a good economy.

6.2.2.2 Health care

Health care reform has been an important pillar for President Obama, where the passing of the Affordable Care Act has been one of the main goals of his presidency. Health care reform is a volatile subject in the USA, and the discussion often causes emotions to run high.

When it comes to the topic health care, the superordinate frame employed by President Obama is the metaphorical HEALTH CARE IS AN INALIENABLE RIGHT frame. In this frame, access to health care is viewed as a right with a basis in the declaration of independence, i.e. the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It could be argued that health care is a basic requirement to live life to its fullest.

[1] We, the people, still believe that every citizen deserves a basic measure of security and dignity. We must make the hard choices to reduce the cost of health care and the size of our deficit. But we reject the belief that America must choose between caring for the generation that built this country and investing in the generation that will build its future (O2 - 61).

[2] They’re people we shop and go to church with, farmers out on the tractor, grocery clerks. They’re people who go to work every morning praying they don’t get sick. No one deserves to live that way (O5 - 331).

In example [1], the HEALTH CARE IS AN INALIENABLE RIGHT frame is implicitly evoked through use of the phrase ‘every citizen deserves a basic measure of security and
dignity’, which could be seen as inalienable rights, before moving on to the topic of health care. In the last sentence of this example, President Obama makes it clear that it is the role of America to care for its people. In example [2], the HEALTH CARE IS AN INALIENABLE RIGHT frame is evoked implicitly, by first stating how certain hard working Americans live without access to health insurance before stating that ‘no one deserves to live that way’. If health care is seen as an inalienable right, then there are a lot of people in the USA that are not ‘receiving’ all their rights, which leads one to infer that something must be done with the system.

Another frame employed by President Obama on the topic of health care is the FAIRNESS frame. This frame was described under the heading ‘economy’; therefore the frame does not need closer introduction, except to state that fairness is an important value in America society. The FAIRNESS frame meshes well with the HEALTH CARE IS AN INALIENABLE RIGHT frame. If health care is seen as a right, then it is only fair that everyone has equal access to health care.

[3] What I’m not willing to do is go back to the days when insurance companies could deny someone coverage because of preexisting conditions (O3 - 279).

[4] I will not go back to the days when health insurance companies had unchecked power to cancel your policy, deny your coverage, or charge women differently than men (O4 - 298).

In both examples [3] and [4], President Obama evokes the FAIRNESS frame implicitly by giving an example of unfair practices on the part of insurance providers. In both examples, President Obama employs the ‘forward is progress’ metaphor, by stating he is not willing to go back to the days of unfair practices. Therefore, in an attempt to gain support for his health care reform, President Obama adopted the FAIRNESS frame.

While addressing the topic of health care, President Obama employed the FREEDOM FROM WANT frame, which for many is tied to the American Dream. The concept of fairness plays an important role in the American Dream. One of the beliefs regarding the American Dream narrative is that of the level playing field, where one succeeds based on the effort and skill possessed by the individual. Another important aspect of the American Dream is its connection to the Four Freedoms (Roosevelt 1941). The Four Freedoms were outlined in President F. D. Roosevelt’s 1941 State of the Union Address, where he list the goal of the four freedoms, i.e. freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom
from fear. For many people the freedom from want includes the right to medical service, which is an integral part of an adequate standard of living.

[5] We recognize that no matter how responsibly we live our lives, any one of us at any time may face a job loss or sudden illness or a home swept away in a terrible storm. The commitments we make to each other through Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, these things do not sap our initiative, they strengthen us. They do not make us a nation of takers; they free us to take the risks that make this country great (O2 - 68).

[6] That’s what health insurance reform is all about: the peace of mind that if misfortune strikes, you don’t have to lose everything (O5 - 310).

[7] They’re people we shop and go to church with, farmers out on the tractor, grocery clerks. They’re people who go to work every morning praying they don’t get sick. No one deserves to live that way (O5 - 331).

In example [5] the FREEDOM FROM WANT frame is evoked implicitly by mentioning the fact that anyone may end up in a situation where they are in need of assistance, regardless of how responsibly they live their life. Within the FREEDOM FROM WANT frame, it is understood that in circumstances outside one’s own control, one has the right to security. In the example, President Obama mentions a few of the safety nets that are in place for the American people, underscoring that the security systems do not weaken America, but make it stronger. In example [6], the FREEDOM FROM WANT frame is evoked implicitly. In the example President Obama talks about the health insurance reform, and how it is needed to give people ‘peace of mind if misfortune strikes’. This is a socioeconomic safety net, which is at the heart of the FREEDOM FROM WANT frame. Example [7] is very similar to the former example. Here, President Obama once again speaks of the need for a socioeconomic safety net for hard working Americans, implicitly invoking the FREEDOM FROM WANT frame.

Following the FREEDOM FROM WANT frame, the speeches audience may have made assumptions as to what rights they should be receiving which are not being provided. This frame works well in unison with the BROKEN SYSTEM frame, which President Obama also employed in his speech. Following the former frames, one would infer that the health care system should be fair, do the most good the population, and provide a safety net. When the system is broken, something must be done to fix it. Through employing the BROKEN
SYTEM frame it becomes difficult to make the argument that the health care system is not in need of revision.

[8] And it’s why we passed reform that finally prevents the health insurance industry from exploiting patients (O3 - 272).

[9] Because of this law, no American - none, zero - can ever again be dropped or denied coverage for a preexisting condition like asthma or back pain or cancer. No woman can ever be charged more just because she’s a woman (O5 - 315).

[10] For decades, few things have exposed hard-working families to economic hardship more than a broken health care system (O5 - 303).

The BROKEN SYSTEM frame is evoked implicitly in examples [8] and [9]. In example [8], President Obama evokes the BROKEN SYSTEM frame by stating that that before his reform, the health care system facilitated exploitative practices by the health insurance industry, which is indicative of a broken health care system. In example [9], President Obama evokes the BROKEN SYSTEM frame by mentioning the repairs his new law has brought to the health care system. Here the system is to be repaired by moving towards freedom of want, through implementation of fairer practices. Finally, in example [10], President Obama explicitly evokes the BROKEN SYSTEM frame through the implementation of the phrase ‘broken health care system’. In this example, President Obama integrates the BROKEN SYSTEM frame and the FREEDOM FROM WANT frame, where the broken system is portrayed as one of the main factors for why people are not ‘free from want’, since there are no safety nets in place.

6.2.2.3 Foreign Policy

As explained under the same topic for President Bush Jr., the topic ‘foreign policy’ in this instance refers to America’s fight against terror, which led to land invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan. Regarding this topic, the FEAR frame can be said to be evoked whenever terrorism and the situation in the Middle East is mentioned.

The superordinate frame employed by President Obama on the topic foreign policy is the WAR frame. It is possible that it was difficult for President Obama to get away from the WAR frame, but it does not seem as if an attempt was made to employ a different frame in the speeches that were analyzed. Through the official use of the WAR frame, the president still
has extraordinary ‘war-time’ powers, and it gives the president more time and leeway with regard to the situations in Afghanistan and Iraq, since there is a ‘war’ going on.

[1] Our Nation is at war against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred (O1 - 13).

[2] This year, our civilians will forge a lasting partnership with the Iraqi people, while we finish the job of bringing our troops out of Iraq. America’s commitment has been kept. The Iraq war is coming to an end (O3 - 380).

[3] From this position of strength, we’ve begun to wind down the war in Afghanistan (O4 - 407).

President Obama evokes the WAR frame explicitly in all three examples, through use of the word ‘war’. In example [1], President Obama states that America is at war with a ‘network of violence and hatred’. It is of course impossible to wage war against a ‘network of violence and hatred’, i.e. terrorism, but by framing the issue as a WAR, gaining support for later military action may be easier, which can be seen in the recent military action taken against the terrorist organization ISIS. In examples [2] and [3], President Obama talks about how the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are winding down and troops are coming back home. Within the WAR frame the ‘wars’ in Afghanistan and Iraq are seen as won. The USA has kept its commitment and made it to a position of strength.

An important subordinate frame to the WAR frame is the metaphorical OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame, where it functions as a reason for going to war. One of the most important roles a nation has is the protection of its people, which equates to, among other things, the defense of its citizens. The OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame allows different courses of action than normal. One is allowed to resort to extreme measures in the name of self-defense. This makes the OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame a powerful one, since it makes the case for invasion and military action as a defensive strategy. An important aspect that the frame leaves in the shadow is that the American invasions have most likely created more hatred and animosity in the world, as well as more enemies. Therefore America’s ‘defense’ may in actuality have created more of a threat.

[4] We will defend our people and uphold our values through strength of arms and rule of law (O2 - 92).
We’ve also taken the fight to Al Qaida and their allies abroad. […] By preventing the Taliban from reestablishing a stranglehold over the Afghan people, we will deny Al Qaida the safe haven that served as a launching pad for 9/11 (O3 - 388).

We gather tonight knowing that this generation of heroes has made the United States safer and more respected around the world (O4 - 7).

In example [4], President Obama evokes the OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame implicitly by stating that America will defend its people through ‘strength of arms’. One knows that there is not a military conflict taking place in the USA, which means ‘defense through strength of arms’ refers to an offensive maneuver. The OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame is evoked implicitly in example [5] through use of an argument that taking the fight to ‘Al Qaida and their allies abroad’ will prevent another 9/11, which is stating that the offensive maneuver defends the USA. In example [6], the OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame is evoked implicitly. Here, President Obama claims that ‘this generation of heroes’, which are the men and women in the military service, ‘has made the United States safer’. The way this has been done, is through participation if foreign ‘wars’, e.g. in Afghanistan and Iraq. The claim being made is that America has become a safer place, because of offensive maneuvers around the world.

One of the early promises made by President Obama was to bring home the troops, and to end the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many people were against the proposal, stating that the countries were left without making sure safety and other social institutions were in place and working. Therefore, an important frame employed by President Obama with regard to the retraction of troops from Iraq and Afghanistan is the RESPONSIBLY LEAVING frame. Many people were afraid that the USA would invade the countries, ruin the national system that was in place, and thereafter leave with the country in turmoil. The RESPONSIBLY LEAVING frame is employed in order to make the argument that bringing home the troops is not detrimental to the safety of the USA and to the safety of the inhabitants of Iraq and Afghanistan.

We will begin to responsibly leave Iraq to its people and forge a hard-earned peace in Afghanistan (O1 - 96).

From this position of strength, we've begun to wind down the war in Afghanistan. Ten thousand of our troops have come home. Twenty-three thousand more will leave by the end of this summer. This transition to Afghan lead will continue, and we will build an enduring
partnership with Afghanistan so that it is never again a source of attacks against America (O4 - 407).

[9] When I took office, nearly 180,000 Americans were serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today, all our troops are out of Iraq. More than 60,000 of our troops have already come home from Afghanistan. With Afghan forces now in the lead for their own security, our troops have moved to a support role (O5 - 358).

In example [7], President Obama evokes the RESPONSIBLY LEAVING frame explicitly through use of the phrase ‘responsibly leave’, where the Iraqi people are to be given control of their country, responsibly. What ‘responsibly leave’ actually entails is a bit more ambiguous. In example [8] on the other hand, the RESPONSIBLY LEAVING frame is evoked implicitly. President Obama states that many soldiers have left Afghanistan, which evokes LEAVING, and he states that the ‘transition to Afghan lead will continue’, which evokes the RESPONSIBILITY aspect of the frame. Even though one does not know exactly what is being done, the word ‘transition’ gives connotations to a period where American troops train Afghani troops in order to keep the country safe. Lastly, in example [9], President Obama discusses how many troops have left Iraq and Afghanistan, while stating that Afghan forces have taken over the responsibility for their security, and that American troops have taken a support role, implicitly invoking the RESPONSIBLY LEAVING frame.

With regard to the threat of violence and conflict in the world, President Obama employs the TOUGH DIPLOMACY frame. Through repetition of the TOUGH DIPLOMACY frame, there is the possibility that the American public will not automatically demand forceful action in the world, but be content to allow America to attempt to use its diplomatic channels. Diplomacy is something that, for many Americans, represents weakness. For many Americans, diplomacy and sanctions cannot be used to combat aggression, especially when it comes to dictatorships where sanctions will hit the population more than the ruling class.

[10] Because of a diplomatic effort to insist that Iran meet its obligations, the Iranian Government now faces tougher sanctions, tighter sanctions than ever before (O3 - 405).

[11] Through the power of our diplomacy, a world that was once divided about how to deal with Iran's nuclear program now stands as one. The regime is more isolated than ever before.
Its leaders are faced with crippling sanctions, and as long as they shirk their responsibilities, this pressure will not relent (O4 - 423).

[12] You see, in a world of complex threats, our security, our leadership, depends on all elements of our power, including strong and principled diplomacy. American diplomacy has rallied more than 50 countries to prevent nuclear materials from falling into the wrong hands and allowed us to reduce our own reliance on cold war stockpiles. American diplomacy, backed by the threat of force, is why Syria’s chemical weapons are being eliminated (O5 - 396).

In example [10], President Obama evokes the TOUGH DIPLOMACY frame explicitly through the use of the word ‘diplomacy’ juxtaposed with the phrases ‘tougher sanctions’ and ‘tighter sanctions’, and informs the American public of an instance where ‘diplomatic effort’ has played an important role on the stage of global politics. Much of the same can be said of example [11], where the world has become a more unified and safer place through the ‘power of our diplomacy’. President Obama also includes the phrases ‘crippling sanctions’ and ‘pressure will not relent’, which, together with the phrase ‘power of our diplomacy’, implicitly evoke the TOUGH DIPLOMACY frame. Finally, in example [12], President Obama evokes the TOUGH DIPLOMACY frame explicitly by using the phrase ‘strong and principled diplomacy’. President Obama also makes sure to acknowledge the importance of diplomacy, and what results are reached through the use of strong diplomacy.

6.2.2.4 Gay Marriage

As mentioned earlier, gay marriage is a topic that divides the American people and causes tempers to flare. At the time of writing, 32 states and the District of Columbia have removed the ban on marriage between people of the same sex, and the Supreme Court has ruled it unconstitutional for the federal government to deny marriage benefits to married same sex couples. This seems to be in line with the position taken by President Obama. Since the tide is moving in the direction President Obama wishes, presumably, there is little mention of gay marriage in his speeches.

The superordinate frame employed by President Obama on the topic of gay marriage is the EQUALITY frame. The equality frame is based on prototypical American values. Within the EQUALITY frame many Americans are likely to think of the Declaration of
Independence which states that ‘All men are created equal’. This is a phrase most Americans know, and is a source of pride for many Americans, which also makes it a hard hitting frame.

[1] Our journey is not complete until our gay brothers and sisters are treated like anyone else under the law - for if we are truly created equal, then surely the love we commit to one another must be equal as well (O2 - 112).

[2] The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit, to choose our better history, to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness (O1 - 30).

[3] We do these things because they help promote our long-term security, and we do them because we believe in the inherent dignity and equality of every human being, regardless of race or religion, creed or sexual orientation (O5 - 444).

In all the above examples the EQUALITY frame is evoked explicitly through the use of the word ‘equal’ and ‘equality’. Within the EQUALITY frame, the assumption is that everyone is created equal, so we deserve to be treated equally. In example [1], President Obama makes the argument that if everyone is created equal, then the love we have for each other is equal, we deserve equal treatment under the law. In example [2], President Obama conjures the Declaration of Independence and the idea of traditional American values which calls for equality. This example is not specifically about the topic gay marriage, but instead reinforces an important frame that provides the back drop for arguments on an array of topics. Finally, in example [3], we also see reinforcement of the EQUALITY frame which was not specifically targeting the topic gay marriage. In the example, President Obama refers to traditional American values and that everyone is deserving of these values, ‘regardless of race, religion, creed or sexual orientation’.

Another frame employed by President Obama regarding the topic gay marriage, is the LOVE frame. Within the LOVE frame, the discussion becomes if everyone has the right to love. Within this frame, the question is not about the definition of marriage, it is not about rights, it does not involve a debate of what is natural, but it hinges on the assumption that everyone deserves love, and that one does not choose whom one loves. The concept of love is powerful, since it is something universal for most humans, and plays an important role in people’s lives.
[4] Our journey is not complete until our gay brothers and sisters are treated like anyone else under the law - for if we are truly created equal, then surely the love we commit to one another must be equal as well (O2 - 112).

[5] Starting this year, no American will be forbidden from serving the country they love because of who they love (O3 - 434).

In all three examples, President Obama evokes the LOVE frame explicitly by using the word ‘love’. In example [4], President Obama evokes the EQUALITY frame, and then goes on to evoke the LOVE frame, stating that the love one person has is as important as the love of another person. In example [5], President Obama also evokes the LOVE frame, but not specifically on the topic of gay marriage. Since there was little on the topic gay marriage in President Obama’s speeches, a few examples regarding the rights and treatment of gay Americans have been included, since comments on gay rights in general can give an indication of the president’s treatment of the topic gay marriage. In example [5], President Obama evokes the LOVE frame both as something one has for another human, and as something one has for one’s country. Here the word ‘forbidden’ is also used. Instead of relying on the argument of rights, which for many conservatives evokes the concept of special rights, it is shown that if one is gay one is forbidden from taking part in society in the same manner as the rest of the population.

The third frame on the topic gay marriage is the OUTSIDER frame. The word ‘outsider’, at least in the examples presented, gives connotations to someone who wishes to take part in the majority society, but is not allowed to do so, which can be seen as discrimination. The OUTSIDER frame may also play with the emotions of those listening, since most people have most likely at one time or another felt like an outsider to some group, and know how devastating the feeling can be. Once again, President Obama did not include much specifically on the subject gay marriage in his speeches, but he did evoke frames regarding the status of gay Americans in general, which in the end may play a role when it comes to gay marriage.

[6] Our troops come from every corner of this country. They're Black, White, Latino, Asian, Native American. They are Christian and Hindu, Jewish and Muslim. And yes, we know that some of them are gay. Starting this year, no American will be forbidden from serving the country they love because of who they love (O3 - 432).
When you put on that uniform, it doesn't matter if you're Black or White, Asian, Latino, Native American; conservative, liberal; rich, poor; gay, straight. When you're marching into battle, you look out for the person next to you or the mission fails. When you're in the thick of the fight, you rise or fall as one unit, serving one nation, leaving no one behind (O4 - 461).

In example [6], President Obama evokes the OUTSIDER frame implicitly. This is done by juxtaposing gay Americans with Americans from all walks of life, e.g. ‘Black, White, Latino, Asian’ and ‘Christian and Hindu, Jewish and Muslim’, making it clear that everyone is allowed to serve the country they love, except gays, who are ‘forbidden from serving the country they love because of who they love’. In this way, gays are framed as outsiders in a society that is full of diversity. The OUTSIDER frame is evoked implicitly also in example [7], by showing the positivity that has come from inclusiveness in the military, showing that our differences are not important, and that the nation can be productive even if we let gays ‘inside’, i.e. doom did not befall the Nation after the repeal of ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’.

There is less focus on gay marriage in the speeches of President Obama compared to President Bush Jr. It is possible this is because the process is going in a direction President Obama is happy with. But, one frame employed with regard to homosexuality, and not just gay marriage, is the VALUE TO SOCIETY frame, which President Obama used particularly by making references to the military. The military was an area that for a long time did not condone openness around homosexuality, relying on the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell policy’, which became illegal in 2011. The VALUE TO SOCIETY frame emphasizes that everyone has value for society, which is in contrast to claims made by certain individuals and groups that since homosexuals do not procreate, they do not have value to society.

Our troops come from every corner of this country. They're Black, White, Latino, Asian, Native American. They are Christian and Hindu, Jewish and Muslim. And yes, we know that some of them are gay. Starting this year, no American will be forbidden from serving the country they love because of who they love (O3 - 432).

When you put on that uniform, it doesn't matter if you're Black or White, Asian, Latino, Native American; conservative, liberal; rich, poor; gay, straight. When you're marching into battle, you look out for the person next to you or the mission fails. When you're in the thick of the fight, you rise or fall as one unit, serving one nation, leaving no one behind (O4 - 461).
It is surprising that in a country where everyone is supposedly ‘created equal’, many people still do not acknowledge that homosexuals have a place in, and have value, for society. The two examples that are presented above are not specifically on the topic of gay marriage, but they can be seen as promoting deep frames that may be influential with regard to the discussion surrounding the topic gay marriage. In both examples [8] and [9], the VALUE TO SOCIETY frame is evoked implicitly, through showing that homosexuals take part in the military. The military is seen by many Americans, and especially conservatives, as something courageous and altruistic, and something very valuable to society. In example [8], homosexuals are juxtaposed with other American groups, showing that in the military, which can be seen as a microcosm of the American society, people from all walks of life come together to provide a service for the best of society. In example [9], homosexuals are once more juxtaposed with other groups of Americans. In this example, President Obama talks about how people must come together and work together in ‘the thick of the fight’. Here, one does not worry about the background of the person next to you, instead one focuses on coming together and working as a team where each person has value.

6.3 Comparison

Through examination of the frames used by President Bush Jr. and President Obama, it can be seen that the topics are argued differently, invoking different frames. So far, the president’s speeches have been examined separately. In this section, each president’s use of frames is summed up, then the presidents’ use of frames will be compared. An attempt will be made to classify the frames in terms of the principles outlined in the conservative strict father model, or the progressive nurturing parent model (see 3.2.4.1).

6.3.1 Economy

On the topic economy, the superordinate frame employed by President Bush Jr., was the FREE MARKET frame. This frame meshes perfectly with ‘the free-market principle’, which is part of the strict father model. ‘The free-market principle’ sees government intervention on the free market as a problem for society restricting people’s freedom. President Bush Jr. also employed the STAGNATION frame, which must be seen through the FREE MARKET frame. Therefore it can be said that the STAGNATION frame also follows ‘the free-market principle’, where the STAGNATION frame is employed to underscore the validity of the free market. The next frame employed by President Bush Jr. on the topic economy is the PEOPLE
AS INVESTORS frame. This frame also fits with ‘the free-market principle’, since it is the people, and not the government, that have the responsibility to act as ‘investors’ in order to fix the economy. The penultimate frame on the topic economy is the RELIEF frame. This frame is also connected to ‘the free-market principle’, since ‘relief’ from government intervention is prescribed. Finally, President Bush Jr. evoked the DISCIPLINE frame. The frame fits with ‘the bootstraps principle’, which is part of the strict father model. ‘The bootstraps principle’ states that anyone, in this case the government, can pull themselves up by their bootstraps if they show enough discipline.

The frames employed by President Obama differ from those of President Bush Jr. The superordinate frame employed by President Obama on the topic economy is the FAIR MARKET frame. This frame is connected to the nurturing parent model, more specifically ‘the common good principle’, which focuses on fairness and equality. The same is true of the next frame employed by President Obama, i.e. the BROKEN SYSTEM frame. The system is broken in the way that it is very unfair, giving an unfair advantage to a small section of society, which opposes ‘the common good principle’. On the topic of economy, President Obama also evokes the FAIRNESS frame, which is also coupled with ‘the common good principle’. In the FAIRNESS frame, the notion is that one needs to work for best of the community, creating a situation in which more people are given the opportunity to succeed. Finally, President Obama employs the GOVERNMENT AS INVESTOR frame. This frame, as the other frames we have examined, is linked to ‘the common good principle’. Here, the government is responsible for laying the foundation for a fairer and stronger economy, instead of laying the responsibility on the people.

It is not surprising that President Bush Jr. mainly employs frames linked to ‘the free-market principle’, as well as linked to ‘the bootstraps principle’. These are typical conservative principles, which fall under the conservative strict father model. It must be said that it is also not surprising that President Obama employs frames linked to ‘the common good principle’, which is part of the nurturing parent model. On the topic of economy, there are no real surprises regarding the frames employed.

6.3.2 Health Care

On the topic of health care, President Bush Jr. employs two superordinate frames. Firstly, one finds the HEALTH CARE IS A PRODUCT frame. With this frame, the focus is on finding
the perfect equilibrium between supply and demand, which is by many seen as the role of the free market. The HEALTH CARE IS A PRODUCT is compatible with the strict father model, specifically ‘the free-market principle’. The next frame employed by President Bush Jr. was the CHOICE frame, which is subordinate to the former frame. In the CHOICE frame, the importance of personal choice is emphasized, and personal choice is presented as an important freedom. The CHOICE frame also fits with ‘the free-market principle’, where the free market is viewed as a force for expanding freedom. The next frame on the list can also be seen as superordinate for the frames coming after. This frame is the WORKING SYSTEM frame, which also relates to ‘the free-market principle’. This frame presents a system that is in need of being updated, but does not need to be completely overhauled, while rejecting the idea of government intervention, promoting the free market. A subordinate frame to the WORKING SYSTEM frame employed by President Bush Jr. is the PROGRESS frame. This frame, as we have seen with the previous frames, follows the conservative ‘free-market principle’. The current system is presented as one that promotes progress, which has made the American system the best in the world. The free market is seen as the force behind the progress that has been made in medical research. Finally, President Bush Jr. employed the BIG GOVERNMENT frame, which in this case relates to two of the principles of the strict father model; ‘the individual responsibility principle’ and ‘the bootstraps principle’. President Bush Jr. evokes the BIG GOVERNMENT frame, which is by many Americans seen as negative, and states that big government is not the answer. Instead, it is the responsibility of the individual to look out for their own destiny. And if needed, it is the responsibility of the individual to show discipline and elevate themselves.

The superordinate frame employed by President Obama on the topic health care is the HEALTH CARE IS AN INALIENABLE RIGHT frame. This frame relates to the nurturing parent model, more specifically ‘the human dignity principle’, where the importance of securing certain rights is emphasized. Health care, which is here viewed as an inalienable right, is important in order to live a full life with dignity. Moving on, President Obama employs the subordinate FAIRNESS frame. This frame connects to ‘the common good principle’, which emphasizes fairness and equality, as well as connecting to ‘the human dignity principle’, as there is focus on that it is fair that everyone has access to health care, regardless of age, gender, medical history, and so on. President Obama also evokes the FREEDOM FROM WANT frame. This frame works on the assumption that health care is important for individual security, where everyone should know that if they get hurt or sick,
they have the right to receive help. This frame meshes with ‘the expansion of freedom principle’, which has to do with expansion of fundamental human rights. Finally, President Obama employed the BROKEN SYSTEM frame. With this frame, the idea is that because of its inherent exploitations and unfairness, the health care system is broken. This relates to ‘the human dignity principle’, which emphasizes empathy for each other, and makes it ‘clear’ that fairness is a right that everyone deserves.

With regard to the topic health care, President Bush Jr. and President Obama employ different frames. As was the case with the last topic, President Bush Jr. seems to evoke typical conservative values, while President Obama evokes typical progressive values. This can be seen since the frames employed by President Bush Jr. connect with the strict father model, and the frames employed by President Obama connect with the nurturing parent model.

6.3.3 Foreign policy

The superordinate frame employed by President Bush Jr. is the FEAR frame. This frame is linked to the strict father model, which emphasizes authority and control, but it is difficult to link it to one political principle. Subordinate to the FEAR frame one finds the EVIL frame. Here, America is presented as the moral leader of the world, fighting to end tyranny and defending the world from terrorism. This frame is linked to the ‘the moral authority principle’. In this case, President Bush Jr. is the moral authority commenting on the morality of those areas that foster terrorism. The next frame employed by President Bush Jr. is the WAR frame, while attempting to negate the CRIME frame. Here, President Bush Jr. is making judgments, stating that he is correct and someone else is incorrect, in this way connecting with ‘the moral authority principle’, where President Bush Jr. is the moral authority. The next frame employed by President Bush Jr. is the OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame, which makes the connection that America’s use of offensive power is the reason why there have not been more attacks on American soil. This frame also connects to the ‘moral authority principle’, where morality is equated with defending America, which again means attacking those who wish to hurt one’s country. Another frame employed by President Bush Jr. is the FREEDOM IS PEACE, where expanding freedom in the world is portrayed as what will lead to peace in the world. This seems to follow one of the nurturing parent model principles, i.e. ‘the expansion of freedom principle’. The definitions that progressives and conservatives adhere to regarding ‘freedom’ can differ greatly; therefore they are most likely not in agreement that freedom is being expanded. Finally, President Bush Jr. evokes the
AMERICA IS ADULT frame. Within this frame President Bush Jr. portrays most countries as followers who do what others tell them, and compares the countries to children. But the point President Bush Jr. makes is that America is not a child; therefore America does not have to listen to others. This frame connects with two principles that are part of the strict father model, i.e. ‘the moral authority principle’ and ‘the individual responsibility principle’. The idea being that America is the moral authority in the world, which, among other things, has led to the USA disregarding the UN when it came to the invasion of Iraq. President Bush Jr. also makes the claim that America is ultimately responsible for its own safety, equating America with an individual.

The superordinate frame employed by President Obama on the topic foreign policy was the WAR frame, which is a frame he has ‘inherited’ from President Bush Jr. By framing America’s relation to ‘terror’ as a war, President Obama is given ‘special’ powers, and makes the discussion to end America’s commitment against the ‘war on terror’ more difficult. The WAR frame is here connected to a principle from the strict father model, i.e. ‘the moral authority principle’. Another frame employed by both President Obama and President Bush Jr. is OFFENSE IS DEFENSE. President Obama presents himself as the moral authority, and in that capacity demands to be listened to. Moving on, the penultimate frame employed by President Obama regarding the topic foreign policy is RESPONSIBLY LEAVING. Here, President Obama moves back to the nurturing parent model, since the frame can be said to relate to ‘the expansion of freedom principle’ as well as ‘the human dignity principle’. Within this frame, President Obama promotes the transition of giving responsibility back to the people of Iraq and Afghanistan, expanding freedom through training the local population and securing basic human rights for the inhabitants. Finally, President Obama employs the TOUGH DIPLOMACY frame. This frame presents diplomacy as a viable option for America to use in conjunction with threats found in the world. This frame is difficult to categorize within either the strict father or the nurturing parent models, as it could be seen as having characteristics from both.

With regard to the topic foreign policy, we can see a change from the previous topics. As expected, President Bush Jr. employs frames that are connected to the strict father model, and uses typical conservative frames, except with regard to the FREEDOM IS PEACE frame. It was unexpected that President Bush Jr. would employ frames that are linked to the
nurturing parent model. President Obama employs a few frames that he has inherited from his predecessor, i.e. the WAR and OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frames.

**6.3.4 Gay marriage**

On the volatile topic of gay marriage, it is clear that President Bush Jr. was against the proposal that homosexuals should have the right to marry. The superordinate frame employed by President Bush Jr. was MARRIAGE IS A PILLAR OF SOCIETY. This frames marriage as something religious and sacred, and is consistent with the strict father model, specifically ‘the moral authority principle’, where President Bush Jr. presents religion, the law, and President Clinton as moral authorities in different speeches. The next frame presented by President Bush Jr., was the MARRIAGE IS UNDER ATTACK frame, which is subordinate to the former frame. This frame portrays marriage as in need of defense, but it hinges on the former frame. Therefore the MARRIAGE IS UNDER ATTACK frame connects to ‘the moral authority principle’. The next frame employed by President Bush Jr. on the topic of gay marriage is ACTIVIST JUDGE. This frame portrays judges making rulings on the issue of gay marriage that go against the status quo as activists, who are non-objective and making subjective decisions. These activists are immoral, going against the moral authority. This frame then also fits with ‘the moral authority principle’. Finally, President Bush Jr. employs the TRADITION IS GOOD frame, which states that traditions have survived for a long time in society for a reason, which is that they are good. This also means that the traditions are in need of protection. This frame, in a similar fashion as the other frames on this topic, relates to ‘the moral authority principal’, where the moral authority in this case is tradition, the president, and God.

President Obama, unlike President Bush Jr., seems to be positive towards marriage rights for homosexuals. The superordinate frame employed by President Obama on the topic gay marriage is the EQUALITY frame. Within this frame the idea is that everyone is created equal, and therefore deserves the same rights. The EQUALITY frame is connected to the nurturing parent model, more specifically both ‘the human dignity principle’ and ‘the diversity principle’, since the frame argues for equality and fairness and discourages discrimination. The next frame employed by President Obama was the LOVE frame. This frame works is also connected to equality, where the argument made is that everyone deserves love and should not ostracize one from partaking equally in society. The LOVE frame is also compatible with ‘the human dignity principle’ and ‘the diversity principle’, where the frame
once again promotes equality and fairness, and discourages discrimination based on who one loves. Love is seen as a fundamental human right. The penultimate frame employed by President Obama is the OUTSIDER frame. This frame is also subordinate to the EQUALITY frame, and focuses on the negative effects of discrimination. As with the earlier mentioned frames, the OUTSIDER frame is connected to ‘the diversity principle’, through the use of examples praising diversity in the military. The frame is also connected to ‘the expansion of freedom principle’, by promoting the positivity from the expansion of the right to participate in previously closed areas of society. Finally, President Obama employs another superordinate frame, the VALUE TO SOCIETY frame. This frame emphasizes that everyone has a role to play, and can be a value to society. In the examples from the speeches, the value to society is shown through presenting their value to the military, which can be seen as a microcosm of society. The VALUE TO SOCIETY frame is connected to ‘the human dignity principle’ and ‘the diversity principle’, where securing individual rights and discouraging discriminatory practices play an important role.

The presidents employ entirely different frames, and they fit well with typical conservative and progressive values. The frames employed by President Bush Jr. are compatible with the principles in the strict father model, while the frames employed by President Obama are compatible with the principles in the nurturing parent model.

6.4 Hypotheses revisited

As was seen earlier in the thesis, two hypotheses were presented. Hypothesis 1 stated:

Similar topics will be framed differently in speeches by President Bush Jr. and President Obama.

With regard to hypothesis 1, the hypothesis is strongly corroborated with reference to the topics economy, health care, and gay marriage. The frames employed by President Bush Jr. and President Obama are all different with reference to the above mentioned topics. On the topic foreign policy, however, the hypothesis is not corroborated, since both President Bush Jr. and President Obama employ the WAR and OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frames.

Hypothesis 2 stated:
The frames used will conform to Lakoff’s theory, i.e. President Bush Jr.’s frames will be in congruence with the strict father model, while President Obama’s frames will be in congruence with the nurturing parent model.

Hypothesis 2 is strongly corroborated with reference to the topics economy, health care, and gay marriage. On the topics presented above, the frames employed by President Bush Jr. conform to the strict father model, while the frames employed by President Obama conform to the nurturing parent model. However, on the topic foreign policy, the hypothesis is not corroborated. With reference to the topic foreign policy, President Bush Jr. employs the FREEDOM IS PEACE frame, which conforms to the nurturing parent model. On the topic foreign policy, President Obama employs the WAR frame and the OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frame, which conform to the strict father model.
7 Conclusion

This thesis set out to discuss a theoretical overview of framing, and link it to neuroscience and emotion. The theoretical overview laid the foundation for an analysis of the frames found in speeches by President Bush Jr. and President Obama. In this theoretical overview, the abstract nature of language has been examined, where different words and phrases operate on different levels of abstraction. Similarly, it has been shown that since language is an abstract system, it is through our experiences with the language that we interpret specific words and phrases.

It has also been shown that politicians are in a position where they, among other things, gain success through the use of language. Conservative and progressive ‘think tanks’ spend millions of dollars a year researching language (Lakoff 2006), framing included, which should be an indicator that it is a subject that could be in need of more research outside politically motivated ‘think tanks’.

When it comes to framing, this thesis has found that frames play a crucial role in one’s conceptual system, working on the unconscious level to structure the way we view a given discussion. Through networks of neurons, frames play a part in influencing one’s emotions and associations. In this way, a careful use of frames may have the effect of highlighting certain aspects of a discussion, while hiding other aspects. We have also seen that metaphors play an important role in how one understands the world, as well as being excellent tools when framing a given topic. With regard to politics, the most salient metaphor we have examined is the NATION AS FAMILY metaphor. Through this metaphor, we have viewed Lakoff’s strict father and nurturing parent models, which structure the way many people view the world. Frames are not only important for structuring how one views a topic, but also for eliciting emotions. In this thesis, we have also seen that emotion plays an important role for voters in the decision making process, compared to being bombarded with facts.

Through an analysis of speeches by President Bush Jr. and President Obama, this thesis set out to examine if the research subjects used different frames when speaking of similar topics, and to examine if the frames conform to Lakoff’s strict father and nurturing parent theory. It was found that President Bush Jr. and President Obama for the most part employ differing frames, except for on the topic foreign policy. Here President Obama employed many of the frames used by President Bush Jr. This was not entirely unexpected, since the frames were already very prominent in the media. Nevertheless, this does not
conform to the hypothesis that the president’s would adopt entirely different frames regarding the same topics. It was also found that the frames used by President Bush Jr. and President Obama for the most part connected with the core political values implied in Lakoff’s strict father and nurturing parent models. Here it was found that President Obama’s frames that were also used by President Bush Jr. on the topic foreign policy connected with the strict father model, i.e. the WAR and OFFENSE IS DEFENSE frames. Likewise, it was found that one frame employed by President Bush Jr., the FREEDOM IS PEACE frame, connects with the nurturing parent model.

It has been shown in this thesis that the Democratic President Obama mostly employs frames that differ from those employed by President Bush Jr. Therefore it may show that Democrats have become conscious of framing, and are conscious in how they formulate themselves. Naturally, since only one Democratic politician has been analyzed, therefore the analysis may not be representative of all Democratic politicians. With politicians on both sides of the political spectrum consciously implementing specific frames, the public is in need of education on the issue, in order to become more critical and less likely to be manipulated.

There are certain limitations to be found in this thesis. This is a thesis that has taken quite a shallow look at a large number of speeches. It is possible that fewer speeches would allow a deeper delve into how the frames employed connect to each other, and to examine the frames in more detail. Another problem with the amount of speeches is that it might lead to confirmation bias, which is ‘the seeking or interpreting of evidence in ways that are partial to existing beliefs, expectations, or a hypothesis in hand’ (Nickerson 1998: 1). By examining such a small amount of topics, the most typical topics may have led to findings of typical conservative and progressive frames and values.

For future research, a comparison of the frames employed by individual politicians over time would be interesting. Especially in situations where public opinion on a topic has changed dramatically, it would be interesting to examine if one can find a shift in the frames used. This is similar to the research that has been done in this thesis, except this thesis has not compared the eventual change in the use of frames by individual presidents over time. More research on the subject could be valuable, especially on the link between frames, emotion, and manipulating choices, i.e. can emotions elicited by frames be manipulated, in that way changing ‘the power’ of a frame? For example, can the WAR frame, through repetition in
comedy, create a situation where comedic feelings are elicited in other settings where the frame is evoked, rather than feelings of fear?
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Appendix

Appendix 1: President Bush Jr. - B1

Inaugural address 2001

Thank you, all. Chief Justice Rehnquist, President Carter, President Bush, President Clinton, distinguished guests, and my fellow citizens. The peaceful transfer of authority is rare in history, yet common in our country. With a simple oath, we affirm old traditions and make new beginnings.

As I begin, I thank President Clinton for his service to our Nation, and I thank Vice President Gore for a contest conducted with spirit and ended with grace.

I am honored and humbled to stand here where so many of America's leaders have come before me, and so many will follow. We have a place, all of us, in a long story, a story we continue but whose end we will not see. It is a story of a new world that became a friend and liberator of the old, the story of a slaveholding society that became a servant of freedom, the story of a power that went into the world to protect but not possess, to defend but not to conquer.

It is the American story, a story of flawed and fallible people united across the generations by grand and enduring ideals. The grandest of these ideals is an unfolding American promise that everyone belongs, that everyone deserves a chance, that no insignificant person was ever born.

Americans are called to enact this promise in our lives and in our laws. And though our Nation has sometimes halted and sometimes delayed, we must follow no other course.

Through much of the last century, America's faith in freedom and democracy was a rock in a raging sea. Now it is a seed upon the wind, taking root in many nations. Our democratic faith is more than the creed of our country. It is the inborn hope of our humanity, an ideal we carry but do not own, a trust we bear and pass along. Even after nearly 225 years, we have a long way yet to travel.

While many of our citizens prosper, others doubt the promise, even the justice of our own country. The ambitions of some Americans are limited by failing schools and hidden prejudice and the circumstances of their birth. And sometimes our differences run so deep, it seems we share a continent but not a country. We do not accept this, and we will not allow it.

Our unity, our Union, is a serious work of leaders and citizens and every generation. And this is my solemn pledge: I will work to build a single nation of justice and opportunity. I know this is in our reach because we are guided by a power larger than ourselves, who creates us equal, in His image, and we are confident in principles that unite and lead us onward.

America has never been united by blood or birth or soil. We are bound by ideals that move us beyond our backgrounds, lift us above our interests, and teach us what it means to be citizens. Every child must be taught these principles. Every citizen must uphold them. And every immigrant, by embracing these ideals, makes our country more, not less, American.
Today we affirm a new commitment to live out our Nation's promise through civility, courage, compassion, and character. America at its best matches a commitment to principle with a concern for civility. A civil society demands from each of us good will and respect, fair dealing and forgiveness.

Some seem to believe that our politics can afford to be petty because in a time of peace the stakes of our debates appear small. But the stakes for America are never small. If our country does not lead the cause of freedom, it will not be led. If we do not turn the hearts of children toward knowledge and character, we will lose their gifts and undermine their idealism. If we permit our economy to drift and decline, the vulnerable will suffer most.

We must live up to the calling we share. Civility is not a tactic or a sentiment; it is the determined choice of trust over cynicism, of community over chaos. And this commitment, if we keep it, is a way to shared accomplishment.

America at its best is also courageous. Our national courage has been clear in times of depression and war, when defeating common dangers defined our common good. Now we must choose if the example of our fathers and mothers will inspire us or condemn us. We must show courage in a time of blessing by confronting problems instead of passing them on to future generations.

Together we will reclaim America's schools before ignorance and apathy claim more young lives. We will reform Social Security and Medicare, sparing our children from struggles we have the power to prevent. And we will reduce taxes to recover the momentum of our economy and reward the effort and enterprise of working Americans.

We will build our defenses beyond challenge, lest weakness invite challenge. We will confront weapons of mass destruction, so that a new century is spared new horrors. The enemies of liberty and our country should make no mistake: America remains engaged in the world, by history and by choice, shaping a balance of power that favors freedom.

We will defend our allies and our interests. We will show purpose without arrogance. We will meet aggression and bad faith with resolve and strength. And to all nations, we will speak for the values that gave our Nation birth.

America at its best is compassionate. In the quiet of American conscience, we know that deep, persistent poverty is unworthy of our Nation's promise. And whatever our views of its cause, we can agree that children at risk are not at fault.

Abandonment and abuse are not acts of God; they are failures of love. And the proliferation of prisons, however necessary, is no substitute for hope and order in our souls. Where there is suffering, there is duty. Americans in need are not strangers; they are citizens—not problems but priorities. And all of us are diminished when any are hopeless.

Government has great responsibilities for public safety and public health, for civil rights and common schools. Yet, compassion is the work of a nation, not just a government. And some needs and hurts are so deep they will only respond to a mentor's touch or a pastor's prayer. Church and charity, synagogue and mosque lend our communities their humanity, and they will have an honored place in our plans and in our laws.
Many in our country do not know the pain of poverty. But we can listen to those who do. And
I can pledge our Nation to a goal: When we see that wounded traveler on the road to Jericho,
we will not pass to the other side.

America at its best is a place where personal responsibility is valued and expected.
Encouraging responsibility is not a search for scapegoats; it is a call to conscience. And
though it requires sacrifice, it brings a deeper fulfillment. We find the fullness of life not only
in options but in commitments. And we find that children and community are the
commitments that set us free.

Our public interest depends on private character, on civic duty and family bonds and basic
fairness, on uncounted, unhonored acts of decency, which give direction to our freedom.

Sometimes in life we're called to do great things. But as a saint of our times has said, "Every
day we are called to do small things with great love." The most important tasks of a
democracy are done by everyone.

I will live and lead by these principles: to advance my convictions with civility, to serve the
public interest with courage, to speak for greater justice and compassion, to call for
responsibility and try to live it, as well. In all these ways, I will bring the values of our history
to the care of our times.

What you do is as important as anything Government does. I ask you to seek a common good
beyond your comfort, to defend needed reforms against easy attacks, to serve your Nation,
beginning with your neighbor. I ask you to be citizens: Citizens, not spectators; citizens, not
subjects; responsible citizens building communities of service and a nation of character.

Americans are generous and strong and decent, not because we believe in ourselves but
because we hold beliefs beyond ourselves. When this spirit of citizenship is missing, no
Government program can replace it. When this spirit is present, no wrong can stand against it.

After the Declaration of Independence was signed, Virginia statesman John Page wrote to
Thomas Jefferson, "We know the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. Do you
not think an angel rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm?"

Much time has passed since Jefferson arrived for his inauguration. The years and changes
accumulate, but the themes of this day, he would know: our Nation's grand story of courage
and its simple dream of dignity.

We are not this story's author, who fills time and eternity with his purpose. Yet, his purpose is
achieved in our duty. And our duty is fulfilled in service to one another. Never tiring, never
yielding, never finishing, we renew that purpose today, to make our country more just and
generous, to affirm the dignity of our lives and every life. This work continues, the story goes
on, and an angel still rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm.

God bless you all, and God bless America.
Inaugural address 2005

Vice President Cheney, Mr. Chief Justice, President Carter, President Bush, President Clinton, Members of the United States Congress, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, fellow citizens:

On this day, prescribed by law and marked by ceremony, we celebrate the durable wisdom of our Constitution and recall the deep commitments that unite our country. I am grateful for the honor of this hour, mindful of the consequential times in which we live, and determined to fulfill the oath that I have sworn and you have witnessed.

At this second gathering, our duties are defined not by the words I use but by the history we have seen together. For a half a century, America defended our own freedom by standing watch on distant borders. After the shipwreck of communism came years of relative quiet, years of repose, years of sabbatical, and then there came a day of fire.

We have seen our vulnerability, and we have seen its deepest source. For as long as whole regions of the world simmer in resentment and tyranny, prone to ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder, violence will gather and multiply in destructive power and cross the most defended borders and raise a mortal threat. There is only one force of history that can break the reign of hatred and resentment and expose the pretensions of tyrants and reward the hopes of the decent and tolerant, and that is the force of human freedom.

We are led, by events and common sense, to one conclusion: The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.

America’s vital interests and our deepest beliefs are now one. From the day of our founding, we have proclaimed that every man and woman on this Earth has rights and dignity and matchless value, because they bear the image of the Maker of heaven and Earth. Across the generations, we have proclaimed the imperative of self-government, because no one is fit to be a master and no one deserves to be a slave. Advancing these ideals is the mission that created our Nation. It is the honorable achievement of our fathers. Now, it is the urgent requirement of our Nation’s security and the calling of our time.

So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world. This is not primarily the task of arms, though we will defend ourselves and our friends by force of arms when necessary. Freedom, by its nature, must be chosen and defended by citizens and sustained by the rule of law and the protection of minorities. And when the soul of a nation finally speaks, the institutions that arise may reflect customs and traditions very different from our own. America will not impose our own style of government on the unwilling. Our goal instead is to help others find their own voice, attain their own freedom, and make their own way.

The great objective of ending tyranny is the concentrated work of generations. The difficulty of the task is no excuse for avoiding it. America’s influence is not unlimited, but fortunately
for the oppressed, America's influence is considerable and we will use it confidently in freedom's cause.

My most solemn duty is to protect this Nation and its people from further attacks and emerging threats. Some have unwisely chosen to test America's resolve and have found it firm. We will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation, the moral choice between oppression, which is always wrong, and freedom, which is eternally right.

America will not pretend that jailed dissidents prefer their chains or that women welcome humiliation and servitude or that any human being aspires to live at the mercy of bullies. We will encourage reform in other governments by making clear that success in our relations will require the decent treatment of their own people. America's belief in human dignity will guide our policies. Yet rights must be more than the grudging concessions of dictators. They are secured by free dissent and the participation of the governed. In the long run, there is no justice without freedom and there can be no human rights without human liberty.

Some, I know, have questioned the global appeal of liberty, though this time in history, four decades defined by the swiftest advance of freedom ever seen, is an odd time for doubt. Americans, of all people, should never be surprised by the power of our ideals. Eventually, the call of freedom comes to every mind and every soul. We do not accept the existence of permanent tyranny because we do not accept the possibility of permanent slavery. Liberty will come to those who love it.

Today, America speaks anew to the peoples of the world. All who live in tyranny and hopelessness can know: The United States will not ignore your oppression or excuse your oppressors. When you stand for your liberty, we will stand with you.

Democratic reformers facing repression, prison, or exile can know: America sees you for who you are, the future leaders of your free country.

The rulers of outlaw regimes can know that we still believe as Abraham Lincoln did: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it."

The leaders of governments with long habits of control need to know: To serve your people, you must learn to trust them. Start on this journey of progress and justice, and America will walk at your side.

And all the allies of the United States can know: We honor your friendship; we rely on your counsel; and we depend on your help. Division among free nations is a primary goal of freedom's enemies. The concerted effort of free nations to promote democracy is a prelude to our enemies' defeat.

Today I also speak anew to my fellow citizens. From all of you I have asked patience in the hard task of securing America, which you have granted in good measure. Our country has accepted obligations that are difficult to fulfill and would be dishonorable to abandon. Yet because we have acted in the great liberating tradition of this Nation, tens of millions have achieved their freedom. And as hope kindles hope, millions more will find it. By our efforts, we have lit a fire as well, a fire in the minds of men. It warms those who feel its power. It
burns those who fight its progress. And one day this untamed fire of freedom will reach the
darkest corners of our world.

A few Americans have accepted the hardest duties in this cause, in the quiet work of
intelligence and diplomacy, the idealistic work of helping raise up free governments, the
dangerous and necessary work of fighting our enemies. Some have shown their devotion to
our country in deaths that honored their whole lives, and we will always honor their names
and their sacrifice.

All Americans have witnessed this idealism and some for the first time. I ask our youngest
citizens to believe the evidence of your eyes. You have seen duty and allegiance in the
determined faces of our soldiers. You have seen that life is fragile and evil is real and courage
triumphs. Make the choice to serve in a cause larger than your wants, larger than yourself, and
in your days you will add not just to the wealth of our country but to its character.

America has need of idealism and courage because we have essential work at home, the
unfinished work of American freedom. In a world moving toward liberty, we are determined
to show the meaning and promise of liberty.

In America's ideal of freedom, citizens find the dignity and security of economic
independence instead of laboring on the edge of subsistence. This is the broader definition of
liberty that motivated the Homestead Act, the Social Security Act, and the GI bill of rights.
And now we will extend this vision by reforming great institutions to serve the needs of our
time. To give every American a stake in the promise and future of our country, we will bring
the highest standards to our schools and build an ownership society. We will widen the
ownership of homes and businesses, retirement savings, and health insurance, preparing our
people for the challenges of life in a free society. By making every citizen an agent of his or
her own destiny, we will give our fellow Americans greater freedom from want and fear and
make our society more prosperous and just and equal.

In America's ideal of freedom, the public interest depends on private character, on integrity
and tolerance toward others and the rule of conscience in our own lives. Self-government
relies, in the end, on the governing of the self. That edifice of character is built in families,
supported by communities with standards, and sustained in our national life by the truths of
Sinai, the Sermon on the Mount, the words of the Koran, and the varied faiths of our people.
Americans move forward in every generation by reaffirming all that is good and true that
came before, ideals of justice and conduct that are the same yesterday, today, and forever.

In America's ideal of freedom, the exercise of rights is ennobled by service and mercy and a
heart for the weak. Liberty for all does not mean independence from one another. Our Nation
relies on men and women who look after a neighbor and surround the lost with love.
Americans, at our best, value the life we see in one another and must always remember that
even the unwanted have worth. And our country must abandon all the habits of racism,
because we cannot carry the message of freedom and the baggage of bigotry at the same time.

From the perspective of a single day, including this day of dedication, the issues and
questions before our country are many. From the viewpoint of centuries, the questions that
come to us are narrowed and few: Did our generation advance the cause of freedom? And did
our character bring credit to that cause?
These questions that judge us also unite us, because Americans of every party and background, Americans by choice and by birth are bound to one another in the cause of freedom. We have known divisions, which must be healed to move forward in great purposes, and I will strive in good faith to heal them. Yet those divisions do not define America. We felt the unity and fellowship of our Nation when freedom came under attack, and our response came like a single hand over a single heart. And we can feel that same unity and pride whenever America acts for good and the victims of disaster are given hope and the unjust encounter justice and the captives are set free.

We go forward with complete confidence in the eventual triumph of freedom, not because history runs on the wheels of inevitability—it is human choices that move events; not because we consider ourselves a chosen nation—God moves and chooses as He wills. We have confidence because freedom is the permanent hope of mankind, the hunger in dark places, the longing of the soul. When our Founders declared a new order of the ages, when soldiers died in wave upon wave for a union based on liberty, when citizens marched in peaceful outrage under the banner "Freedom Now," they were acting on an ancient hope that is meant to be fulfilled. History has an ebb and flow of justice, but history also has a visible direction, set by liberty and the Author of Liberty.

When the Declaration of Independence was first read in public and the Liberty Bell was sounded in celebration, a witness said, "It rang as if it meant something." In our time, it means something still. America, in this young century, proclaims liberty throughout all the world and to all the inhabitants thereof. Renewed in our strength, tested but not weary, we are ready for the greatest achievements in the history of freedom.

May God bless you, and may He watch over the United States of America.
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Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, Members of Congress, distinguished citizens and fellow citizens: Every year, by law and by custom, we meet here to consider the state of the Union. This year, we gather in this Chamber deeply aware of decisive days that lie ahead.

You and I serve our country in a time of great consequence. During this session of Congress, we have the duty to reform domestic programs vital to our country. We have the opportunity to save millions of lives abroad from a terrible disease. We will work for a prosperity that is broadly shared, and we will answer every danger and every enemy that threatens the American people.

In all these days of promise and days of reckoning, we can be confident. In a whirlwind of change and hope and peril, our faith is sure; our resolve is firm; and our Union is strong.

This country has many challenges. We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other Presidents, and other generations. We will confront them with focus and clarity and courage.

During the last 2 years, we have seen what can be accomplished when we work together. To lift the standards of our public schools, we achieved historic education reform, which must now be carried out in every school and in every classroom so that every child in America can read and learn and succeed in life. To protect our country, we reorganized our Government and created the Department of Homeland Security, which is mobilizing against the threats of a new era. To bring our economy out of recession, we delivered the largest tax relief in a generation. To insist on integrity in American business, we passed tough reforms, and we are holding corporate criminals to account.

Some might call this a good record. I call it a good start. Tonight I ask the House and the Senate to join me in the next bold steps to serve our fellow citizens.

Our first goal is clear: We must have an economy that grows fast enough to employ every man and woman who seeks a job. After recession, terrorist attacks, corporate scandals, and stock market declines, our economy is recovering. Yet, it's not growing fast enough or strongly enough. With unemployment rising, our Nation needs more small businesses to open, more companies to invest and expand, more employers to put up the sign that says "Help Wanted."

Jobs are created when the economy grows. The economy grows when Americans have more money to spend and invest, and the best and fairest way to make sure Americans have that money is not to tax it away in the first place.

I am proposing that all the income-tax reductions set for 2004 and 2006 be made permanent and effective this year. And under my plan, as soon as I've signed the bill, this extra money will start showing up in workers' paychecks. Instead of gradually reducing the marriage penalty, we should do it now. Instead of slowly raising the child credit to $1,000, we should send the checks to American families now.
The tax relief is for everyone who pays income taxes, and it will help our economy immediately. Ninety-two million Americans will keep, this year, an average of almost $1,100 more of their own money. A family of four with an income of $40,000 would see their Federal income taxes fall from $1,178 to $45 per year. Our plan will improve the bottom line for more than 23 million small businesses.

You, the Congress, have already passed all these reductions and promised them for future years. If this tax relief is good for Americans 3 or 5 or 7 years from now, it is even better for Americans today.

We should also strengthen the economy by treating investors equally in our tax laws. It's fair to tax a company's profits. It is not fair to again tax the shareholder on the same profits. To boost investor confidence and to help the nearly 10 million seniors who receive dividend income, I ask you to end the unfair double taxation of dividends.

Lower taxes and greater investment will help this economy expand. More jobs mean more taxpayers and higher revenues to our Government. The best way to address the deficit and move toward a balanced budget is to encourage economic growth and to show some spending discipline in Washington, DC.

We must work together to fund only our most important priorities. I will send you a budget that increases discretionary spending by 4 percent next year, about as much as the average family's income is expected to grow. And that is a good benchmark for us. Federal spending should not rise any faster than the paychecks of American families.

A growing economy and a focus on essential priorities will be crucial to the future of Social Security. As we continue to work together to keep Social Security sound and reliable, we must offer younger workers a chance to invest in retirement accounts that they will control and they will own.

Our second goal is high quality, affordable health for all Americans. The American system of medicine is a model of skill and innovation, with a pace of discovery that is adding good years to our lives. Yet for many people, medical care costs too much, and many have no health coverage at all. These problems will not be solved with a nationalized health care system that dictates coverage and rations care.

Instead, we must work toward a system in which all Americans have a good insurance policy, choose their own doctors, and seniors and low-income Americans receive the help they need. Instead of bureaucrats and trial lawyers and HMOs, we must put doctors and nurses and patients back in charge of American medicine.

Health care reform must begin with Medicare. Medicare is the binding commitment of a caring society. We must renew that commitment by giving seniors access to preventive medicine and new drugs that are transforming health care in America.

Seniors happy with the current Medicare system should be able to keep their coverage just the way it is. And just like you, the Members of Congress, and your staffs and other Federal employees, all seniors should have the choice of a health care plan that provides prescription drugs.
My budget will commit an additional $400 billion over the next decade to reform and strengthen Medicare. Leaders of both political parties have talked for years about strengthening Medicare. I urge the Members of this new Congress to act this year.

To improve our health care system, we must address one of the prime causes of higher cost, the constant threat that physicians and hospitals will be unfairly sued. Because of excessive litigation, everybody pays more for health care, and many parts of America are losing fine doctors. No one has ever been healed by a frivolous lawsuit. I urge the Congress to pass medical liability reform.

Our third goal is to promote energy independence for our country while dramatically improving the environment. I have sent you a comprehensive energy plan to promote energy efficiency and conservation, to develop cleaner technology, and to produce more energy at home. I have sent you Clear Skies legislation that mandates a 70-percent cut in air pollution from powerplants over the next 15 years. I have sent you a Healthy Forests Initiative, to help prevent the catastrophic fires that devastate communities, kill wildlife, and burn away millions of acres of treasured forests.

I urge you to pass these measures, for the good of both our environment and our economy. Even more, I ask you to take a crucial step and protect our environment in ways that generations before us could not have imagined.

In this century, the greatest environmental progress will come about not through endless lawsuits or command-and-control regulations but through technology and innovation. Tonight I'm proposing $1.2 billion in research funding so that America can lead the world in developing clean, hydrogen-powered automobiles.

A simple chemical reaction between hydrogen and oxygen generates energy which can be used to power a car, producing only water, not exhaust fumes. With a new national commitment, our scientists and engineers will overcome obstacles to taking these cars from laboratory to showroom, so that the first car driven by a child born today could be powered by hydrogen and pollution-free. Join me in this important innovation to make our air significantly cleaner and our country much less dependent on foreign sources of energy.

Our fourth goal is to apply the compassion of America to the deepest problems of America. For so many in our country, the homeless and the fatherless, the addicted, the need is great. Yet there's power, wonder-working power, in the goodness and idealism and faith of the American people.

Americans are doing the work of compassion every day, visiting prisoners, providing shelter for battered women, bringing companionship to lonely seniors. These good works deserve our praise. They deserve our personal support, and when appropriate, they deserve the assistance of the Federal Government.

I urge you to pass both my Faith-Based Initiative and the "Citizen Service Act," to encourage acts of compassion that can transform America, one heart and one soul at a time.

Last year, I called on my fellow citizens to participate in the USA Freedom Corps, which is enlisting tens of thousands of new volunteers across America. Tonight I ask Congress and the
American people to focus the spirit of service and the resources of Government on the needs of some of our most vulnerable citizens, boys and girls trying to grow up without guidance and attention and children who have to go through a prison gate to be hugged by their mom or dad. I propose a $450 million initiative to bring mentors to more than a million disadvantaged junior high students and children of prisoners. Government will support the training and recruiting of mentors. Yet it is the men and women of America who will fill the need. One mentor, one person, can change a life forever, and I urge you to be that one person.

Another cause of hopelessness is addiction to drugs. Addiction crowds out friendship, ambition, moral conviction and reduces all the richness of life to a single destructive desire. As a government, we are fighting illegal drugs by cutting off supplies and reducing demand through antidrug education programs. Yet for those already addicted, the fight against drugs is a fight for their own lives. Too many Americans in search of treatment cannot get it. So tonight I propose a new $600 million program to help an additional 300,000 Americans receive treatment over the next 3 years.

Our Nation is blessed with recovery programs that do amazing work. One of them is found at the Healing Place Church in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. A man in the program said, "God does miracles in people's lives, and you never think it could be you." Tonight let us bring to all Americans who struggle with drug addiction this message of hope: The miracle of recovery is possible, and it could be you.

By caring for children who need mentors and for addicted men and women who need treatment, we are building a more welcoming society, a culture that values every life. And in this work, we must not overlook the weakest among us. I ask you to protect infants at the very hour of their birth and end the practice of partial-birth abortion. And because no human life should be started or ended as the object of an experiment, I ask you to set a high standard for humanity and pass a law against all human cloning.

The qualities of courage and compassion that we strive for in America also determine our conduct abroad. The American flag stands for more than our power and our interests. Our Founders dedicated this country to the cause of human dignity, the rights of every person, and the possibilities of every life. This conviction leads us into the world to help the afflicted and defend the peace and confound the designs of evil men.

In Afghanistan, we helped to liberate an oppressed people. And we will continue helping them secure their country, rebuild their society, and educate all their children, boys and girls. In the Middle East, we will continue to seek peace between a secure Israel and a democratic Palestine. Across the Earth, America is feeding the hungry. More than 60 percent of international food aid comes as a gift from the people of the United States. As our Nation moves troops and builds alliances to make our world safer, we must also remember our calling as a blessed country is to make the world better.

Today, on the continent of Africa, nearly 30 million people have the AIDS virus, including 3 million children under the age 15. There are whole countries in Africa where more than one-third of the adult population carries the infection. More than 4 million require immediate drug treatment. Yet across that continent, only 50,000 AIDS victims—only 50,000—are receiving the medicine they need. Because the AIDS diagnosis is considered a death sentence, many do not seek treatment. Almost all who do are turned away. A doctor in rural South Africa
describes his frustration. He says, "We have no medicines. Many hospitals tell people, 'You've got AIDS. We can't help you. Go home and die.'" In an age of miraculous medicines, no person should have to hear those words.

AIDS can be prevented. Antiretroviral drugs can extend life for many years. And the cost of those drugs has dropped from $12,000 a year to under $300 a year, which places a tremendous possibility within our grasp. Ladies and gentlemen, seldom has history offered a greater opportunity to do so much for so many.

We have confronted and will continue to confront HIV/AIDS in our own country. And to meet a severe and urgent crisis abroad, tonight I propose the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, a work of mercy beyond all current international efforts to help the people of Africa.

This comprehensive plan will prevent 7 million new AIDS infections, treat at least 2 million people with life-extending drugs, and provide humane care for millions of people suffering from AIDS and for children orphaned by AIDS. I ask the Congress to commit $15 billion over the next 5 years, including nearly $10 billion in new money, to turn the tide against AIDS in the most afflicted nations of Africa and the Caribbean.

This Nation can lead the world in sparing innocent people from a plague of nature. And this Nation is leading the world in confronting and defeating the manmade evil of international terrorism.

There are days when our fellow citizens do not hear news about the war on terror. There's never a day when I do not learn of another threat or receive reports of operations in progress or give an order in this global war against a scattered network of killers. The war goes on, and we are winning.

To date, we've arrested or otherwise dealt with many key commanders of Al Qaida. They include a man who directed logistics and funding for the September the 11th attacks, the chief of Al Qaida operations in the Persian Gulf who planned the bombings of our embassies in east Africa and the U.S.S. Cole, an Al Qaida operations chief from Southeast Asia, a former director of Al Qaida's training camps in Afghanistan, a key Al Qaida operative in Europe, a major Al Qaida leader in Yemen. All told, more than 3,000 suspected terrorists have been arrested in many countries. Many others have met a different fate. Let's put it this way: They are no longer a problem to the United States and our friends and allies.

We are working closely with other nations to prevent further attacks. America and coalition countries have uncovered and stopped terrorist conspiracies targeting the Embassy in Yemen, the American Embassy in Singapore, a Saudi military base, ships in the Straits of Hormuz and the Straits of Gibraltar. We've broken Al Qaida cells in Hamburg, Milan, Madrid, London, Paris, as well as Buffalo, New York.

We have the terrorists on the run. We're keeping them on the run. One by one, the terrorists are learning the meaning of American justice.

As we fight this war, we will remember where it began: Here, in our own country. This Government is taking unprecedented measures to protect our people and defend our homeland. We've intensified security at the borders and ports of entry, posted more than 50,000 newly trained Federal screeners in airports, begun inoculating troops and first-
responders against smallpox, and are deploying the Nation’s first early warning network of
sensors to detect biological attack. And this year, for the first time, we are beginning to field a
defense to protect this Nation against ballistic missiles.

I thank the Congress for supporting these measures. I ask you tonight to add to our future
security with a major research and production effort to guard our people against bioterrorism,
called Project Bio-Shield. The budget I send you will propose almost $6 billion to quickly
make available effective vaccines and treatments against agents like anthrax, botulinum toxin,
Ebola, and plague. We must assume that our enemies would use these diseases as weapons,
and we must act before the dangers are upon us.

Since September the 11th, our intelligence and law enforcement agencies have worked more
closely than ever to track and disrupt the terrorists. The FBI is improving its ability to analyze
intelligence and is transforming itself to meet new threats. Tonight I am instructing the
leaders of the FBI, the CIA, the Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense to
develop a Terrorist Threat Integration Center, to merge and analyze all threat information in a
single location. Our Government must have the very best information possible, and we will
use it to make sure the right people are in the right places to protect all our citizens.

Our war against terror is a contest of will in which perseverance is power. In the ruins of two
towers, at the western wall of the Pentagon, on a field in Pennsylvania, this Nation made a
pledge, and we renew that pledge tonight: Whatever the duration of this struggle and
whatever the difficulties, we will not permit the triumph of violence in the affairs of men; free
people will set the course of history.

Today, the gravest danger in the war on terror, the gravest danger facing America and the
world, is outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons.
These regimes could use such weapons for blackmail, terror, and mass murder. They could
also give or sell those weapons to terrorist allies, who would use them without the least
hesitation.

This threat is new. America's duty is familiar. Throughout the 20th century, small groups of
men seized control of great nations, built armies and arsenals, and set out to dominate the
weak and intimidate the world. In each case, their ambitions of cruelty and murder had no
limit. In each case, the ambitions of Hitlerism, militarism, and communism were defeated by
the will of free peoples, by the strength of great alliances, and by the might of the United
States of America.

Now, in this century, the ideology of power and domination has appeared again and seeks to
gain the ultimate weapons of terror. Once again, this Nation and all our friends are all that
stand between a world at peace and a world of chaos and constant alarm. Once again, we are
called to defend the safety of our people and the hopes of all mankind. And we accept this
responsibility.

America is making a broad and determined effort to confront these dangers. We have called
on the United Nations to fulfill its charter and stand by its demand that Iraq disarm. We're
strongly supporting the International Atomic Energy Agency in its mission to track and
control nuclear materials around the world. We're working with other governments to secure
nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union and to strengthen global treaties banning the
production and shipment of missile technologies and weapons of mass destruction.

In all these efforts, however, America's purpose is more than to follow a process; it is to
achieve a result, the end of terrible threats to the civilized world. All free nations have a stake
in preventing sudden and catastrophic attacks. And we're asking them to join us, and many are
doing so. Yet the course of this Nation does not depend on the decisions of others. Whatever
action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the
American people.

Different threats require different strategies. In Iran, we continue to see a Government that
represses its people, pursues weapons of mass destruction, and supports terror. We also see
Iranian citizens risking intimidation and death as they speak out for liberty and human rights
and democracy. Iranians, like all people, have a right to choose their own Government and
determine their own destiny, and the United States supports their aspirations to live in
freedom.

On the Korean Peninsula, an oppressive regime rules a people living in fear and starvation.
Throughout the 1990s, the United States relied on a negotiated framework to keep North
Korea from gaining nuclear weapons. We now know that that regime was deceiving the world
and developing those weapons all along. And today, the North Korean regime is using its
nuclear program to incite fear and seek concessions. America and the world will not be
blackmailed.

America is working with the countries of the region, South Korea, Japan, China, and Russia,
to find a peaceful solution and to show the North Korean Government that nuclear weapons
will bring only isolation, economic stagnation, and continued hardship. The North Korean
regime will find respect in the world and revival for its people only when it turns away from
its nuclear ambitions.

Our Nation and the world must learn the lessons of the Korean Peninsula and not allow an
even greater threat to rise up in Iraq. A brutal dictator, with a history of reckless aggression,
with ties to terrorism, with great potential wealth, will not be permitted to dominate a vital
region and threaten the United States.

Twelve years ago, Saddam Hussein faced the prospect of being the last casualty in a war he
had started and lost. To spare himself, he agreed to disarm of all weapons of mass destruction.
For the next 12 years, he systematically violated that agreement. He pursued chemical,
biological, and nuclear weapons, even while inspectors were in his country. Nothing to date
has restrained him from his pursuit of these weapons, not economic sanctions, not isolation
from the civilized world, not even cruise missile strikes on his military facilities.

Almost 3 months ago, the United Nations Security Council gave Saddam Hussein his final
chance to disarm. He has shown instead utter contempt for the United Nations and for the
opinion of the world. The 108 U.N. inspectors were sent to conduct—a were not sent to
conduct a scavenger hunt for hidden materials across a country the size of California. The job
of the inspectors is to verify that Iraq's regime is disarming. It is up to Iraq to show exactly
where it is hiding its banned weapons, lay those weapons out for the world to see, and destroy
them as directed. Nothing like this has happened.
The United Nations concluded in 1999 that Saddam Hussein had biological weapons sufficient to produce over 25,000 liters of anthrax, enough doses to kill several million people. He hasn't accounted for that material. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed it.

The United Nations concluded that Saddam Hussein had materials sufficient to produce more than 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin, enough to subject millions of people to death by respiratory failure. He hasn't accounted for that material. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed it.

Our intelligence officials estimate that Saddam Hussein had the materials to produce as much as 500 tons of sarin, mustard, and VX nerve agent. In such quantities, these chemical agents could also kill untold thousands. He's not accounted for these materials. He has given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

U.S. intelligence indicates that Saddam Hussein had upwards of 30,000 munitions capable of delivering chemical agents. Inspectors recently turned up 16 of them, despite Iraq's recent declaration denying their existence. Saddam Hussein has not accounted for the remaining 29,984 of these prohibited munitions. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

From three Iraqi defectors we know that Iraq, in the late 1990s, had several mobile biological weapons labs. These are designed to produce germ warfare agents and can be moved from place to a place to evade inspectors. Saddam Hussein has not disclosed these facilities. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

The International Atomic Energy Agency confirmed in the 1990s that Saddam Hussein had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, had a design for a nuclear weapon, and was working on five different methods of enriching uranium for a bomb. The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production. Saddam Hussein has not credibly explained these activities. He clearly has much to hide.

The dictator of Iraq is not disarming. To the contrary, he is deceiving. From intelligence sources we know, for instance, that thousands of Iraqi security personnel are at work hiding documents and materials from the U.N. inspectors, sanitizing inspection sites, and monitoring the inspectors themselves. Iraqi officials accompany the inspectors in order to intimidate witnesses. Iraq is blocking U-2 surveillance flights requested by the United Nations. Iraqi intelligence officers are posing as the scientists inspectors are supposed to interview. Real scientists have been coached by Iraqi officials on what to say. Intelligence sources indicate that Saddam Hussein has ordered that scientists who cooperate with U.N. inspectors in disarming Iraq will be killed, along with their families.

Year after year, Saddam Hussein has gone to elaborate lengths, spent enormous sums, taken great risks to build and keep weapons of mass destruction. But why? The only possible explanation, the only possible use he could have for those weapons, is to dominate, intimidate, or attack.

With nuclear arms or a full arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, Saddam Hussein could resume his ambitions of conquest in the Middle East and create deadly havoc in that
region. And this Congress and the American people must recognize another threat. Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of Al Qaida. Secretly and without fingerprints, he could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists or help them develop their own.

Before September the 11th, many in the world believed that Saddam Hussein could be contained. But chemical agents, lethal viruses, and shadowy terrorist networks are not easily contained. Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans, this time armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known. We will do everything in our power to make sure that that day never comes.

Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option.

The dictator who is assembling the world’s most dangerous weapons has already used them on whole villages, leaving thousands of his own citizens dead, blind, or disfigured. Iraqi refugees tell us how forced confessions are obtained, by torturing children while their parents are made to watch. International human rights groups have cataloged other methods used in the torture chambers of Iraq: electric shock, burning with hot irons, dripping acid on the skin, mutilation with electric drills, cutting out tongues, and rape. If this is not evil, then evil has no meaning.

And tonight I have a message for the brave and oppressed people of Iraq: Your enemy is not surrounding your country; your enemy is ruling your country. And the day he and his regime are removed from power will be the day of your liberation.

The world has waited 12 years for Iraq to disarm. America will not accept a serious and mounting threat to our country and our friends and our allies. The United States will ask the U.N. Security Council to convene on February the 5th to consider the facts of Iraq’s ongoing defiance of the world. Secretary of State Powell will present information and intelligence about Iraqi’s legal—Iraq’s illegal weapons programs, its attempt to hide those weapons from inspectors, and its links to terrorist groups.

We will consult. But let there be no misunderstanding: If Saddam Hussein does not fully disarm, for the safety of our people and for the peace of the world, we will lead a coalition to disarm him.

Tonight I have a message for the men and women who will keep the peace, members of the American Armed Forces: Many of you are assembling in or near the Middle East, and some crucial hours may lay ahead. In those hours, the success of our cause will depend on you. Your training has prepared you. Your honor will guide you. You believe in America, and America believes in you.

Sending Americans into battle is the most profound decision a President can make. The technologies of war have changed; the risks and suffering of war have not. For the brave
Americans who bear the risk, no victory is free from sorrow. This Nation fights reluctantly, because we know the cost and we dread the days of mourning that always come.

We seek peace. We strive for peace. And sometimes peace must be defended. A future lived at the mercy of terrible threats is no peace at all. If war is forced upon us, we will fight in a just cause and by just means, sparing, in every way we can, the innocent. And if war is forced upon us, we will fight with the full force and might of the United States military, and we will prevail.

And as we and our coalition partners are doing in Afghanistan, we will bring to the Iraqi people food and medicines and supplies and freedom.

Many challenges, abroad and at home, have arrived in a single season. In 2 years, America has gone from a sense of invulnerability to an awareness of peril, from bitter division in small matters to calm unity in great causes. And we go forward with confidence, because this call of history has come to the right country.

Americans are a resolute people who have risen to every test of our time. Adversity has revealed the character of our country, to the world and to ourselves. America is a strong nation and honorable in the use of our strength. We exercise power without conquest, and we sacrifice for the liberty of strangers.

Americans are a free people who know that freedom is the right of every person and the future of every nation. The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world; it is God's gift to humanity.

We Americans have faith in ourselves, but not in ourselves alone. We do not know—we do not claim to know all the ways of providence, yet we can trust in them, placing our confidence in the loving God behind all of life and all of history.

May He guide us now. And may God continue to bless the United States of America.
Appendix 4: President Bush Jr. - B4

Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens: America this evening is a nation called to great responsibilities, and we are rising to meet them.

As we gather tonight, hundreds of thousands of American service men and women are deployed across the world in the war on terror. By bringing hope to the oppressed and delivering justice to the violent, they are making America more secure.

Each day, law enforcement personnel and intelligence officers are tracking terrorist threats; analysts are examining airline passenger lists; the men and women of our new Homeland Security Department are patrolling our coasts and borders. And their vigilance is protecting America.

Americans are proving once again to be the hardest working people in the world. The American economy is growing stronger. The tax relief you passed is working. Tonight Members of Congress can take pride in the great works of compassion and reform that skeptics had thought impossible. You’re raising the standards for our public schools, and you are giving our senior citizens prescription drug coverage under Medicare.

We have faced serious challenges together, and now we face a choice: We can go forward with confidence and resolve, or we can turn back to the dangerous illusion that terrorists are not plotting and outlaw regimes are no threat to us. We can press on with economic growth and reforms in education and Medicare, or we can turn back to old policies and old divisions.

We’ve not come all this way, through tragedy and trial and war, only to falter and leave our work unfinished. Americans are rising to the tasks of history, and they expect the same from us. In their efforts, their enterprise, and their character, the American people are showing that the state of our Union is confident and strong.

Our greatest responsibility is the active defense of the American people. Twenty-eight months have passed since September the 11th, 2001—over 2 years without an attack on American soil. And it is tempting to believe that the danger is behind us. That hope is understandable, comforting— and false. The killing has continued in Bali, Jakarta, Casablanca, Riyadh, Mombasa, Jerusalem, Istanbul, and Baghdad. The terrorists continue to plot against America and the civilized world. And by our will and courage, this danger will be defeated.

Inside the United States, where the war began, we must continue to give our homeland security and law enforcement personnel every tool they need to defend us. And one of those essential tools is the PATRIOT Act, which allows Federal law enforcement to better share information to track terrorists, to disrupt their cells, and to seize their assets. For years, we have used similar provisions to catch embezzlers and drug traffickers. If these methods are good for hunting criminals, they are even more important for hunting terrorists.
Key provisions of the PATRIOT Act are set to expire next year. The terrorist threat will not expire on that schedule. Our law enforcement needs this vital legislation to protect our citizens. You need to renew the PATRIOT Act.

America is on the offensive against the terrorists who started this war. Last March, Khalid Sheik Mohammed, a mastermind of September the 11th, awoke to find himself in the custody of U.S. and Pakistani authorities. Last August the 11th brought the capture of the terrorist Hambali, who was a key player in the attack in Indonesia that killed over 200 people. We're tracking Al Qaida around the world, and nearly two-thirds of their known leaders have now been captured or killed. Thousands of very skilled and determined military personnel are on the manhunt, going after the remaining killers who hide in cities and caves, and one by one, we will bring these terrorists to justice.

As part of the offensive against terror, we are also confronting the regimes that harbor and support terrorists and could supply them with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. The United States and our allies are determined: We refuse to live in the shadow of this ultimate danger.

The first to see our determination were the Taliban, who made Afghanistan the primary training base of Al Qaida killers. As of this month, that country has a new constitution guaranteeing free elections and full participation by women. Businesses are opening. Health care centers are being established, and the boys and girls of Afghanistan are back in school. With the help from the new Afghan army, our coalition is leading aggressive raids against the surviving members of the Taliban and Al Qaida. The men and women of Afghanistan are building a nation that is free and proud and fighting terror, and America is honored to be their friend.

Since we last met in this Chamber, combat forces of the United States, Great Britain, Australia, Poland, and other countries enforced the demands of the United Nations, ended the rule of Saddam Hussein. And the people of Iraq are free.

Having broken the Ba'athist regime, we face a remnant of violent Saddam supporters. Men who ran away from our troops in battle are now dispersed and attack from the shadows. These killers, joined by foreign terrorists, are a serious, continuing danger. Yet we're making progress against them. The once all-powerful ruler of Iraq was found in a hole and now sits in a prison cell. Of the top 55 officials of the former regime, we have captured or killed 45. Our forces are on the offensive, leading over 1,600 patrols a day and conducting an average of 180 raids a week. We are dealing with these thugs in Iraq just as surely as we dealt with Saddam Hussein's evil regime.

The work of building a new Iraq is hard, and it is right. And America has always been willing to do what it takes for what is right. Last January, Iraq's only law was the whim of one brutal man. Today, our coalition is working with the Iraqi Governing Council to draft a basic law with a bill of rights. We're working with Iraqis and the United Nations to prepare for a transition to full Iraqi sovereignty by the end of June.

As democracy takes hold in Iraq, the enemies of freedom will do all in their power to spread violence and fear. They are trying to shake the will of our country and our friends, but the
United States of America will never be intimidated by thugs and assassins. The killers will fail, and the Iraqi people will live in freedom.

Month by month, Iraqis are assuming more responsibility for their own security and their own future. And tonight we are honored to welcome one of Iraq's most respected leaders, the current President of the Iraqi Governing Council, Adnan Pachachi. Sir, America stands with you and the Iraqi people as you build a free and peaceful nation.

Because of American leadership and resolve, the world is changing for the better. Last month, the leader of Libya voluntarily pledged to disclose and dismantle all of his regime's weapons of mass destruction programs, including a uranium enrichment project for nuclear weapons. Colonel Qadhafi correctly judged that his country would be better off and far more secure without weapons of mass murder.

Nine months of intense negotiations involving the United States and Great Britain succeeded with Libya, while 12 years of diplomacy with Iraq did not. And one reason is clear: For diplomacy to be effective, words must be credible, and no one can now doubt the word of America.

Different threats require different strategies. Along with nations in the region, we're insisting that North Korea eliminate its nuclear program. America and the international community are demanding that Iran meet its commitments and not develop nuclear weapons. America is committed to keeping the world's most dangerous weapons out of the hands of the most dangerous regimes.

When I came to this rostrum on September the 20th, 2001, I brought the police shield of a fallen officer, my reminder of lives that ended and a task that does not end. I gave to you and to all Americans my complete commitment to securing our country and defeating our enemies. And this pledge, given by one, has been kept by many.

You in the Congress have provided the resources for our defense and cast the difficult votes of war and peace. Our closest allies have been unwavering. America's intelligence personnel and diplomats have been skilled and tireless. And the men and women of the American military— they have taken the hardest duty. We've seen their skill and their courage in armored charges and midnight raids and lonely hours on faithful watch. We have seen the joy when they return and felt the sorrow when one is lost. I've had the honor of meeting our service men and women at many posts, from the deck of a carrier in the Pacific to a mess hall in Baghdad.

Many of our troops are listening tonight, and I want you and your families to know: America is proud of you, and my administration and this Congress will give you the resources you need to fight and win the war on terror.

I know that some people question if America is really in a war at all. They view terrorism more as a crime, a problem to be solved mainly with law enforcement and indictments. After the World Trade Center was first attacked in 1993, some of the guilty were indicted and tried and convicted and sent to prison. But the matter was not settled. The terrorists were still training and plotting in other nations and drawing up more ambitious plans. After the chaos and carnage of September the 11th, it is not enough to serve our enemies with legal papers.
The terrorists and their supporters declared war on the United States, and war is what they got.

Some in this Chamber and in our country did not support the liberation of Iraq. Objections to war often come from principled motives, but let us be candid about the consequences of leaving Saddam Hussein in power. We're seeking all the facts. Already, the Kay Report identified dozens of weapons-of-mass-destruction-related program activities and significant amounts of equipment that Iraq concealed from the United Nations. Had we failed to act, the dictator's weapons of mass destruction programs would continue to this day. Had we failed to act, Security Council resolutions on Iraq would have been revealed as empty threats, weakening the United Nations and encouraging defiance by dictators around the world. Iraq's torture chambers would still be filled with victims, terrified and innocent. The killing fields of Iraq, where hundreds of thousands of men and women and children vanished into the sands, would still be known only to the killers. For all who love freedom and peace, the world without Saddam Hussein's regime is a better and safer place.

Some critics have said our duties in Iraq must be internationalized. This particular criticism is hard to explain to our partners in Britain, Australia, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Italy, Spain, Poland, Denmark, Hungary, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Romania, the Netherlands, Norway, El Salvador, and the 17 other countries that have committed troops to Iraq. As we debate at home, we must never ignore the vital contributions of our international partners or dismiss their sacrifices.

From the beginning, America has sought international support for our operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, and we have gained much support. There is a difference, however, between leading a coalition of many nations and submitting to the objections of a few. America will never seek a permission slip to defend the security of our country.

We also hear doubts that democracy is a realistic goal for the greater Middle East, where freedom is rare. Yet it is mistaken and condescending to assume that whole cultures and great religions are incompatible with liberty and self-government. I believe that God has planted in every human heart the desire to live in freedom, and even when that desire is crushed by tyranny for decades, it will rise again.

As long as the Middle East remains a place of tyranny and despair and anger, it will continue to produce men and movements that threaten the safety of America and our friends. So America is pursuing a forward strategy of freedom in the greater Middle East. We will challenge the enemies of reform, confront the allies of terror, and expect a higher standard from our friend. To cut through the barriers of hateful propaganda, the Voice of America and other broadcast services are expanding their programming in Arabic and Persian, and soon a new television service will begin providing reliable news and information across the region. I will send you a proposal to double the budget of the National Endowment for Democracy and to focus its new work on the development of free elections and free markets, free press, and free labor unions in the Middle East. And above all, we will finish the historic work of democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq so those nations can light the way for others and help transform a troubled part of the world.

America is a nation with a mission, and that mission comes from our most basic beliefs. We have no desire to dominate, no ambitions of empire. Our aim is a democratic peace, a peace
founded upon the dignity and rights of every man and woman. America acts in this cause with friends and allies at our side, yet we understand our special calling: This great Republic will lead the cause of freedom.

In the last 3 years, adversity has also revealed the fundamental strengths of the American economy. We have come through recession and terrorist attack and corporate scandals and the uncertainties of war. And because you acted to stimulate our economy with tax relief, this economy is strong and growing stronger.

You have doubled the child tax credit from 500 to $1,000, reduced the marriage penalty, begun to phase out the death tax, reduced taxes on capital gains and stock dividends, cut taxes on small businesses, and you have lowered taxes for every American who pays income taxes.

Americans took those dollars and put them to work, driving this economy forward. The pace of economic growth in the third quarter of 2003 was the fastest in nearly 20 years; new home construction, the highest in almost 20 years; homeowner-ship rates, the highest ever.

Manufacturing activity is increasing. Inflation is low. Interest rates are low. Exports are growing. Productivity is high, and jobs are on the rise. These numbers confirm that the American people are using their money far better than Government would have, and you were right to return it.

America's growing economy is also a changing economy. As technology transforms the way almost every job is done, America becomes more productive and workers need new skills. Much of our job growth will be found in high-skilled fields like health care and biotechnology. So we must respond by helping more Americans gain the skills to find good jobs in our new economy.

All skills begin with the basics of reading and math, which are supposed to be learned in the early grades of our schools. Yet for too long, for too many children, those skills were never mastered. By passing the No Child Left Behind Act, you have made the expectation of literacy the law of our country. We're providing more funding for our schools, a 36-percent increase since 2001. We're requiring higher standards. We are regularly testing every child on the fundamentals. We are reporting results to parents and making sure they have better options when schools are not performing. We are making progress toward excellence for every child in America.

But the status quo always has defenders. Some want to undermine the No Child Left Behind Act by weakening standards and accountability. Yet the results we require are really a matter of common sense: We expect third graders to read and do math at the third grade level, and that's not asking too much. Testing is the only way to identify and help students who are falling behind. This Nation will not go back to the days of simply shuffling children along from grade to grade without them learning the basics. I refuse to give up on any child, and the No Child Left Behind Act is opening the door of opportunity to all of America's children.

At the same time, we must ensure that older students and adults can gain the skills they need to find work now. Many of the fastest growing occupations require strong math and science preparation and training beyond the high school level. So tonight, I propose a series of measures called Jobs for the 21st Century. This program will provide extra help to middle and high school students who fall behind in reading and math, expand advanced placement
programs in low-income schools, invite math and science professionals from the private
sector to teach part-time in our high schools. I propose larger Pell grants for students who
prepare for college with demanding courses in high school. I propose increasing our support
for America’s fine community colleges, so they can—I do so, so they can train workers for
industries that are creating the most new jobs. By all these actions, we’ll help more and more
Americans to join in the growing prosperity of our country. Job training is important, and so
is job creation. We must continue to pursue an aggressive, progrowth economic agenda.

Congress has some unfinished business on the issue of taxes. The tax reductions you passed
are set to expire. Unless you act, the unfair tax on marriage will go back up. Unless you act,
millions of families will be charged $300 more in Federal taxes for every child. Unless you
act, small businesses will pay higher taxes. Unless you act, the death tax will eventually come
back to life. Unless you act, Americans face a tax increase. What Congress has given, the
Congress should not take away. For the sake of job growth, the tax cuts you passed should be
permanent.

Our agenda for jobs and growth must help small-business owners and employees with relief
from needless Federal regulation and protect them from junk and frivolous lawsuits.

Consumers and businesses need reliable supplies of energy to make our economy run, so I
urge you to pass legislation to modernize our electricity system, promote conservation, and
make America less dependent on foreign sources of energy.

My administration is promoting free and fair trade to open up new markets for America's
entrepreneurs and manufacturers and farmers, to create jobs for American workers. Younger
taxes in a personal retirement account. We should make the Social Security system a source
of ownership for the American people. And we should limit the burden of Government on this
economy by acting as good stewards of taxpayers’ dollars.

In 2 weeks, I will send you a budget that funds the war, protects the homeland, and meets
important domestic needs while limiting the growth in discretionary spending to less than 4
percent. This will require that Congress focus on priorities, cut wasteful spending, and be
wise with the people's money. By doing so, we can cut the deficit in half over the next 5
years.

Tonight I also ask you to reform our immigration laws so they reflect our values and benefit
our economy. I propose a new temporary-worker program to match willing foreign workers
with willing employers when no Americans can be found to fill the job. This reform will be
good for our economy because employers will find needed workers in an honest and orderly
system. A temporary-worker program will help protect our homeland, allowing Border Patrol
and law enforcement to focus on true threats to our national security.

I oppose amnesty, because it would encourage further illegal immigration and unfairly reward
those who break our laws. My temporary-worker program will preserve the citizenship path
for those who respect the law while bringing millions of hard-working men and women out
from the shadows of American life.
Our Nation's health care system, like our economy, is also in a time of change. Amazing medical technologies are improving and saving lives. This dramatic progress has brought its own challenge, in the rising costs of medical care and health insurance. Members of Congress, we must work together to help control those costs and extend the benefits of modern medicine throughout our country.

Meeting these goals requires bipartisan effort, and 2 months ago, you showed the way. By strengthening Medicare and adding a prescription drug benefit, you kept a basic commitment to our seniors. You are giving them the modern medicine they deserve.

Starting this year, under the law you passed, seniors can choose to receive a drug discount card, saving them 10 to 25 percent off the retail price of most prescription drugs, and millions of low-income seniors can get an additional $600 to buy medicine. Beginning next year, seniors will have new coverage for preventive screenings against diabetes and heart disease, and seniors just entering Medicare can receive wellness exams.

In January of 2006, seniors can get prescription drug coverage under Medicare. For a monthly premium of about $35, most seniors who do not have that coverage today can expect to see their drug bills cut roughly in half. Under this reform, senior citizens will be able to keep their Medicare just as it is, or they can choose a Medicare plan that fits them best, just as you, as Members of Congress, can choose an insurance plan that meets your needs. And starting this year, millions of Americans will be able to save money tax-free for their medical expenses in a health savings account.

I signed this measure proudly, and any attempt to limit the choices of our seniors or to take away their prescription drug coverage under Medicare will meet my veto.

On the critical issue of health care, our goal is to ensure that Americans can choose and afford private health care coverage that best fits their individual needs. To make insurance more affordable, Congress must act to address rapidly rising health care costs. Small businesses should be able to band together and negotiate for lower insurance rates, so they can cover more workers with health insurance. I urge you to pass association health plans. I ask you to give lower income Americans a refundable tax credit that would allow millions to buy their own basic health insurance.

By computerizing health records, we can avoid dangerous medical mistakes, reduce costs, and improve care. To protect the doctor-patient relationship and keep good doctors doing good work, we must eliminate wasteful and frivolous medical lawsuits. And tonight I propose that individuals who buy catastrophic health care coverage as part of our new health savings accounts be allowed to deduct 100 percent of the premiums from their taxes.

A Government-run health care system is the wrong prescription. By keeping costs under control, expanding access, and helping more Americans afford coverage, we will preserve the system of private medicine that makes America's health care the best in the world.

We are living in a time of great change in our world, in our economy, in science and medicine. Yet some things endure: courage and compassion, reverence and integrity, respect for differences of faith and race. The values we try to live by never change, and they are instilled in us by fundamental institutions such as families and schools and religious
congregations. These institutions, these unseen pillars of civilization, must remain strong in America, and we will defend them. We must stand with our families to help them raise healthy, responsible children. When it comes to helping children make right choices, there is work for all of us to do.

One of the worst decisions our children can make is to gamble their lives and futures on drugs. Our Government is helping parents confront this problem with aggressive education, treatment, and law enforcement. Drug use in high school has declined by 11 percent over the last 2 years. Four hundred thousand fewer young people are using illegal drugs than in the year 2001. In my budget, I propose new funding to continue our aggressive, community-based strategy to reduce demand for illegal drugs. Drug testing in our schools has proven to be an effective part of this effort. So tonight I propose an additional 23 million for schools that want to use drug testing as a tool to save children's lives. The aim here is not to punish children but to send them this message: We love you, and we do not want to lose you.

To help children make right choices, they need good examples. Athletics play such an important role in our society, but unfortunately, some in professional sports are not setting much of an example. The use of performance-enhancing drugs like steroids in baseball, football, and other sports is dangerous, and it sends the wrong message, that there are shortcuts to accomplishment and that performance is more important than character. So tonight I call on team owners, union representatives, coaches, and players to take the lead, to send the right signal, to get tough, and to get rid of steroids now.

To encourage right choices, we must be willing to confront the dangers young people face, even when they're difficult to talk about. Each year, about 3 million teenagers contract sexually transmitted diseases that can harm them or kill them or prevent them from ever becoming parents. In my budget, I propose a grassroots campaign to help inform families about these medical risks. We will double Federal funding for abstinence programs, so schools can teach this fact of life: Abstinence for young people is the only certain way to avoid sexually transmitted diseases.

Decisions children now make can affect their health and character for the rest of their lives. All of us, parents and schools and government, must work together to counter the negative influence of the culture and to send the right messages to our children.

A strong America must also value the institution of marriage. I believe we should respect individuals as we take a principled stand for one of the most fundamental, enduring institutions of our civilization. Congress has already taken a stand on this issue by passing the Defense of Marriage Act, signed in 1996 by President Clinton. That statute protects marriage under Federal law as a union of a man and a woman and declares that one State may not redefine marriage for other States.

Activist judges, however, have begun redefining marriage by court order, without regard for the will of the people and their elected representatives. On an issue of such great consequence, the people's voice must be heard. If judges insist on forcing their arbitrary will upon the people, the only alternative left to the people would be the constitutional process. Our Nation must defend the sanctity of marriage.
The outcome of this debate is important, and so is the way we conduct it. The same moral tradition that defines marriage also teaches that each individual has dignity and value in God's sight.

It's also important to strengthen our communities by unleashing the compassion of America's religious institutions. Religious charities of every creed are doing some of the most vital work in our country: mentoring children, feeding the hungry, taking the hand of the lonely. Yet Government has often denied social service grants and contracts to these groups, just because they have a cross or a Star of David or a crescent on the wall. By Executive order, I have opened billions of dollars in grant money to competition that includes faith-based charities.

Tonight I ask you to codify this into law, so people of faith can know that the law will never discriminate against them again.

In the past, we've worked together to bring mentors to children of prisoners and provide treatment for the addicted and help for the homeless. Tonight I ask you to consider another group of Americans in need of help. This year, some 600,000 inmates will be released from prison back into society. We know from long experience that if they can't find work or a home or help, they are much more likely to commit crime and return to prison. So tonight I propose a 4-year, $300 million prisoner reentry initiative to expand job training and placement services, to provide transitional housing, and to help newly released prisoners get mentoring, including from faith-based groups. America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life.

For all Americans, the last 3 years have brought tests we did not ask for and achievements shared by all. By our actions, we have shown what kind of nation we are. In grief, we have found the grace to go on. In challenge, we rediscovered the courage and daring of a free people. In victory, we have shown the noble aims and good heart of America. And having come this far, we sense that we live in a time set apart.

I've been witness to the character of the people of America, who have shown calm in times of danger, compassion for one another, and toughness for the long haul. All of us have been partners in a great enterprise. And even some of the youngest understand that we are living in historic times. Last month a girl in Lincoln, Rhode Island, sent me a letter. It began, "Dear George W. Bush. If there's anything you know I, Ashley Pearson, age 10, can do to help anyone, please send me a letter and tell me what I can do to save our country." She added this P.S.: "If you can send a letter to the troops, please put, 'Ashley Pearson believes in you.'"

Tonight, Ashley, your message to our troops has just been conveyed. And yes, you have some duties yourself: Study hard in school; listen to your mom or dad; help someone in need; and when you and your friends see a man or woman in uniform, say, "Thank you." And Ashley, while you do your part, all of us here in this great Chamber will do our best to keep you and the rest of America safe and free.

My fellow citizens, we now move forward with confidence and faith. Our Nation is strong and steadfast. The cause we serve is right, because it is the cause of all mankind. The momentum of freedom in our world is unmistakable, and it is not carried forward by our power alone. We can trust in that greater power who guides the unfolding of the years. And in all that is to come, we can know that His purposes are just and true.
May God continue to bless America.
Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, Members of Congress, fellow citizens:

As a new Congress gathers, all of us in the elected branches of Government share a great privilege: We've been placed in office by the votes of the people we serve. And tonight that is a privilege we share with newly elected leaders of Afghanistan, the Palestinian Territories, Ukraine, and a free and sovereign Iraq.

Two weeks ago, I stood on the steps of this Capitol and renewed the commitment of our Nation to the guiding ideal of liberty for all. This evening I will set forth policies to advance that ideal at home and around the world.

Tonight, with a healthy, growing economy, with more Americans going back to work, with our Nation an active force for good in the world, the state of our Union is confident and strong.

Our generation has been blessed by the expansion of opportunity, by advances in medicine, by the security purchased by our parents' sacrifice. Now, as we see a little gray in the mirror—or a lot of gray—[laughter]—and we watch our children moving into adulthood, we ask the question: What will be the state of their Union? Members of Congress, the choices we make together will answer that question. Over the next several months, on issue after issue, let us do what Americans have always done and build a better world for our children and our grandchildren.

First, we must be good stewards of this economy and renew the great institutions on which millions of our fellow citizens rely. America's economy is the fastest growing of any major industrialized nation. In the past 4 years, we've provided tax relief to every person who pays income taxes, overcome a recession, opened up new markets abroad, prosecuted corporate criminals, raised homeownership to its highest level in history. And in the last year alone, the United States has added 2.3 million new jobs. When action was needed, the Congress delivered, and the Nation is grateful.

Now we must add to these achievements. By making our economy more flexible, more innovative, and more competitive, we will keep America the economic leader of the world.

America's prosperity requires restraining the spending appetite of the Federal Government. I welcome the bipartisan enthusiasm for spending discipline. I will send you a budget that holds the growth of discretionary spending below inflation, makes tax relief permanent, and stays on track to cut the deficit in half by 2009. My budget substantially reduces or eliminates more than 150 Government programs that are not getting results or duplicate current efforts or do not fulfill essential priorities. The principle here is clear: Taxpayer dollars must be spent wisely or not at all.

To make our economy stronger and more dynamic, we must prepare a rising generation to fill the jobs of the 21st century. Under the No Child Left Behind Act, standards are higher, test scores are on the rise, and we're closing the achievement gap for minority students. Now we
must demand better results from our high schools, so every high school diploma is a ticket to
success. We will help an additional 200,000 workers to get training for a better career by
reforming our job training system and strengthening America's community colleges. And
we'll make it easier for Americans to afford a college education by increasing the size of Pell
grants.

To make our economy stronger and more competitive, America must reward, not punish, the
efforts and dreams of entrepreneurs. Small business is the path of advancement, especially for
women and minorities, so we must free small businesses from needless regulation and protect
honest job-creators from junk lawsuits. Justice is distorted and our economy is held back by
irresponsible class actions and frivolous asbestos claims, and I urge Congress to pass legal
reforms this year.

To make our economy stronger and more productive, we must make health care more
affordable and give families greater access to good coverage and more control over their
health decisions. I ask Congress to move forward on a comprehensive health care agenda with
tax credits to help low-income workers buy insurance, a community health center in every
poor county, improved information technology to prevent medical error and needless costs,
association health plans for small businesses and their employees, expanded health savings
accounts, and medical liability reform that will reduce health care costs and make sure
patients have the doctors and care they need.

To keep our economy growing, we also need reliable supplies of affordable, environmentally
responsible energy. Nearly 4 years ago, I submitted a comprehensive energy strategy that
encourages conservation, alternative sources, a modernized electricity grid, and more
production here at home, including safe, clean nuclear energy. My Clear Skies legislation will
cut powerplant pollution and improve the health of our citizens. And my budget provides
strong funding for leading-edge technology, from hydrogen-fueled cars to clean coal to
renewable sources such as ethanol. Four years of debate is enough. I urge Congress to pass
legislation that makes America more secure and less dependent on foreign energy.

All these proposals are essential to expand this economy and add new jobs, but they are just
the beginning of our duty. To build the prosperity of future generations, we must update
institutions that were created to meet the needs of an earlier time. Year after year, Americans
are burdened by an archaic, incoherent Federal Tax Code. I've appointed a bipartisan panel to
examine the Tax Code from top to bottom. And when their recommendations are delivered,
you and I will work together to give this Nation a Tax Code that is progrowth, easy to
understand, and fair to all.

America's immigration system is also outdated, unsuited to the needs of our economy and to
the values of our country. We should not be content with laws that punish hard-working
people who want only to provide for their families and deny businesses willing workers and
invite chaos at our border. It is time for an immigration policy that permits temporary-guest
workers to fill jobs Americans will not take, that rejects amnesty, that tells us who is entering
and leaving our country, and that closes the border to drug dealers and terrorists.

One of America's most important institutions, a symbol of the trust between generations, is
also in need of wise and effective reform. Social Security was a great moral success of the
20th century, and we must honor its great purposes in this new century. The system, however,
on its current path, is headed toward bankruptcy. And so we must join together to strengthen
and save Social Security.

Today, more than 45 million Americans receive Social Security benefits, and millions more
are nearing retirement. And for them the system is sound and fiscally strong. I have a message
for every American who is 55 or older: Do not let anyone mislead you; for you, the Social
Security system will not change in any way.

For younger workers, the Social Security system has serious problems that will grow worse
with time. Social Security was created decades ago for a very different era. In those days,
people did not live as long. Benefits were much lower than they are today. And a half century
ago, about 16 workers paid into the system for each person drawing benefits.

Our society has changed in ways the founders of Social Security could not have foreseen. In
today's world, people are living longer and, therefore, drawing benefits longer. And those
benefits are scheduled to rise dramatically over the next few decades. And instead of 16
workers paying in for every beneficiary, right now it's only about 3 workers. And over the
next few decades, that number will fall to just 2 workers per beneficiary. With each passing
year, fewer workers are paying ever-higher benefits to an ever-larger number of retirees.

So here is the result: Thirteen years from now, in 2018, Social Security will be paying out
more than it takes in. And every year afterward will bring a new shortfall, bigger than the year
before. For example, in the year 2027, the Government will somehow have to come up with
an extra $200 billion to keep the system afloat, and by 2033, the annual shortfall would be
more than $300 billion. By the year 2042, the entire system would be exhausted and bankrupt.

If steps are not taken to avert that outcome, the only solutions would be dramatically higher
taxes, massive new borrowing, or sudden and severe cuts in Social Security benefits or other
Government programs.

I recognize that 2018 and 2042 may seem a long way off. But those dates are not so distant, as
any parent will tell you. If you have a 5-year-old, you're already concerned about how you'll
pay for college tuition 13 years down the road. If you've got children in their twenties, as
some of us do, the idea of Social Security collapsing before they retire does not seem like a
small matter. And it should not be a small matter to the United States Congress. You and I
share a responsibility. We must pass reforms that solve the financial problems of Social
Security once and for all.

Fixing Social Security permanently will require an open, candid review of the options. Some
have suggested limiting benefits for wealthy retirees. Former Congressman Tim Penny has
raised the possibility of indexing benefits to prices rather than wages. During the 1990s, my
predecessor, President Clinton, spoke of increasing the retirement age. Former Senator John
Breaux suggested discouraging early collection of Social Security benefits. The late Senator
Daniel Patrick Moynihan recommended changing the way benefits are calculated. All these
ideas are on the table.

I know that none of these reforms would be easy. But we have to move ahead with courage
and honesty, because our children's retirement security is more important than partisan
politics. I will work with Members of Congress to find the most effective combination of
reforms. I will listen to anyone who has a good idea to offer. We must, however, be guided by
some basic principles. We must make Social Security permanently sound, not leave that task
for another day. We must not jeopardize our economic strength by increasing payroll taxes.
We must ensure that lower income Americans get the help they need to have dignity and
peace of mind in their retirement. We must guarantee there is no change for those now retired
or nearing retirement. And we must take care that any changes in the system are gradual, so
younger workers have years to prepare and plan for their future.

As we fix Social Security, we also have the responsibility to make the system a better deal for
younger workers. And the best way to reach that goal is through voluntary personal retirement
accounts. Here is how the idea works. Right now, a set portion of the money you earn is taken
out of your paycheck to pay for the Social Security benefits of today's retirees. If you're a
younger worker, I believe you should be able to set aside part of that money in your own
retirement account, so you can build a nest egg for your own future.

Here's why the personal accounts are a better deal. Your money will grow over time at a
greater rate than anything the current system can deliver, and your account will provide
money for retirement over and above the check you will receive from Social Security. In
addition, you'll be able to pass along the money that accumulates in your personal account, if
you wish, to your children and—or grandchildren. And best of all, the money in the account is
yours, and the Government can never take it away.

The goal here is greater security in retirement, so we will set careful guidelines for personal
accounts. We'll make sure the money can only go into a conservative mix of bonds and stock
funds. We'll make sure that your earnings are not eaten up by hidden Wall Street fees. We'll
make sure there are good options to protect your investments from sudden market swings on
the eve of your retirement. We'll make sure a personal account cannot be emptied out all at
once but rather paid out over time as an addition to traditional Social Security benefits. And
we'll make sure this plan is fiscally responsible by starting personal retirement accounts
gradually and raising the yearly limits on contributions over time, eventually permitting all
workers to set aside 4 percentage points of their payroll taxes in their accounts.

Personal retirement accounts should be familiar to Federal employees, because you already
have something similar called the Thrift Savings Plan, which lets workers deposit a portion of
their paychecks into any of five different broadly based investment funds. It's time to extend
the same security and choice and ownership to young Americans.

Our second great responsibility to our children and grandchildren is to honor and to pass
along the values that sustain a free society. So many of my generation, after a long journey,
have come home to family and faith and are determined to bring up responsible, moral
children. Government is not the source of these values, but Government should never
undermine them.

Because marriage is a sacred institution and the foundation of society, it should not be
redefined by activist judges. For the good of families, children, and society, I support a
constitutional amendment to protect the institution of marriage.

Because a society is measured by how it treats the weak and vulnerable, we must strive to
build a culture of life. Medical research can help us reach that goal by developing treatments
and cures that save lives and help people overcome disabilities, and I thank the Congress for
doubling the funding of the National Institutes of Health.

To build a culture of life, we must also ensure that scientific advances always serve human
dignity, not take advantage of some lives for the benefit of others. We should all be able to
agree on some clear standards. I will work with Congress to ensure that human embryos are
not created for experimentation or grown for body parts and that human life is never bought
or sold as a commodity. America will continue to lead the world in medical research that is
ambitious, aggressive, and always ethical.

Because courts must always deliver impartial justice, judges have a duty to faithfully interpret
the law, not legislate from the bench. As President, I have a constitutional responsibility to
nominate men and women who understand the role of courts in our democracy and are well-
qualified to serve on the bench, and I have done so. The Constitution also gives the Senate a
responsibility: Every judicial nominee deserves an up-or-down vote.

Because one of the deepest values of our country is compassion, we must never turn away
from any citizen who feels isolated from the opportunities of America. Our Government will
continue to support faith-based and community groups that bring hope to harsh places. Now
we need to focus on giving young people, especially young men in our cities, better options
than apathy or gangs or jail. Tonight I propose a 3-year initiative to help organizations keep
young people out of gangs and show young men an ideal of manhood that respects women
and rejects violence. Taking on gang life will be one part of a broader outreach to at-risk
youth, which involves parents and pastors, coaches and community leaders in programs
ranging from literacy to sports. And I am proud that the leader of this nationwide effort will
be our First Lady, Laura Bush.

Because HIV/AIDS brings suffering and fear into so many lives, I ask you to reauthorize the
Ryan White Act to encourage prevention and provide care and treatment to the victims of that
disease. And as we update this important law, we must focus our efforts on fellow citizens
with the highest rates of new cases, African American men and women.

Because one of the main sources of our national unity is our belief in equal justice, we need to
make sure Americans of all races and backgrounds have confidence in the system that
provides justice. In America, we must make doubly sure no person is held to account for a
crime he or she did not commit, so we are dramatically expanding the use of DNA evidence
to prevent wrongful conviction. Soon I will send to Congress a proposal to fund special
training for defense counsel in capital cases, because people on trial for their lives must have
competent lawyers by their side.

Our third responsibility to future generations is to leave them an America that is safe from
danger and protected by peace. We will pass along to our children all the freedoms we enjoy,
and chief among them is freedom from fear.

In the 3 1/2 years since September the 11th, 2001, we have taken unprecedented actions to
protect Americans. We’ve created a new department of Government to defend our homeland,
focused the FBI on preventing terrorism, begun to reform our intelligence agencies, broken up
terror cells across the country, expanded research on defenses against biological and chemical
attack, improved border security, and trained more than a half million first-responders. Police
and firefighters, air marshals, researchers, and so many others are working every day to make
our homeland safer, and we thank them all.

Our Nation, working with allies and friends, has also confronted the enemy abroad with
measures that are determined, successful, and continuing. The Al Qaida terror network that
attacked our country still has leaders, but many of its top commanders have been removed.
There are still governments that sponsor and harbor terrorists, but their number has declined.
There are still regimes seeking weapons of mass destruction but no longer without attention
and without consequence. Our country is still the target of terrorists who want to kill many
and intimidate us all, and we will stay on the offensive against them until the fight is won.

Pursuing our enemies is a vital commitment of the war on terror, and I thank the Congress for
providing our service men and women with the resources they have needed. During this time
of war, we must continue to support our military and give them the tools for victory.

Other nations around the globe have stood with us. In Afghanistan, an international force is
helping provide security. In Iraq, 28 countries have troops on the ground, the United Nations
and the European Union provided technical assistance for the elections, and NATO is leading
a mission to help train Iraqi officers. We're cooperating with 60 governments in the
Proliferation Security Initiative to detect and stop the transit of dangerous materials. We're
working closely with the governments in Asia to convince North Korea to abandon its nuclear
ambitions. Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and nine other countries have captured or detained Al
Qaida terrorists. In the next 4 years, my administration will continue to build the coalitions
that will defeat the dangers of our time.

In the long term, the peace we seek will only be achieved by eliminating the conditions that
feed radicalism and ideologies of murder. If whole regions of the world remain in despair and
grow in hatred, they will be the recruiting grounds for terror, and that terror will stalk
America and other free nations for decades. The only force powerful enough to stop the rise
of tyranny and terror and replace hatred with hope is the force of human freedom. Our
enemies know this, and that is why the terrorist Zarqawi recently declared war on what he
called the "evil principle" of democracy. And we've declared our own intention: America will
stand with the allies of freedom to support democratic movements in the Middle East and
beyond, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.

The United States has no right, no desire, and no intention to impose our form of government
on anyone else. That is one of the main differences between us and our enemies. They seek to
impose and expand an empire of oppression in which a tiny group of brutal, self-appointed
rulers control every aspect of every life. Our aim is to build and preserve a community of free
and independent nations, with governments that answer to their citizens and reflect their own
cultures. And because democracies respect their own people and their neighbors, the advance
of freedom will lead to peace.

That advance has great momentum in our time, shown by women voting in Afghanistan and
Palestinians choosing a new direction and the people of Ukraine asserting their democratic
rights and electing a President. We are witnessing landmark events in the history of liberty,
and in the coming years, we will add to that story.
The beginnings of reform and democracy in the Palestinian Territories are now showing the power of freedom to break old patterns of violence and failure. Tomorrow morning Secretary of State Rice departs on a trip that will take her to Israel and the West Bank for meetings with Prime Minister Sharon and President Abbas. She will discuss with them how we and our friends can help the Palestinian people end terror and build the institutions of a peaceful, independent, democratic state. To promote this democracy, I will ask Congress for $350 million to support Palestinian political, economic, and security reforms. The goal of two democratic states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace is within reach, and America will help them achieve that goal.

To promote peace and stability in the broader Middle East, the United States will work with our friends in the region to fight the common threat of terror, while we encourage a higher standard of freedom. Hopeful reform is already taking hold in an arc from Morocco to Jordan to Bahrain. The Government of Saudi Arabia can demonstrate its leadership in the region by expanding the role of its people in determining their future. And the great and proud nation of Egypt, which showed the way toward peace in the Middle East, can now show the way toward democracy in the Middle East.

To promote peace in the broader Middle East, we must confront regimes that continue to harbor terrorists and pursue weapons of mass murder. Syria still allows its territory and parts of Lebanon to be used by terrorists who seek to destroy every chance of peace in the region. You have passed and we are applying the Syrian Accountability Act, and we expect the Syrian Government to end all support for terror and open the door to freedom. Today, Iran remains the world's primary state sponsor of terror, pursuing nuclear weapons while depriving its people of the freedom they seek and deserve. We are working with European allies to make clear to the Iranian regime that it must give up its uranium enrichment program and any plutonium reprocessing and end its support for terror. And to the Iranian people, I say tonight: As you stand for your own liberty, America stands with you.

Our generational commitment to the advance of freedom, especially in the Middle East, is now being tested and honored in Iraq. That country is a vital front in the war on terror, which is why the terrorists have chosen to make a stand there. Our men and women in uniform are fighting terrorists in Iraq so we do not have to face them here at home. And the victory of freedom in Iraq will strengthen a new ally in the war on terror, inspire democratic reformers from Damascus to Tehran, bring more hope and progress to a troubled region, and thereby lift a terrible threat from the lives of our children and grandchildren.

We will succeed because the Iraqi people value their own liberty, as they showed the world last Sunday. Across Iraq, often at great risk, millions of citizens went to the polls and elected 275 men and women to represent them in a new Transitional National Assembly. A young woman in Baghdad told of waking to the sound of mortar fire on election day and wondering if it might be too dangerous to vote. She said, "Hearing those explosions, it occurred to me: The insurgents are weak; they are afraid of democracy; they are losing. So I got my husband and I got my parents, and we all came out and voted together."

Americans recognize that spirit of liberty, because we share it. In any nation, casting your vote is an act of civic responsibility. For millions of Iraqis, it was also an act of personal courage, and they have earned the respect of us all.
One of Iraq's leading democracy and human rights advocates is Safia Taleb al-Suhail. She says of her country, "We were occupied for 35 years by Saddam Hussein. That was the real occupation. Thank you to the American people who paid the cost but, most of all, to the soldiers." Eleven years ago, Safia's father was assassinated by Saddam's intelligence service. Three days ago in Baghdad, Safia was finally able to vote for the leaders of her country, and we are honored that she is with us tonight.

The terrorists and insurgents are violently opposed to democracy and will continue to attack it. Yet the terrorists' most powerful myth is being destroyed. The whole world is seeing that the car bombers and assassins are not only fighting coalition forces; they are trying to destroy the hopes of Iraqis, expressed in free elections. And the whole world now knows that a small group of extremists will not overturn the will of the Iraqi people.

We will succeed in Iraq because Iraqis are determined to fight for their own freedom and to write their own history. As Prime Minister Allawi said in his speech to Congress last September, "Ordinary Iraqis are anxious to shoulder all the security burdens of our country as quickly as possible." That is the natural desire of an independent nation, and it is also the stated mission of our coalition in Iraq. The new political situation in Iraq opens a new phase of our work in that country.

At the recommendation of our commanders on the ground and in consultation with the Iraqi Government, we will increasingly focus our efforts on helping prepare more capable Iraqi security forces, forces with skilled officers and an effective command structure. As those forces become more self-reliant and take on greater security responsibilities, America and its coalition partners will increasingly be in a supporting role. In the end, Iraqis must be able to defend their own country, and we will help that proud new nation secure its liberty.

Recently an Iraqi interpreter said to a reporter, "Tell America not to abandon us." He and all Iraqis can be certain: While our military strategy is adapting to circumstances, our commitment remains firm and unchanging. We are standing for the freedom of our Iraqi friends, and freedom in Iraq will make America safer for generations to come. We will not set an artificial timetable for leaving Iraq, because that would embolden the terrorists and make them believe they can wait us out. We are in Iraq to achieve a result, a country that is democratic, representative of all its people, at peace with its neighbors, and able to defend itself. And when that result is achieved, our men and women serving in Iraq will return home with the honor they have earned.

Right now, Americans in uniform are serving at posts across the world, often taking great risks on my orders. We have given them training and equipment, and they have given us an example of idealism and character that makes every American proud. The volunteers of our military are unrelenting in battle, unwavering in loyalty, unmatched in honor and decency, and every day they're making our Nation more secure. Some of our service men and women have survived terrible injuries, and this grateful country will do everything we can to help them recover. And we have said farewell to some very good men and women who died for our freedom and whose memory this Nation will honor forever.

One name we honor is Marine Corps Sergeant Byron Norwood of Pflugerville, Texas, who was killed during the assault on Fallujah. His mom, Janet, sent me a letter and told me how much Byron loved being a marine and how proud he was to be on the frontline against terror.
She wrote, "When Byron was home the last time, I said that I wanted to protect him like I had since he was born. He just hugged me and said, 'You've done your job, Mom. Now it is my turn to protect you.'" Ladies and gentlemen, with grateful hearts we honor freedom's defenders and our military families, represented here this evening by Sergeant Norwood's mom and dad, Janet and Bill Norwood.

[At this point, in the First Lady's box, guest Safia Taleb al-Suhail embraced guest Janet Norwood.]

In these 4 years, Americans have seen the unfolding of large events. We have known times of sorrow and hours of uncertainty and days of victory. In all this history, even when we have disagreed, we have seen threads of purpose that unite us. The attack on freedom in our world has reaffirmed our confidence in freedom's power to change the world. We are all part of a great venture: To extend the promise of freedom in our country, to renew the values that sustain our liberty, and to spread the peace that freedom brings.

As Franklin Roosevelt once reminded Americans, "Each age is a dream that is dying, or one that is coming to birth." And we live in the country where the biggest dreams are born. The abolition of slavery was only a dream until it was fulfilled. The liberation of Europe from fascism was only a dream until it was achieved. The fall of imperial communism was only a dream until, one day, it was accomplished. Our generation has dreams of its own, and we also go forward with confidence. The road of providence is uneven and unpredictable, yet we know where it leads: It leads to freedom.

Thank you, and may God bless America.
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My fellow citizens, I stand here today humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust you have bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors. I thank President Bush for his service to our Nation, as well as the generosity and cooperation he has shown throughout this transition.

Forty-four Americans have now taken the Presidential oath. The words have been spoken during rising tides of prosperity and the still waters of peace. Yet every so often, the oath is taken amidst gathering clouds and raging storms. At these moments, America has carried on not simply because of the skill or vision of those in high office, but because we the people have remained faithful to the ideals of our forebears and true to our founding documents.

So it has been; so it must be with this generation of Americans.

That we are in the midst of crisis is now well understood. Our Nation is at war against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred. Our economy is badly weakened, a consequence of greed and irresponsibility on the part of some, but also our collective failure to make hard choices and prepare the Nation for a new age. Homes have been lost, jobs shed, businesses shuttered. Our health care is too costly. Our schools fail too many. And each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet.

These are the indicators of crisis, subject to data and statistics. Less measurable but no less profound is a sapping of confidence across our land, a nagging fear that America's decline is inevitable, that the next generation must lower its sights. Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real. They are serious, and they are many. They will not be met easily or in a short span of time. But know this, America: They will be met.

On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord. On this day, we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn-out dogmas that for far too long have strangled our politics.

We remain a young nation, but in the words of Scripture, the time has come to set aside childish things. The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit, to choose our better history, to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness.

In reaffirming the greatness of our Nation, we understand that greatness is never a given. It must be earned. Our journey has never been one of shortcuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the fainthearted, for those who prefer leisure over work or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame. Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things--some celebrated, but more often men and women obscure in their labor--who have carried us up the long, rugged path toward prosperity and freedom.
For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in search of a
new life. For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West, endured the lash of the whip,
and plowed the hard Earth. For us, they fought and died in places like Concord and
Gettysburg, Normandy and Khe Sanh.

Time and again, these men and women struggled and sacrificed and worked 'til their hands
were raw so that we might live a better life. They saw America as bigger than the sum of our
individual ambitions, greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction.

This is the journey we continue today. We remain the most prosperous, powerful nation on
Earth. Our workers are no less productive than when this crisis began. Our minds are no less
inventive. Our goods and services no less needed than they were last week or last month or
last year. Our capacity remains undiminished. But our time of standing pat, of protecting
narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions, that time has surely passed. Starting
today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking
America.

For everywhere we look, there is work to be done. The state of the economy calls for action,
bold and swift, and we will act not only to create new jobs but to lay a new foundation for
growth. We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our
commerce and bind us together. We will restore science to its rightful place and wield
technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost. We will harness the sun
and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our
schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age. All this we can do.
All this we will do.

Now, there are some who question the scale of our ambitions, who suggest that our system
cannot tolerate too many big plans. Their memories are short, for they have forgotten what
this country has already done, what free men and women can achieve when imagination is
joined to common purpose and necessity to courage.

What the cynics fail to understand is that the ground has shifted beneath them, that the stale
political arguments that have consumed us for so long no longer apply. The question we ask
today is not whether our Government is too big or too small, but whether it works; whether it
helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified.
Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. Where the answer is no, programs will
end. And those of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account to spend wisely,
reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day, because only then can we restore
the vital trust between a people and their government.

Nor is the question before us whether the market is a force for good or ill. Its power to
generate wealth and expand freedom is unmatched. But this crisis has reminded us that
without a watchful eye, the market can spin out of control. The Nation cannot prosper long
when it favors only the prosperous. The success of our economy has always depended not just
on the size of our gross domestic product, but on the reach of our prosperity, on our ability to
extend opportunity to every willing heart, not out of charity, but because it is the surest route
to our common good.
As for our common defense, we reject as false the choice between our safety and our ideals. Our Founding Fathers, faced with perils that we can scarcely imagine, drafted a charter to assure the rule of law and the rights of man, a charter expanded by the blood of generations. Those ideals still light the world, and we will not give them up for expedience's sake. And so to all the other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born, know that America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity, and we are ready to lead once more.

Recall that earlier generations faced down fascism and communism not just with missiles and tanks but with sturdy alliances and enduring convictions. They understood that our power alone cannot protect us, nor does it entitle us to do as we please. Instead, they knew that our power grows through its prudent use. Our security emanates from the justness of our cause, the force of our example, the tempering qualities of humility and restraint.

We are the keepers of this legacy. Guided by these principles once more, we can meet those new threats that demand even greater effort, even greater cooperation and understanding between nations. We will begin to responsibly leave Iraq to its people and forge a hard-earned peace in Afghanistan. With old friends and former foes, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat and roll back the specter of a warming planet. We will not apologize for our way of life, nor will we waver in its defense. And for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents, we say to you now that our spirit is stronger and cannot be broken. You cannot outlast us, and we will defeat you.

For we know that our patchwork heritage is a strength, not a weakness. We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus and nonbelievers. We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth. And because we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation and emerged from that dark chapter stronger and more united, we cannot help but believe that the old hatreds shall someday pass, that the lines of tribe shall soon dissolve; that as the world grows smaller, our common humanity shall reveal itself, and that America must play its role in ushering in a new era of peace.

To the Muslim world, we seek a new way forward based on mutual interest and mutual respect. To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict or blame their society's ills on the West, know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy. To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are on the wrong side of history, but that we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist.

To the people of poor nations, we pledge to work alongside you to make your farms flourish and let clean waters flow, to nourish starved bodies and feed hungry minds. And to those nations like ours that enjoy relative plenty, we say we can no longer afford indifference to suffering outside our borders, nor can we consume the world's resources without regard to effect, for the world has changed, and we must change with it.

As we consider the road that unfolds before us, we remember with humble gratitude those brave Americans who, at this very hour, patrol far-off deserts and distant mountains. They have something to tell us today, just as the fallen heroes who lie in Arlington whisper through the ages. We honor them not only because they are guardians of our liberty, but because they
embody the spirit of service, a willingness to find meaning in something greater than
themselves. And yet at this moment, a moment that will define a generation, it is precisely
this spirit that must inhabit us all.

For as much as Government can do and must do, it is ultimately the faith and determination of
the American people upon which this Nation relies. It is the kindness to take in a stranger
when the levees break, the selflessness of workers who would rather cut their hours than see a
friend lose their job, which sees us through our darkest hours. It is the firefighter's courage to
storm a stairway filled with smoke, but also a parent's willingness to nurture a child, that
finally decides our fate.

Our challenges may be new. The instruments with which we meet them may be new. But
those values upon which our success depends--honesty and hard work, courage and fair play,
tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism--these things are old. These things are true.
They have been the quiet force of progress throughout our history. What is demanded then is
a return to these truths. What is required of us now is a new era of responsibility, a
recognition on the part of every American that we have duties to ourselves, our Nation, and
the world. Duties that we do not grudgingly accept but, rather, seize gladly, firm in the
knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than
giving our all to a difficult task.

This is the price and the promise of citizenship. This is the source of our confidence, the
knowledge that God calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny. This is the meaning of our
liberty and our creed; why men and women and children of every race and every faith can join
in celebration across this magnificent Mall, and why a man whose father less than 60 years
ago might not have been served at a local restaurant can now stand before you to take a most
sacred oath.

So let us mark this day with remembrance of who we are and how far we have traveled. In the
year of America's birth, in the coldest of months, a small band of patriots huddled by dying
campfires on the shores of an icy river. The Capital was abandoned. The enemy was
advancing. The snow was stained with blood. At a moment when the outcome of our
Revolution was most in doubt, the Father of our Nation ordered these words be read to the
people:

"Let it be told to the future world . . . that in the depth of winter, when nothing but hope and
virtue could survive . . . that the city and the country, alarmed at one common danger, came
forth to meet [it]."

America, in the face of our common dangers, in this winter of our hardship, let us remember
these timeless words. With hope and virtue, let us brave once more the icy currents and
endure what storms may come. Let it be said by our children's children that when we were
tested, we refused to let this journey end; that we did not turn back, nor did we falter. And
with eyes fixed on the horizon and God's grace upon us, we carried forth that great gift of
freedom and delivered it safely to future generations.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.
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Thank you. Thank you so much.

Vice President Biden, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the United States Congress,
distinguished guests, and fellow citizens:

Each time we gather to inaugurate a President we bear witness to the enduring strength of our
Constitution. We affirm the promise of our democracy. We recall that what binds this Nation
together is not the colors of our skin or the tenets of our faith or the origins of our names.
What makes us exceptional—that makes us American—is our allegiance to an idea
articulated in a declaration made more than two centuries ago:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed
by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the
pursuit of happiness.

Today we continue a never-ending journey to bridge the meaning of those words with the
realities of our time. For history tells us that while these truths may be self-evident, they've
never been self-executing; that while freedom is a gift from God, it must be secured by His
people here on Earth. The patriots of 1776 did not fight to replace the tyranny of a king with
the privileges of a few or the rule of a mob. They gave to us a republic, a government of and
by and for the people, entrusting each generation to keep safe our founding creed.

And for more than 200 years, we have.

Through blood drawn by lash and blood drawn by sword, we learned that no union founded
on the principles of liberty and equality could survive half-slave and half-free. We made
ourselves anew, and vowed to move forward together.

Together, we determined that a modern economy requires railroads and highways to speed
travel and commerce, schools and colleges to train our workers.

Together, we discovered that a free market only thrives when there are rules to ensure
competition and fair play.

Together, we resolved that a great nation must care for the vulnerable and protect its people
from life's worst hazards and misfortune.

Through it all, we have never relinquished our skepticism of central authority nor have we
succumbed to the fiction that all society's ills can be cured through government alone. Our
celebration of initiative and enterprise, our insistence on hard work and personal
responsibility, these are constants in our character.

But we have always understood that when times change, so must we; that fidelity to our
founding principles requires new responses to new challenges; that preserving our individual
freedoms ultimately requires collective action. For the American people can no more meet the
demands of today's world by acting alone than American soldiers could have met the forces of
fascism or communism with muskets and militias. No single person can train all the math and
science teachers we'll need to equip our children for the future, or build the roads and
networks and research labs that will bring new jobs and businesses to our shores. Now more
than ever, we must do these things together, as one nation and one people.

This generation of Americans has been tested by crises that steeled our resolve and proved
our resilience. A decade of war is now ending. An economic recovery has begun. America's
possibilities are limitless, for we possess all the qualities that this world without boundaries
demands: youth and drive; diversity and openness; an endless capacity for risk and a gift for
reinvention. My fellow Americans, we are made for this moment and we will seize it—so
long as we seize it together.

For we, the people, understand that our country cannot succeed when a shrinking few do very
well and a growing many barely make it. We believe that America's prosperity must rest upon
the broad shoulders of a rising middle class. We know that America thrives when every
person can find independence and pride in their work; when the wages of honest labor liberate
families from the brink of hardship. We are true to our creed when a little girl born into the
bleakest poverty knows that she has the same chance to succeed as anybody else, because she
is an American; she is free and she is equal, not just in the eyes of God, but also in our own.

We understand that outworn programs are inadequate to the needs of our time. So we must
harness new ideas and technology to remake our government, revamp our Tax Code, reform
our schools, and empower our citizens with the skills they need to work harder, learn more,
reach higher. But while the means will change, our purpose endures: a nation that rewards the
effort and determination of every single American. That is what this moment requires. That is
what will give real meaning to our creed.

We, the people, still believe that every citizen deserves a basic measure of security and
dignity. We must make the hard choices to reduce the cost of health care and the size of our
deficit. But we reject the belief that America must choose between caring for the generation
that built this country and investing in the generation that will build its future. For we
remember the lessons of our past, when twilight years were spent in poverty and parents of a
child with a disability had nowhere to turn.

We do not believe that in this country freedom is reserved for the lucky, or happiness for the
few. We recognize that no matter how responsibly we live our lives, any one of us at any time
may face a job loss or a sudden illness or a home swept away in a terrible storm. The
commitments we make to each other through Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security,
these things do not sap our initiative, they strengthen us. They do not make us a nation of
takers; they free us to take the risks that make this country great.

We, the people, still believe that our obligations as Americans are not just to ourselves, but to
all posterity. We will respond to the threat of climate change, knowing that the failure to do so
would betray our children and future generations. Some may still deny the overwhelming
judgment of science, but none can avoid the devastating impact of raging fires and crippling
drought and more powerful storms.
The path towards sustainable energy sources will be long and sometimes difficult. But America cannot resist this transition, we must lead it. We cannot cede to other nations the technology that will power new jobs and new industries, we must claim its promise. That's how we will maintain our economic vitality and our national treasure—our forests and waterways, our crop lands and snow-capped peaks. That is how we will preserve our planet, commanded to our care by God. That's what will lend meaning to the creed our fathers once declared.

We, the people, still believe that enduring security and lasting peace do not require perpetual war. Our brave men and women in uniform, tempered by the flames of battle, are unmatched in skill and courage. Our citizens, seared by the memory of those we have lost, know too well the price that is paid for liberty. The knowledge of their sacrifice will keep us forever vigilant against those who would do us harm. But we are also heirs to those who won the peace and not just the war; who turned sworn enemies into the surest of friends—and we must carry those lessons into this time as well.

We will defend our people and uphold our values through strength of arms and rule of law. We will show the courage to try and resolve our differences with other nations peacefully—not because we are naive about the dangers we face, but because engagement can more durably lift suspicion and fear.

America will remain the anchor of strong alliances in every corner of the globe. And we will renew those institutions that extend our capacity to manage crisis abroad, for no one has a greater stake in a peaceful world than its most powerful nation. We will support democracy from Asia to Africa, from the Americas to the Middle East, because our interests and our conscience compel us to act on behalf of those who long for freedom. And we must be a source of hope to the poor, the sick, the marginalized, the victims of prejudice—not out of mere charity, but because peace in our time requires the constant advance of those principles that our common creed describes: tolerance and opportunity, human dignity and justice.

We, the people, declare today that the most evident of truths—that all of us are created equal—is the star that guides us still; just as it guided our forebears through Seneca Falls and Selma and Stonewall; just as it guided all those men and women, sung and unsung, who left footprints along this great Mall, to hear a preacher say that we cannot walk alone; to hear a King proclaim that our individual freedom is inextricably bound to the freedom of every soul on Earth.

It is now our generation's task to carry on what those pioneers began. For our journey is not complete until our wives, our mothers and daughters can earn a living equal to their efforts. Our journey is not complete until our gay brothers and sisters are treated like anyone else under the law—for if we are truly created equal, then surely the love we commit to one another must be equal as well. Our journey is not complete until no citizen is forced to wait for hours to exercise the right to vote. Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity—until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country. Our journey is not complete until all our children, from the streets of Detroit to the hills of Appalachia, to the quiet lanes of Newtown, know that they are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.
That is our generation's task—to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American. Being true to our founding documents does not require us to agree on every contour of life. It does not mean we all define liberty in exactly the same way or follow the same precise path to happiness. Progress does not compel us to settle centuries-long debates about the role of government for all time, but it does require us to act in our time.

For now decisions are upon us and we cannot afford delay. We cannot mistake absolutism for principle or substitute spectacle for politics or treat name-calling as reasoned debate. We must act, knowing that our work will be imperfect. We must act, we must act knowing that today's victories will be only partial and that it will be up to those who stand here in 4 years and 40 years and 400 years hence to advance the timeless spirit once conferred to us in a spare Philadelphia hall.

My fellow Americans, the oath I have sworn before you today, like the one recited by others who serve in this Capitol, was an oath to God and country, not party or faction. And we must faithfully execute that pledge during the duration of our service. But the words I spoke today are not so different from the oath that is taken each time a soldier signs up for duty or an immigrant realizes her dream. My oath is not so different from the pledge we all make to the flag that waves above and that fills our hearts with pride.

They are the words of citizens and they represent our greatest hope. You and I, as citizens, have the power to set this country's course. You and I, as citizens, have the obligation to shape the debates of our time—not only with the votes we cast, but with the voices we lift in defense of our most ancient values and enduring ideals.

Let us, each of us, now embrace with solemn duty and awesome joy what is our lasting birthright. With common effort and common purpose, with passion and dedication, let us answer the call of history and carry into an uncertain future that precious light of freedom.

Thank you. God bless you, and may He forever bless these United States of America.
State of the Union address 2011

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans: Tonight I want to begin by congratulating the men and women of the 112th Congress, as well as your new Speaker, John Boehner. And as we mark this occasion, we're also mindful of the empty chair in this Chamber, and we pray for the health of our colleague and our friend Gabby Giffords.

It's no secret that those of us here tonight have had our differences over the last 2 years. The debates have been contentious; we have fought fiercely for our beliefs. And that's a good thing. That's what a robust democracy demands. That's what helps set us apart as a nation.

But there's a reason the tragedy in Tucson gave us pause. Amid all the noise and passion and rancor of our public debate, Tucson reminded us that no matter who we are or where we come from, each of us is a part of something greater, something more consequential than party or political preference.

We are part of the American family. We believe that in a country where every race and faith and point of view can be found, we are still bound together as one people, that we share common hopes and a common creed, that the dreams of a little girl in Tucson are not so different than those of our own children, that they all deserve the chance to be fulfilled. That too is what sets us apart as a nation.

Now, by itself, this simple recognition won't usher in a new era of cooperation. What comes of this moment is up to us. What comes of this moment will be determined not by whether we can sit together tonight, but whether we can work together tomorrow.

I believe we can, and I believe we must. That's what the people who sent us here expect of us. With their votes, they've determined that governing will now be a shared responsibility between parties. New laws will only pass with support from Democrats and Republicans. We will move forward together or not at all, for the challenges we face are bigger than party and bigger than politics.

At stake right now is not who wins the next election. After all, we just had an election. At stake is whether new jobs and industries take root in this country or somewhere else. It's whether the hard work and industry of our people is rewarded. It's whether we sustain the leadership that has made America not just a place on a map, but the light to the world.

We are poised for progress. Two years after the worst recession most of us have ever known, the stock market has come roaring back, corporate profits are up, the economy is growing again.

But we have never measured progress by these yardsticks alone. We measure progress by the success of our people, by the jobs they can find and the quality of life those jobs offer, by the prospects of a small-business owner who dreams of turning a good idea into a thriving enterprise, by the opportunities for a better life that we pass on to our children.
That's the project the American people want us to work on—together.

Now, we did that in December. Thanks to the tax cuts we passed, Americans' paychecks are a little bigger today. Every business can write off the full cost of new investments that they make this year. And these steps, taken by Democrats and Republicans, will grow the economy and add to the more than 1 million private sector jobs created last year.

But we have to do more. These steps we've taken over the last 2 years may have broken the back of this recession, but to win the future, we'll need to take on challenges that have been decades in the making.

Many people watching tonight can probably remember a time when finding a good job meant showing up at a nearby factory or a business downtown. You didn't always need a degree, and your competition was pretty much limited to your neighbors. If you worked hard, chances are you'd have a job for life, with a decent paycheck and good benefits and the occasional promotion. Maybe you'd even have the pride of seeing your kids work at the same company.

That world has changed. And for many, the change has been painful. I've seen it in the shuttered windows of once booming factories and the vacant storefronts on once busy Main Streets. I've heard it in the frustrations of Americans who've seen their paychecks dwindle or their jobs disappear, proud men and women who feel like the rules have been changed in the middle of the game.

They're right. The rules have changed. In a single generation, revolutions in technology have transformed the way we live, work, and do business. Steel mills that once needed 1,000 workers can now do the same work with 100. Today, just about any company can set up shop, hire workers, and sell their products wherever there's an Internet connection.

Meanwhile, nations like China and India realized that with some changes of their own, they could compete in this new world. And so they started educating their children earlier and longer, with greater emphasis on math and science. They're investing in research and new technologies. Just recently, China became the home to the world's largest private solar research facility and the world's fastest computer.

So yes, the world is changed. The competition for jobs is real. But this shouldn't discourage us. It should challenge us. Remember, for all the hits we've taken these last few years, for all the naysayers predicting our decline, America still has the largest, most prosperous economy in the world. No workers are more productive than ours. No country has more successful companies or grants more patents to inventors and entrepreneurs. We're the home to the world's best colleges and universities, where more students come to study than any place on Earth.

What's more, we are the first nation to be founded for the sake of an idea: the idea that each of us deserves the chance to shape our own destiny. That's why centuries of pioneers and immigrants have risked everything to come here. It's why our students don't just memorize equations, but answer questions like "What do you think of that idea? What would you change about the world? What do you want to be when you grow up?"
The future is ours to win. But to get there, we can’t just stand still. As Robert Kennedy told us, "The future is not a gift. It is an achievement." Sustaining the American Dream has never been about standing pat. It has required each generation to sacrifice and struggle and meet the demands of a new age.

And now it's our turn. We know what it takes to compete for the jobs and industries of our time. We need to out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world. We have to make America the best place on Earth to do business. We need to take responsibility for our deficit and reform our Government. That's how our people will prosper. That's how we'll win the future. And tonight, I'd like to talk about how we get there.

The first step in winning the future is encouraging American innovation. None of us can predict with certainty what the next big industry will be or where the new jobs will come from. Thirty years ago, we couldn't know that something called the Internet would lead to an economic revolution. What we can do—what America does better than anyone else—is spark the creativity and imagination of our people. We're the nation that put cars in driveways and computers in offices; the nation of Edison and the Wright brothers, of Google and Facebook.

In America, innovation doesn't just change our lives. It is how we make our living. Our free enterprise system is what drives innovation. But because it's not always profitable for companies to invest in basic research, throughout our history, our Government has provided cutting-edge scientists and inventors with the support that they need. That's what planted the seeds for the Internet. That's what helped make possible things like computer chips and GPS. Just think of all the good jobs—from manufacturing to retail—that have come from these breakthroughs.

Half a century ago, when the Soviets beat us into space with the launch of a satellite called Sputnik, we had no idea how we would beat them to the Moon. The science wasn't even there yet. NASA didn't exist. But after investing in better research and education, we didn't just surpass the Soviets; we unleashed a wave of innovation that created new industries and millions of new jobs.

This is our generation's Sputnik moment. Two years ago, I said that we needed to reach a level of research and development we haven't seen since the height of the space race. And in a few weeks, I will be sending a budget to Congress that helps us meet that goal. We'll invest in biomedical research, information technology, and especially clean energy technology, an investment that will strengthen our security, protect our planet, and create countless new jobs for our people.

Already, we're seeing the promise of renewable energy. Robert and Gary Allen are brothers who run a small Michigan roofing company. After September 11th, they volunteered their best roofers to help repair the Pentagon. But half of their factory went unused, and the recession hit them hard. Today, with the help of a Government loan, that empty space is being used to manufacture solar shingles that are being sold all across the country. In Robert's words, "We reinvented ourselves."

That's what Americans have done for over 200 years: reinvented ourselves. And to spur on more success stories like the Allen Brothers, we've begun to reinvent our energy policy. We're not just handing out money. We're issuing a challenge. We're telling America's scientists and
engineers that if they assemble teams of the best minds in their fields and focus on the hardest
problems in clean energy, we'll fund the Apollo projects of our time.

At the California Institute of Technology, they're developing a way to turn sunlight and water
into fuel for our cars. At Oak Ridge National Laboratory, they're using supercomputers to get
a lot more power out of our nuclear facilities. With more research and incentives, we can
break our dependence on oil with biofuels and become the first country to have a million
electric vehicles on the road by 2015.

We need to get behind this innovation. And to help pay for it, I'm asking Congress to
eliminate the billions in taxpayer dollars we currently give to oil companies. I don't know if
you've noticed, but they're doing just fine on their own. [Laughter] So instead of subsidizing
yesterday's energy, let's invest in tomorrow's.

Now, clean energy breakthroughs will only translate into clean energy jobs if businesses
know there will be a market for what they're selling. So tonight I challenge you to join me in
setting a new goal: By 2035, 80 percent of America's electricity will come from clean energy
sources.

Some folks want wind and solar. Others want nuclear, clean coal, and natural gas. To meet
this goal, we will need them all, and I urge Democrats and Republicans to work together to
make it happen.

Maintaining our leadership in research and technology is crucial to America's success. But if
we want to win the future, if we want innovation to produce jobs in America and not
overseas, then we also have to win the race to educate our kids.

Think about it. Over the next 10 years, nearly half of all new jobs will require education that
goes beyond a high school education. And yet as many as a quarter of our students aren't even
finishing high school. The quality of our math and science education lags behind many other
countries. America has fallen to ninth in the proportion of young people with a college degree.
And so the question is whether all of us, as citizens and as parents, are willing to do what's
necessary to give every child a chance to succeed.

That responsibility begins not in our classrooms, but in our homes and communities. It's
family that first instills the love of learning in a child. Only parents can make sure the TV is
turned off and homework gets done. We need to teach our kids that it's not just the winner of
the Super Bowl who deserves to be celebrated, but the winner of the science fair. We need to
Teach them that success is not a function of fame or PR, but of hard work and discipline.

Our schools share this responsibility. When a child walks into a classroom, it should be a
place of high expectations and high performance. But too many schools don't meet this test.
That's why instead of just pouring money into a system that's not working, we launched a
competition called Race to the Top. To all 50 States, we said, "If you show us the most
innovative plans to improve teacher quality and student achievement, we'll show you the
money."

Race to the Top is the most meaningful reform of our public schools in a generation. For less
than 1 percent of what we spend on education each year, it has led over 40 States to raise their
standards for teaching and learning. And these standards were developed, by the way, not by Washington, but by Republican and Democratic Governors throughout the country. And Race to the Top should be the approach we follow this year as we replace No Child Left Behind with a law that's more flexible and focused on what's best for our kids.

You see, we know what's possible from our children when reform isn't just a top-down mandate, but the work of local teachers and principals, school boards and communities. Take a school like Bruce Randolph in Denver. Three years ago, it was rated one of the worst schools in Colorado, located on turf between two rival gangs. But last May, 97 percent of the seniors received their diploma. Most will be the first in their families to go to college. And after the first year of the school's transformation, the principal who made it possible wiped away tears when a student said, "Thank you, Ms. Waters, for showing that we are smart and we can make it." That's what good schools can do, and we want good schools all across the country.

Let's also remember that after parents, the biggest impact on a child's success comes from the man or woman at the front of the classroom. In South Korea, teachers are known as "nation builders." Here in America, it's time we treated the people who educate our children with the same level of respect. We want to reward good teachers and stop making excuses for bad ones. And over the next 10 years, with so many baby boomers retiring from our classrooms, we want to prepare 100,000 new teachers in the fields of science and technology and engineering and math.

In fact, to every young person listening tonight who's contemplating their career choice: If you want to make a difference in the life of our Nation, if you want to make a difference in the life of a child, become a teacher. Your country needs you.

Of course, the education race doesn't end with a high school diploma. To compete, higher education must be within the reach of every American. That's why we've ended the unwarranted taxpayer subsidies that went to banks and used the savings to make college affordable for millions of students. And this year, I ask Congress to go further and make permanent our tuition tax credit, worth $10,000 for 4 years of college. It's the right thing to do.

Because people need to be able to train for new jobs and careers in today's fast-changing economy, we're also revitalizing America's community colleges. Last month, I saw the promise of these schools at Forsyth Tech in North Carolina. Many of the students there used to work in the surrounding factories that have since left town. One mother of two, a woman named Kathy Proctor, had worked in the furniture industry since she was 18 years old. And she told me she's earning her degree in biotechnology now, at 55 years old, not just because the furniture jobs are gone, but because she wants to inspire her children to pursue their dreams too. As Kathy said, "I hope it tells them to never give up."

If we take these steps, if we raise expectations for every child and give them the best possible chance at an education, from the day they are born until the last job they take, we will reach the goal that I set 2 years ago: By the end of the decade, America will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world.
One last point about education: Today, there are hundreds of thousands of students excelling in our schools who are not American citizens. Some are the children of undocumented workers, who had nothing to do with the actions of their parents. They grew up as Americans and pledge allegiance to our flag, and yet they live every day with the threat of deportation. Others come here from abroad to study in our colleges and universities. But as soon as they obtain advanced degrees, we send them back home to compete against us. It makes no sense.

Now, I strongly believe that we should take on, once and for all, the issue of illegal immigration. And I am prepared to work with Republicans and Democrats to protect our borders, enforce our laws, and address the millions of undocumented workers who are now living in the shadows. I know that debate will be difficult. I know it will take time. But tonight, let's agree to make that effort. And let's stop expelling talented, responsible young people who could be staffing our research labs or starting a new business, who could be further enriching this Nation.

The third step in winning the future is rebuilding America. To attract new businesses to our shores, we need the fastest, most reliable ways to move people, goods, and information, from high-speed rail to high-speed Internet.

Our infrastructure used to be the best, but our lead has slipped. South Korean homes now have greater Internet access than we do. Countries in Europe and Russia invest more in their roads and railways than we do. China is building faster trains and newer airports. Meanwhile, when our own engineers graded our Nation's infrastructure, they gave us a "D."

We have to do better. America is the nation that built the transcontinental railroad, brought electricity to rural communities, constructed the Interstate Highway System. The jobs created by these projects didn't just come from laying down track or pavement. They came from businesses that opened near a town's new train station or the new off-ramp.

So over the last 2 years, we've begun rebuilding for the 21st century, a project that has meant thousands of good jobs for the hard-hit construction industry. And tonight I'm proposing that we redouble those efforts.

We'll put more Americans to work repairing crumbling roads and bridges. We'll make sure this is fully paid for, attract private investment, and pick projects based [on] what's best for the economy, not politicians.

Within 25 years, our goal is to give 80 percent of Americans access to high-speed rail. This could allow you to go places in half the time it takes to travel by car. For some trips, it will be faster than flying, without the pat-down. [Laughter] As we speak, routes in California and the Midwest are already underway.

Within the next 5 years, we'll make it possible for businesses to deploy the next generation of high-speed wireless coverage to 98 percent of all Americans. This isn't just about—this isn't about faster Internet or fewer dropped calls. It's about connecting every part of America to the digital age. It's about a rural community in Iowa or Alabama where farmers and small-business owners will be able to sell their products all over the world. It's about a firefighter who can download the design of a burning building onto a handheld device, a student who
can take classes with a digital textbook, or a patient who can have face-to-face video chats with her doctor.

All these investments, in innovation, education, and infrastructure, will make America a better place to do business and create jobs. But to help our companies compete, we also have to knock down barriers that stand in the way of their success.

For example, over the years, a parade of lobbyists has rigged the Tax Code to benefit particular companies and industries. Those with accountants or lawyers to work the system can end up paying no taxes at all. But all the rest are hit with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and it has to change.

So tonight I'm asking Democrats and Republicans to simplify the system, get rid of the loopholes, level the playing field, and use the savings to lower the corporate tax rate for the first time in 25 years without adding to our deficit. It can be done.

To help businesses sell more products abroad, we set a goal of doubling our exports by 2014. Because the more we export, the more jobs we create here at home. Already, our exports are up. Recently, we signed agreements with India and China that will support more than 250,000 jobs here in the United States. And last month, we finalized a trade agreement with South Korea that will support at least 70,000 American jobs. This agreement has unprecedented support from business and labor, Democrats and Republicans, and I ask this Congress to pass it as soon as possible.

* White House correction.

Now, before I took office, I made it clear that we would enforce our trade agreements, and that I would only sign deals that keep faith with American workers and promote American jobs. That's what we did with Korea, and that's what I intend to do as we pursue agreements with Panama and Colombia and continue our Asia Pacific and global trade talks.

To reduce barriers to growth and investment, I've ordered a review of Government regulations. When we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them. But I will not hesitate to create or enforce commonsense safeguards to protect the American people. That's what we've done in this country for more than a century. It's why our food is safe to eat, our water is safe to drink, and our air is safe to breathe. It's why we have speed limits and child labor laws. It's why last year, we put in place consumer protections against hidden fees and penalties by credit card companies and new rules to prevent another financial crisis. And it's why we passed reform that finally prevents the health insurance industry from exploiting patients.

Now, I have heard rumors that a few of you still have concerns about our new health care law. [Laughter] So let me be the first to say that anything can be improved. If you have ideas about how to improve this law by making care better or more affordable, I am eager to work with you. We can start right now by correcting a flaw in the legislation that has placed an unnecessary bookkeeping burden on small businesses.

What I'm not willing to do—what I'm not willing to do is go back to the days when insurance companies could deny someone coverage because of a preexisting condition.
I'm not willing to tell James Howard, a brain cancer patient from Texas, that his treatment might not be covered. I'm not willing to tell Jim Houser, a small-business man from Oregon, that he has to go back to paying $5,000 more to cover his employees. As we speak, this law is making prescription drugs cheaper for seniors and giving uninsured students a chance to stay on their patients'—parents' coverage.

So I say to this chamber tonight: Instead of refighting the battles of the last 2 years, let's fix what needs fixing, and let's move forward.

Now, the final critical step in winning the future is to make sure we aren't buried under a mountain of debt.

We are living with a legacy of deficit spending that began almost a decade ago. And in the wake of the financial crisis, some of that was necessary to keep credit flowing, save jobs, and put money in people's pockets.

But now that the worst of the recession is over, we have to confront the fact that our Government spends more than it takes in. That is not sustainable. Every day, families sacrifice to live within their means. They deserve a Government that does the same.

So tonight I am proposing that starting this year, we freeze annual domestic spending for the next 5 years. Now, this would reduce the deficit by more than $400 billion over the next decade and will bring discretionary spending to the lowest share of our economy since Dwight Eisenhower was President.

This freeze will require painful cuts. Already, we've frozen the salaries of hard-working Federal employees for the next 2 years. I've proposed cuts to things I care deeply about, like community action programs. The Secretary of Defense has also agreed to cut tens of billions of dollars in spending that he and his generals believe our military can do without.

Now, I recognize that some in this Chamber have already proposed deeper cuts, and I'm willing to eliminate whatever we can honestly afford to do without. But let's make sure that we're not doing it on the backs of our most vulnerable citizens. And let's make sure that what we're cutting is really excess weight. Cutting the deficit by gutting our investments in innovation and education is like lightening an overloaded airplane by removing its engine. It may make you feel like you're flying high at first, but it won't take long before you feel the impact. [Laughter]

Now, most of the cuts and savings I've proposed only address annual domestic spending, which represents a little more than 12 percent of our budget. To make further progress, we have to stop pretending that cutting this kind of spending alone will be enough. It won't.

The bipartisan fiscal commission I created last year made this crystal clear. I don't agree with all their proposals, but they made important progress. And their conclusion is that the only way to tackle our deficit is to cut excessive spending wherever we find it, in domestic spending, defense spending, health care spending, and spending through tax breaks and loopholes.
This means further reducing health care costs, including programs like Medicare and Medicaid, which are the single biggest contributor to our long-term deficit. The health insurance law we passed last year will slow these rising costs, which is part of the reason that nonpartisan economists have said that repealing the health care law would add a quarter of a trillion dollars to our deficit. Still, I'm willing to look at other ideas to bring down costs, including one that Republicans suggested last year: medical malpractice reform to rein in frivolous lawsuits.

To put us on solid ground, we should also find a bipartisan solution to strengthen Social Security for future generations. We must do it without putting at risk current retirees, the most vulnerable, or people with disabilities, without slashing benefits for future generations, and without subjecting Americans' guaranteed retirement income to the whims of the stock market.

And if we truly care about our deficit, we simply can't afford a permanent extension of the tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans. Before we take money away from our schools or scholarships away from our students, we should ask millionaires to give up their tax break. It's not a matter of punishing their success, it's about promoting America's success.

In fact, the best thing we could do on taxes for all Americans is to simplify the individual Tax Code. This will be a tough job, but members of both parties have expressed an interest in doing this, and I am prepared to join them.

So now is the time to act. Now is the time for both sides and both Houses of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, to forge a principled compromise that gets the job done. If we make the hard choices now to rein in our deficits, we can make the investments we need to win the future.

Let me take this one step further. We shouldn't just give our people a Government that's more affordable, we should give them a Government that's more competent and more efficient. We can't win the future with a Government of the past.

We live and do business in the information age, but the last major reorganization of the Government happened in the age of black-and-white TV. There are 12 different agencies that deal with exports. There are at least five different agencies that deal with housing policy. Then there's my favorite example: The Interior Department is in charge of salmon while they're in fresh water, but the Commerce Department handles them when they're in saltwater. [Laughter] I hear it gets even more complicated once they're smoked. [Laughter]

Now, we've made great strides over the last 2 years in using technology and getting rid of waste. Veterans can now download their electronic medical records with a click of the mouse. We're selling acres of Federal office space that hasn't been used in years, and we'll cut through redtape to get rid of more. But we need to think bigger. In the coming months, my administration will develop a proposal to merge, consolidate, and reorganize the Federal Government in a way that best serves the goal of a more competitive America. I will submit that proposal to Congress for a vote, and we will push to get it passed.

In the coming year, we'll also work to rebuild people's faith in the institution of Government. Because you deserve to know exactly how and where your tax dollars are being spent, you'll
be able to go to a web site and get that information for the very first time in history. Because
you deserve to know when your elected officials are meeting with lobbyists, I ask Congress to
do what the White House has already done: put that information online. And because the
American people deserve to know that special interests aren't larding up legislation with pet
projects, both parties in Congress should know this: If a bill comes to my desk with earmarks
inside, I will veto it. I will veto it.

The 21st-century Government that's open and competent, a government that lives within its
means, an economy that's driven by new skills and new ideas—our success in this new and
changing world will require reform, responsibility, and innovation. It will also require us to
approach that world with a new level of engagement in our foreign affairs.

Just as jobs and businesses can now race across borders, so can new threats and new
challenges. No single wall separates East and West. No one rival superpower is aligned
against us.

And so we must defeat determined enemies, wherever they are, and build coalitions that cut
across lines of region and race and religion. And America's moral example must always shine
for all who yearn for freedom and justice and dignity. And because we've begun this work,
tonight we can say that American leadership has been renewed and America's standing has
been restored.

Look to Iraq, where nearly 100,000 of our brave men and women have left with their heads
held high. American combat patrols have ended, violence is down, and a new Government
has been formed. This year, our civilians will forge a lasting partnership with the Iraqi people,
while we finish the job of bringing our troops out of Iraq. America's commitment has been
kept. The Iraq war is coming to an end.

Of course, as we speak, Al Qaida and their affiliates continue to plan attacks against us.
Thanks to our intelligence and law enforcement professionals, we're disrupting plots and
securing our cities and skies. And as extremists try to inspire acts of violence within our
borders, we are responding with the strength of our communities, with respect for the rule of
law, and with the conviction that American Muslims are a part of our American family.

We've also taken the fight to Al Qaida and their allies abroad. In Afghanistan, our troops have
taken Taliban strongholds and trained Afghan security forces. Our purpose is clear: By
preventing the Taliban from reestablishing a stranglehold over the Afghan people, we will
deny Al Qaida the safe haven that served as a launching pad for 9/11.

Thanks to our heroic troops and civilians, fewer Afghans are under the control of the
insurgency. There will be tough fighting ahead, and the Afghan Government will need to
deliver better governance. But we are strengthening the capacity of the Afghan people and
building an enduring partnership with them. This year, we will work with nearly 50 countries
to begin a transition to an Afghan lead, and this July, we will begin to bring our troops home.

In Pakistan, Al Qaida's leadership is under more pressure than at any point since 2001. Their
leaders and operatives are being removed from the battlefield. Their safe havens are
shrinking. And we've sent a message from the Afghan border to the Arabian Peninsula to all
parts of the globe: We will not relent, we will not waver, and we will defeat you.
American leadership can also be seen in the effort to secure the worst weapons of war. Because Republicans and Democrats approved the new START Treaty, far fewer nuclear weapons and launchers will be deployed. Because we rallied the world, nuclear materials are being locked down on every continent so they never fall into the hands of terrorists.

Because of a diplomatic effort to insist that Iran meet its obligations, the Iranian Government now faces tougher sanctions, tighter sanctions than ever before. And on the Korean Peninsula, we stand with our ally South Korea and insist that North Korea keeps its commitment to abandon nuclear weapons.

This is just a part of how we're shaping a world that favors peace and prosperity. With our European allies, we revitalized NATO and increased our cooperation on everything from counterterrorism to missile defense. We've reset our relationship with Russia, strengthened Asian alliances, built new partnerships with nations like India.

This March, I will travel to Brazil, Chile, and El Salvador to forge new alliances across the Americas. Around the globe, we're standing with those who take responsibility, helping farmers grow more food, supporting doctors who care for the sick, and combating the corruption that can rot a society and rob people of opportunity.

Recent events have shown us that what sets us apart must not just be our power—it must also be the purpose behind it. In south Sudan—with our assistance—the people were finally able to vote for independence after years of war. Thousands lined up before dawn. People danced in the streets. One man who lost four of his brothers at war summed up the scene around him. "This was a battlefield for most of my life," he said. "Now we want to be free."

And we saw that same desire to be free in Tunisia, where the will of the people proved more powerful than the writ of a dictator. And tonight let us be clear: The United States of America stands with the people of Tunisia and supports the democratic aspirations of all people.

We must never forget that the things we've struggled for, and fought for, live in the hearts of people everywhere. And we must always remember that the Americans who have borne the greatest burden in this struggle are the men and women who serve our country.

Tonight let us speak with one voice in reaffirming that our Nation is united in support of our troops and their families. Let us serve them as well as they've served us, by giving them the equipment they need, by providing them with the care and benefits that they have earned, and by enlisting our veterans in the great task of building our own Nation.

Our troops come from every corner of this country. They're Black, White, Latino, Asian, Native American. They are Christian and Hindu, Jewish and Muslim. And yes, we know that some of them are gay. Starting this year, no American will be forbidden from serving the country they love because of who they love. And with that change, I call on all our college campuses to open their doors to our military recruiters and ROTC. It is time to leave behind the divisive battles of the past. It is time to move forward as one Nation.

We should have no illusions about the work ahead of us. Reforming our schools, changing the way we use energy, reducing our deficit, none of this will be easy. All of it will take time.
And it will be harder because we will argue about everything: the costs, the details, the letter of every law.

Of course, some countries don't have this problem. If the central government wants a railroad, they build a railroad, no matter how many homes get bulldozed. If they don't want a bad story in the newspaper, it doesn't get written.

And yet, as contentious and frustrating and messy as our democracy can sometimes be, I know there isn't a person here who would trade places with any other nation on Earth. We may have differences in policy, but we all believe in the rights enshrined in our Constitution. We may have different opinions, but we believe in the same promise that says this is a place where you can make it if you try. We may have different backgrounds, but we believe in the same dream that says this is a country where anything is possible, no matter who you are, no matter where you come from.

That dream is why I can stand here before you tonight. That dream is why a working-class kid from Scranton can sit behind me. [Laughter] That dream is why someone who began by sweeping the floors of his father's Cincinnati bar can preside as Speaker of the House in the greatest nation on Earth.

That dream—that American Dream—is what drove the Allen Brothers to reinvent their roofing company for a new era. It's what drove those students at Forsyth Tech to learn a new skill and work towards the future. And that dream is the story of a small-business owner named Brandon Fisher.

Brandon started a company in Berlin, Pennsylvania, that specializes in a new kind of drilling technology. And one day last summer, he saw the news that halfway across the world, 33 men were trapped in a Chilean mine, and no one knew how to save them.

But Brandon thought his company could help. And so he designed a rescue that would come to be known as Plan B. His employees worked around the clock to manufacture the necessary drilling equipment, and Brandon left for Chile.

Along with others, he began drilling a 2,000-foot hole into the ground, working 3 or 4 hour—3 or 4 days at a time without any sleep. Thirty-seven days later, Plan B succeeded, and the miners were rescued. But because he didn't want all of the attention, Brandon wasn't there when the miners emerged. He'd already gone back home, back to work on his next project.

And later, one of his employees said of the rescue, "We proved that Center Rock is a little company, but we do big things."

We do big things.

From the earliest days of our founding, America has been the story of ordinary people who dare to dream. That's how we win the future.

We're a nation that says, "I might not have a lot of money, but I have this great idea for a new company." "I might not come from a family of college graduates, but I will be the first to get
my degree." "I might not know those people in trouble, but I think I can help them, and I need to try." "I'm not sure how we'll reach that better place beyond the horizon, but I know we'll get there. I know we will."

We do big things.

The idea of America endures. Our destiny remains our choice. And tonight more than two centuries later, it's because of our people that our future is hopeful, our journey goes forward, and the state of our Union is strong.

Thank you. God bless you, and may God bless the United States of America.
State of the Union address

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans: Last month, I went to Andrews Air Force Base and welcomed home some of our last troops to serve in Iraq. Together, we offered a final, proud salute to the colors under which more than a million of our fellow citizens fought and several thousand gave their lives.

We gather tonight knowing that this generation of heroes has made the United States safer and more respected around the world. For the first time in 9 years, there are no Americans fighting in Iraq. For the first time in two decades, Usama bin Laden is not a threat to this country. Most of Al Qaida's top lieutenants have been defeated. The Taliban's momentum has been broken, and some troops in Afghanistan have begun to come home.

These achievements are a testament to the courage, selflessness, and teamwork of America's Armed Forces. At a time when too many of our institutions have let us down, they exceed all expectations. They're not consumed with personal ambition. They don't obsess over their differences. They focus on the mission at hand. They work together.

Imagine what we could accomplish if we followed their example. Think about the America within our reach: a country that leads the world in educating its people; an America that attracts a new generation of high-tech manufacturing and high-paying jobs; a future where we're in control of our own energy and our security and prosperity aren't so tied to unstable parts of the world; an economy built to last, where hard work pays off and responsibility is rewarded.

We can do this. I know we can, because we've done it before. At the end of World War II, when another generation of heroes returned home from combat, they built the strongest economy and middle class the world has ever known. My grandfather, a veteran of Patton's army, got the chance to go to college on the GI bill. My grandmother, who worked on a bomber assembly line, was part of a workforce that turned out the best products on Earth.

The two of them shared the optimism of a nation that had triumphed over a depression and fascism. They understood they were part of something larger, that they were contributing to a story of success that every American had a chance to share, the basic American promise that if you worked hard, you could do well enough to raise a family, own a home, send your kids to college, and put a little away for retirement.

The defining issue of our time is how to keep that promise alive. No challenge is more urgent. No debate is more important. We can either settle for a country where a shrinking number of people do really well while a growing number of Americans barely get by. Or we can restore an economy where everyone gets a fair shot and everyone does their fair share and everyone plays by the same set of rules. What's at stake aren't Democratic values or Republican values, but American values. And we have to reclaim them.

Let's remember how we got here. Long before the recession, jobs and manufacturing began leaving our shores. Technology made businesses more efficient, but also made some jobs obsolete. Folks at the top saw their incomes rise like never before, but most hard-working
Americans struggled with costs that were growing, paychecks that weren't, and personal debt that kept piling up.

In 2008, the house of cards collapsed. We learned that mortgages had been sold to people who couldn't afford or understand them. Banks had made huge bets and bonuses with other people's money. Regulators had looked the other way or didn't have the authority to stop the bad behavior.

It was wrong, it was irresponsible, and it plunged our economy into a crisis that put millions out of work, saddled us with more debt, and left innocent, hard-working Americans holding the bag. In the 6 months before I took office, we lost nearly 4 million jobs. And we lost another 4 million before our policies were in full effect.

Those are the facts. But so are these: In the last 22 months, businesses have created more than 3 million jobs. Last year, they created the most jobs since 2005. American manufacturers are hiring again, creating jobs for the first time since the late 1990s. Together, we've agreed to cut the deficit by more than $2 trillion. And we've put in place new rules to hold Wall Street accountable so a crisis like this never happens again.

The state of our Union is getting stronger. And we've come too far to turn back now. As long as I'm President, I will work with anyone in this Chamber to build on this momentum. But I intend to fight obstruction with action, and I will oppose any effort to return to the very same policies that brought on this economic crisis in the first place.

No, we will not go back to an economy weakened by outsourcing, bad debt, and phony financial profits. Tonight I want to speak about how we move forward and lay out a blueprint for an economy that's built to last, an economy built on American manufacturing, American energy, skills for American workers, and a renewal of American values.

Now, this blueprint begins with American manufacturing.

On the day I took office, our auto industry was on the verge of collapse. Some even said we should let it die. With a million jobs at stake, I refused to let that happen. In exchange for help, we demanded responsibility. We got workers and automakers to settle their differences. We got the industry to retool and restructure. Today, General Motors is back on top as the world's number-one automaker. Chrysler has grown faster in the U.S. than any major car company. Ford is investing billions in U.S. plants and factories. And together, the entire industry added nearly a hundred and sixty thousand jobs.

We bet on American workers. We bet on American ingenuity. And tonight, the American auto industry is back.

What's happening in Detroit can happen in other industries. It can happen in Cleveland and Pittsburgh and Raleigh. We can't bring every job back that's left our shore. But right now it's getting more expensive to do business in places like China. Meanwhile, America is more productive. A few weeks ago, the CEO of Master Lock told me that it now makes business sense for him to bring jobs back home. Today, for the first time in 15 years, Master Lock's unionized plant in Milwaukee is running at full capacity.
So we have a huge opportunity at this moment to bring manufacturing back. But we have to seize it. Tonight my message to business leaders is simple: Ask yourselves what you can do to bring jobs back to your country, and your country will do everything we can to help you succeed.

We should start with our Tax Code. Right now companies get tax breaks for moving jobs and profits overseas. Meanwhile, companies that choose to stay in America get hit with one of the highest tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and everyone knows it. So let's change it.

First, if you're a business that wants to outsource jobs, you shouldn't get a tax deduction for doing it. That money should be used to cover moving expenses for companies like Master Lock that decide to bring jobs home.

Second, no American company should be able to avoid paying its fair share of taxes by moving jobs and profits overseas. From now on, every multinational company should have to pay a basic minimum tax. And every penny should go towards lowering taxes for companies that choose to stay here and hire here in America.

Third, if you're an American manufacturer, you should get a bigger tax cut. If you're a high-tech manufacturer, we should double the tax deduction you get for making your products here. And if you want to relocate in a community that was hit hard when a factory left town, you should get help financing a new plant, equipment, or training for new workers.

So my message is simple: It is time to stop rewarding businesses that ship jobs overseas, and start rewarding companies that create jobs right here in America. Send me these tax reforms, and I will sign them right away.

We're also making it easier for American businesses to sell products all over the world. Two years ago, I set a goal of doubling U.S. exports over 5 years. With the bipartisan trade agreements we signed into law, we're on track to meet that goal ahead of schedule. And soon there will be millions of new customers for American goods in Panama, Colombia, and South Korea. Soon there will be new cars on the streets of Seoul imported from Detroit and Toledo and Chicago.

I will go anywhere in the world to open new markets for American products. And I will not stand by when our competitors don't play by the rules. We've brought trade cases against China at nearly twice the rate as the last administration, and it's made a difference. Over a thousand Americans are working today because we stopped a surge in Chinese tires. But we need to do more. It's not right when another country lets our movies, music, and software be pirated. It's not fair when foreign manufacturers have a leg up on ours only because they're heavily subsidized.

Tonight I'm announcing the creation of a trade enforcement unit that will be charged with investigating unfair trading practices in countries like China. There will be more inspections to prevent counterfeit or unsafe goods from crossing our borders. And this Congress should make sure that no foreign company has an advantage over American manufacturing when it comes to accessing financing or new markets like Russia. Our workers are the most productive on Earth, and if the playing field is level, I promise you, America will always win.
I also hear from many business leaders who want to hire in the United States, but can’t find workers with the right skills. Growing industries in science and technology have twice as many openings as we have workers who can do the job. Think about that: openings at a time when millions of Americans are looking for work. It’s inexcusable, and we know how to fix it.

Jackie Bray is a single mom from North Carolina who was laid off from her job as a mechanic. Then Siemens opened a gas turbine factory in Charlotte and formed a partnership with Central Piedmont Community College. The company helped the college design courses in laser and robotics training. It paid Jackie’s tuition, then hired her to help operate their plant.

I want every American looking for work to have the same opportunity as Jackie did. Join me in a national commitment to train 2 million Americans with skills that will lead directly to a job. My administration has already lined up more companies that want to help. Model partnerships between businesses like Siemens and community colleges in places like Charlotte and Orlando and Louisville are up and running. Now you need to give more community colleges the resources they need to become community career centers, places that teach people skills that businesses are looking for right now, from data management to high-tech manufacturing.

And I want to cut through the maze of confusing training programs so that from now on, people like Jackie have one program, one web site, and one place to go for all the information and help that they need. It is time to turn our unemployment system into a reemployment system that puts people to work.

These reforms will help people get jobs that are open today. But to prepare for the jobs of tomorrow, our commitment to skills and education has to start earlier.

For less than 1 percent of what our Nation spends on education each year, we’ve convinced nearly every State in the country to raise their standards for teaching and learning, the first time that’s happened in a generation. But challenges remain, and we know how to solve them.

At a time when other countries are doubling down on education, tight budgets have forced States to lay off thousands of teachers. We know a good teacher can increase the lifetime income of a classroom by over $250,000. A great teacher can offer an escape from poverty to the child who dreams beyond his circumstance. Every person in this Chamber can point to a teacher who changed the trajectory of their lives. Most teachers work tirelessly, with modest pay, sometimes digging into their own pocket for school supplies, just to make a difference.

Teachers matter. So instead of bashing them or defending the status quo, let’s offer schools a deal. Give them the resources to keep good teachers on the job and reward the best ones. And in return, grant schools flexibility to teach with creativity and passion, to stop teaching to the test, and to replace teachers who just aren’t helping kids learn. That’s a bargain worth making.

We also know that when students don’t walk away from their education, more of them walk the stage to get their diploma. When students are not allowed to drop out, they do better. So tonight I am proposing that every State—every State—requires that all students stay in high school until they graduate or turn 18.
When kids do graduate, the most daunting challenge can be the cost of college. At a time when Americans owe more in tuition debt than credit card debt, this Congress needs to stop the interest rates on student loans from doubling in July.

Extend the tuition tax credit we started that saves millions of middle class families thousands of dollars and give more young people the chance to earn their way through college by doubling the number of work-study jobs in the next 5 years.

Of course, it's not enough for us to increase student aid. We can't just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we'll run out of money. States also need to do their part by making higher education a higher priority in their budgets. And colleges and universities have to do their part by working to keep costs down.

Recently, I spoke with a group of college presidents who have done just that. Some schools redesign courses to help students finish more quickly. Some use better technology. The point is, it's possible. So let me put colleges and universities on notice: If you can't stop tuition from going up, the funding you get from taxpayers will go down. Higher education can't be a luxury. It is an economic imperative that every family in America should be able to afford.

Let's also remember that hundreds of thousands of talented, hard-working students in this country face another challenge: the fact that they aren't yet American citizens. Many were brought here as small children, are American through and through, yet they live every day with the threat of deportation. Others came more recently, to study business and science and engineering, but as soon as they get their degree, we send them home to invent new products and create new jobs somewhere else. That doesn't make sense.

I believe as strongly as ever that we should take on illegal immigration. That's why my administration has put more boots on the border than ever before. That's why there are fewer illegal crossings than when I took office. The opponents of action are out of excuses. We should be working on comprehensive immigration reform right now.

But if election-year politics keeps Congress from acting on a comprehensive plan, let's at least agree to stop expelling responsible young people who want to staff our labs, start new businesses, defend this country. Send me a law that gives them the chance to earn their citizenship. I will sign it right away.

You see, an economy built to last is one where we encourage the talent and ingenuity of every person in this country. That means women should earn equal pay for equal work. It means we should support everyone who's willing to work and every risk taker and entrepreneur who aspires to become the next Steve Jobs.

After all, innovation is what America has always been about. Most new jobs are created in startups and small businesses. So let's pass an agenda that helps them succeed. Tear down regulations that prevent aspiring entrepreneurs from getting the financing to grow. Expand tax relief to small businesses that are raising wages and creating good jobs. Both parties agree on these ideas. So put them in a bill and get it on my desk this year.

Innovation also demands basic research. Today, the discoveries taking place in our federally financed labs and universities could lead to new treatments that kill cancer cells, but leave
healthy ones untouched, new lightweight vests for cops and soldiers that can stop any bullet.

Don't gut these investments in our budget. Don't let other countries win the race for the future. Support the same kind of research and innovation that led to the computer chip and the Internet, to new American jobs and new American industries.

And nowhere is the promise of innovation greater than in American-made energy. Over the last 3 years, we've opened millions of new acres for oil and gas exploration, and tonight I'm directing my administration to open more than 75 percent of our potential offshore oil and gas resources. Right now—right now—American oil production is the highest that it's been in 8 years. That's right, 8 years. Not only that, last year, we relied less on foreign oil than in any of the past 16 years.

But with only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, oil isn't enough. This country needs an all-out, all-of-the-above strategy that develops every available source of American energy, a strategy that's cleaner, cheaper, and full of new jobs.

We have a supply of natural gas that can last America nearly 100 years. And my administration will take every possible action to safely develop this energy. Experts believe this will support more than 600,000 jobs by the end of the decade. And I'm requiring all companies that drill for gas on public lands to disclose the chemicals they use. Because America will develop this resource without putting the health and safety of our citizens at risk.

The development of natural gas will create jobs and power trucks and factories that are cleaner and cheaper, proving that we don't have to choose between our environment and our economy. And by the way, it was public research dollars, over the course of 30 years, that helped develop the technologies to extract all this natural gas out of shale rock, reminding us that Government support is critical in helping businesses get new energy ideas off the ground.

Now, what's true for natural gas is just as true for clean energy. In 3 years, our partnership with the private sector has already positioned America to be the world's leading manufacturer of high-tech batteries. Because of Federal investments, renewable energy use has nearly doubled, and thousands of Americans have jobs because of it.

When Bryan Ritterby was laid off from his job making furniture, he said he worried that at 55 no one would give him a second chance. But he found work at Energetx, a wind turbine manufacturer in Michigan. Before the recession, the factory only made luxury yachts. Today, it's hiring workers like Bryan, who said, "I'm proud to be working in the industry of the future."

Our experience with shale gas, our experience with natural gas, shows us that the payoffs on these public investments don't always come right away. Some technologies don't pan out, some companies fail. But I will not walk away from the promise of clean energy. I will not walk away from workers like Bryan. I will not cede the wind or solar or battery industry to China or Germany because we refuse to make the same commitment here.

We've subsidized oil companies for a century. That's long enough. It's time to end the taxpayer giveaways to an industry that rarely has been more profitable and double down on a
clean energy industry that never has been more promising. Pass clean energy tax credits.

Create these jobs.

We can also spur energy innovation with new incentives. The differences in this Chamber may be too deep right now to pass a comprehensive plan to fight climate change. But there's no reason why Congress shouldn't at least set a clean energy standard that creates a market for innovation. So far, you haven't acted. Well, tonight I will. I'm directing my administration to allow the development of clean energy on enough public land to power 3 million homes. And I'm proud to announce that the Department of Defense, working with us, the world's largest consumer of energy, will make one of the largest commitments to clean energy in history, with the Navy purchasing enough capacity to power a quarter of a million homes a year.

Of course, the easiest way to save money is to waste less energy. So here's a proposal: Help manufacturers eliminate energy waste in their factories and give businesses incentives to upgrade their buildings. Their energy bills will be a hundred billion dollars lower over the next decade, and America will have less pollution, more manufacturing, more jobs for construction workers who need them. Send me a bill that creates these jobs.

Building this new energy future should be just one part of a broader agenda to repair America's infrastructure. So much of America needs to be rebuilt. We've got crumbling roads and bridges, a power grid that wastes too much energy, an incomplete high-speed broadband network that prevents a small-business owner in rural America from selling her products all over the world.

During the Great Depression, America built the Hoover Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge. After World War II, we connected our States with a system of highways. Democratic and Republican administrations invested in great projects that benefited everybody, from the workers who built them to the businesses that still use them today.

In the next few weeks, I will sign an Executive order clearing away the redtape that slows down too many construction projects. But you need to fund these projects. Take the money we're no longer spending at war, use half of it to pay down our debt, and use the rest to do some nation-building right here at home.

There's never been a better time to build, especially since the construction industry was one of the hardest hit when the housing bubble burst. Of course, construction workers weren't the only ones who were hurt. So were millions of innocent Americans who've seen their home values decline. And while Government can't fix the problem on its own, responsible homeowners shouldn't have to sit and wait for the housing market to hit bottom to get some relief.

And that's why I'm sending this Congress a plan that gives every responsible homeowner the chance to save about $3,000 a year on their mortgage by refinancing at historically low rates. No more redtape. No more runaround from the banks. A small fee on the largest financial institutions will ensure that it won't add to the deficit and will give those banks that were rescued by taxpayers a chance to repay a deficit of trust.

Let's never forget: Millions of Americans who work hard and play by the rules every day deserve a Government and a financial system that do the same. It's time to apply the same
rules from top to bottom. No bailouts, no handouts, and no copouts. An America built to last
insists on responsibility from everybody.

We've all paid the price for lenders who sold mortgages to people who couldn't afford them
and buyers who knew they couldn't afford them. That's why we need smart regulations to
prevent irresponsible behavior. Rules to prevent financial fraud or toxic dumping or faulty
medical devices, these don't destroy the free market. They make the free market work better.

There's no question that some regulations are outdated, unnecessary, or too costly. In fact, I've
approved fewer regulations in the first 3 years of my Presidency than my Republican
predecessor did in his. I've ordered every Federal agency to eliminate rules that don't make
sense. We've already announced over 500 reforms, and just a fraction of them will save
business and citizens more than $10 billion over the next 5 years. We got rid of one rule from
40 years ago that could have forced some dairy farmers to spend $10,000 a year proving that
they could contain a spill, because milk was somehow classified as an oil. With a rule like
that, I guess it was worth crying over spilled milk. [Laughter]

Now, I'm confident a farmer can contain a milk spill without a Federal agency looking over
his shoulder. Absolutely. But I will not back down from making sure an oil company can
contain the kind of oil spill we saw in the Gulf 2 years ago. I will not back down from
protecting our kids from mercury poisoning or making sure that our food is safe and our water
is clean. I will not go back to the days when health insurance companies had unchecked
power to cancel your policy, deny your coverage, or charge women differently than men.

And I will not go back to the days when Wall Street was allowed to play by its own set of
rules. The new rules we passed restore what should be any financial system's core purpose:
getting funding to entrepreneurs with the best ideas and getting loans to responsible families
who want to buy a home or start a business or send their kids to college.

So if you are a big bank or financial institution, you're no longer allowed to make risky bets
with your customers' deposits. You're required to write out a "living will" that details exactly
how you'll pay the bills if you fail, because the rest of us are not bailing you out ever again.
And if you're a mortgage lender or a payday lender or a credit card company, the days of
signing people up for products they can't afford with confusing forms and deceptive practices,
those days are over. Today, American consumers finally have a watchdog in Richard Cordray,
with one job: to look out for them.

We'll also establish a financial crimes unit of highly trained investigators to crack down on
large-scale fraud and protect people's investments. Some financial firms violate major
antifraud laws because there's no real penalty for being a repeat offender. That's bad for
consumers, and it's bad for the vast majority of bankers and financial service professionals
who do the right thing. So pass legislation that makes the penalties for fraud count.

And tonight I'm asking my Attorney General to create a special unit of Federal prosecutors
and leading State attorney general to expand our investigations into the abusive lending and
packaging of risky mortgages that led to the housing crisis. This new unit will hold
accountable those who broke the law, speed assistance to homeowners, and help turn the page
on an era of recklessness that hurt so many Americans.
Now, a return to the American values of fair play and shared responsibility will help protect our people and our economy. But it should also guide us as we look to pay down our debt and invest in our future.

Right now our most immediate priority is stopping a tax hike on a hundred and sixty million working Americans while the recovery is still fragile. People cannot afford losing $40 out of each paycheck this year. There are plenty of ways to get this done. So let's agree right here, right now. No side issues. No drama. Pass the payroll tax cut without delay. Let's get it done.

When it comes to the deficit, we've already agreed to more than $2 trillion in cuts and savings. But we need to do more, and that means making choices. Right now we're poised to spend nearly $1 trillion more on what was supposed to be a temporary tax break for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans. Right now because of loopholes and shelters in the Tax Code, a quarter of all millionaires pay lower tax rates than millions of middle class households. Right now Warren Buffett pays a lower tax rate than his secretary.

Do we want to keep these tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans? Or do we want to keep our investments in everything else, like education and medical research, a strong military and care for our veterans? Because if we're serious about paying down our debt, we can't do both.

The American people know what the right choice is. So do I. As I told the Speaker this summer, I'm prepared to make more reforms that rein in the long-term costs of Medicare and Medicaid and strengthen Social Security, so long as those programs remain a guarantee of security for seniors. But in return, we need to change our Tax Code so that people like me, and an awful lot of Members of Congress, pay our fair share of taxes. Tax reform should follow the Buffett rule. If you make more than a million dollars a year, you should not pay less than 30 percent in taxes. And my Republican friend Tom Coburn is right: Washington should stop subsidizing millionaires. In fact, if you're earning a million dollars a year, you shouldn't get special tax subsidies or deductions. On the other hand, if you make under $250,000 a year, like 98 percent of American families, your taxes shouldn't go up. You're the ones struggling with rising costs and stagnant wages. You're the ones who need relief.

Now, you can call this class warfare all you want. But asking a billionaire to pay at least as much as his secretary in taxes? Most Americans would call that common sense.

We don't begrudge financial success in this country. We admire it. When Americans talk about folks like me paying my fair share of taxes, it's not because they envy the rich. It's because they understand that when I get a tax break I don't need and the country can't afford, it either adds to the deficit or somebody else has to make up the difference, like a senior on a fixed income or a student trying to get through school or a family trying to make ends meet. That's not right. Americans know that's not right. They know that this generation's success is only possible because past generations felt a responsibility to each other and to the future of their country, and they know our way of life will only endure if we feel that same sense of shared responsibility. That's how we'll reduce our deficit. That's an America built to last.

Now, I recognize that people watching tonight have differing views about taxes and debt, energy and health care. But no matter what party they belong to, I bet most Americans are
thinking the same thing right about now: Nothing will get done in Washington this year or
next year or maybe even the year after that, because Washington is broken.

Can you blame them for feeling a little cynical?

The greatest blow to our confidence in our economy last year didn't come from events beyond
our control. It came from a debate in Washington over whether the United States would pay
its bills or not. Who benefited from that fiasco?

I've talked tonight about the deficit of trust between Main Street and Wall Street. But the
divide between this city and the rest of the country is at least as bad, and it seems to get worse
every year.

Now, some of this has to do with the corrosive influence of money in politics. So together,
let's take some steps to fix that. Send me a bill that bans insider trading by Members of
Congress. I will sign it tomorrow. Let's limit any elected official from owning stocks in
industries they impact. Let's make sure people who bundle campaign contributions for
Congress can't lobby Congress and vice versa, an idea that has bipartisan support, at least
outside of Washington.

Some of what's broken has to do with the way Congress does its business these days. A
simple majority is no longer enough to get anything—even routine business—passed through
the Senate. Neither party has been blameless in these tactics. Now both parties should put an
end to it. For starters, I ask the Senate to pass a simple rule that all judicial and public service
nominations receive a simple up-or-down vote within 90 days.

The executive branch also needs to change. Too often, it's inefficient, outdated, and remote.
That's why I've asked this Congress to grant me the authority to consolidate the Federal
bureaucracy so that our Government is leaner, quicker, and more responsive to the needs of
the American people.

Finally, none of this can happen unless we also lower the temperature in this town. We need
to end the notion that the two parties must be locked in a perpetual campaign of mutual
destruction, that politics is about clinging to rigid ideologies instead of building consensus
around commonsense ideas.

I'm a Democrat, but I believe what Republican Abraham Lincoln believed: That Government
should do for people only what they cannot do better by themselves and no more. That's why
my education reform offers more competition and more control for schools and States. That's
why we're getting rid of regulations that don't work. That's why our health care law relies on a
reformed private market, not a Government program.

On the other hand, even my Republican friends who complain the most about Government
spending have supported federally financed roads and clean energy projects and Federal
offices for the folks back home.

The point is, we should all want a smarter, more effective Government. And while we may
not be able to bridge our biggest philosophical differences this year, we can make real
progress. With or without this Congress, I will keep taking actions that help the economy
grow. But I can do a whole lot more with your help. Because when we act together, there's
nothing the United States of America can't achieve.

That's the lesson we've learned from our actions abroad over the last few years. Ending the
Iraq war has allowed us to strike decisive blows against our enemies. From Pakistan to
Yemen, the Al Qaida operatives who remain are scrambling, knowing that they can't escape
the reach of the United States of America.

From this position of strength, we've begun to wind down the war in Afghanistan. Ten
thousand of our troops have come home. Twenty-three thousand more will leave by the end of
this summer. This transition to Afghan lead will continue, and we will build an enduring
partnership with Afghanistan so that it is never again a source of attacks against America.

As the tide of war recedes, a wave of change has washed across the Middle East and North
Africa, from Tunis to Cairo, from Sana'a to Tripoli. A year ago, Qadhafi was one of the
world's longest serving dictators, a murderer with American blood on his hands. Today, he is
gone. And in Syria, I have no doubt that the Asad regime will soon discover that the forces of
change cannot be reversed and that human dignity cannot be denied.

How this incredible transformation will end remains uncertain. But we have a huge stake in
the outcome. And while it's ultimately up to the people of the region to decide their fate, we
will advocate for those values that have served our own country so well. We will stand
against violence and intimidation. We will stand for the rights and dignity of all human
beings: men and women; Christians, Muslims, and Jews. We will support policies that lead to
strong and stable democracies and open markets, because tyranny is no match for liberty.

And we will safeguard America's own security against those who threaten our citizens, our
friends, and our interests. Look at Iran. Through the power of our diplomacy, a world that was
once divided about how to deal with Iran's nuclear program now stands as one. The regime is
more isolated than ever before. Its leaders are faced with crippling sanctions, and as long as
they shirk their responsibilities, this pressure will not relent.

Let there be no doubt: America is determined to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon,
and I will take no options off the table to achieve that goal. But a peaceful resolution of this
issue is still possible, and far better. And if Iran changes course and meets its obligations, it
can rejoin the community of nations.

The renewal of American leadership can be felt across the globe. Our oldest alliances in
Europe and Asia are stronger than ever. Our ties to the Americas are deeper. Our ironclad
commitment—and I mean ironclad—to Israel's security has meant the closest military
cooperation between our two countries in history.

We've made it clear that America is a Pacific power, and a new beginning in Burma has lit a
new hope. From the coalitions we've built to secure nuclear materials, to the missions we've
led against hunger and disease, from the blows we've dealt to our enemies, to the enduring
power of our moral example, America is back.

Anyone who tells you otherwise, anyone who tells you that America is in decline or that our
influence has waned, doesn't know what they're talking about. That's not the message we get
from leaders around the world who are eager to work with us. That's not how people feel from Tokyo to Berlin, from Cape Town to Rio, where opinions of America are higher than they've been in years. Yes, the world is changing. No, we can't control every event. But America remains the one indispensable nation in world affairs, and as long as I'm President, I intend to keep it that way.

That's why, working with our military leaders, I've proposed a new defense strategy that ensures we maintain the finest military in the world, while saving nearly half a trillion dollars in our budget. To stay one step ahead of our adversaries, I've already sent this Congress legislation that will secure our country from the growing dangers of cyber threats.

Above all, our freedom endures because of the men and women in uniform who defend it. As they come home, we must serve them as well as they've served us. That includes giving them the care and the benefits they have earned, which is why we've increased annual VA spending every year I've been President. And it means enlisting our veterans in the work of rebuilding our Nation.

With the bipartisan support of this Congress, we're providing new tax credits to companies that hire vets. Michelle and Jill Biden have worked with American businesses to secure a pledge of 135,000 jobs for veterans and their families. And tonight I'm proposing a veterans jobs corps that will help our communities hire veterans as cops and firefighters, so that America is as strong as those who defend her.

Which brings me back to where I began. Those of us who've been sent here to serve can learn a thing or two from the service of our troops. When you put on that uniform, it doesn't matter if you're Black or White, Asian, Latino, Native American; conservative, liberal; rich, poor; gay, straight. When you're marching into battle, you look out for the person next to you or the mission fails. When you're in the thick of the fight, you rise or fall as one unit, serving one nation, leaving no one behind.

You know, one of my proudest possessions is the flag that the SEAL team took with them on the mission to get bin Laden. On it are each of their names. Some may be Democrats, some may be Republicans, but that doesn't matter. Just like it didn't matter that day in the Situation Room, when I sat next to Bob Gates, a man who was George Bush's Defense Secretary, and Hillary Clinton, a woman who ran against me for President.

All that mattered that day was the mission. No one thought about politics. No one thought about themselves. One of the young men involved in the raid later told me that he didn't deserve credit for the mission. It only succeeded, he said, because every single member of that unit did their job: the pilot who landed the helicopter that spun out of control, the translator who kept others from entering the compound, the troops who separated the women and children from the fight, the SEALs who charged up the stairs. More than that, the mission only succeeded because every member of that unit trusted each other, because you can't charge up those stairs into darkness and danger unless you know that there's somebody behind you, watching your back.

So it is with America. Each time I look at that flag, I'm reminded that our destiny is stitched together like those 50 stars and those 13 stripes. No one built this country on their own. This Nation is great because we built it together. This Nation is great because we worked as a
team. This Nation is great because we get each other's backs. And if we hold fast to that truth, in this moment of trial, there is no challenge too great, no mission too hard. As long as we are joined in common purpose, as long as we maintain our common resolve, our journey moves forward, and our future is hopeful, and the state of our Union will always be strong.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.
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Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, my fellow Americans: Today in America, a teacher spent extra time with a student who needed it and did her part to lift America's graduation rate to its highest levels in more than three decades. An entrepreneur flipped on the lights in her tech startup and did her part to add to the more than 8 million new jobs our businesses have created over the past 4 years. An autoworker fine-tuned some of the best, most fuel-efficient cars in the world and did his part to help America wean itself off foreign oil.

A farmer prepared for the spring after the strongest 5-year stretch of farm exports in our history. A rural doctor gave a young child the first prescription to treat asthma that his mother could afford. A man took the bus home from the graveyard shift, bone-tired, but dreaming big dreams for his son. And in tight-knit communities all across America, fathers and mothers will tuck in their kids, put an arm around their spouse, remember fallen comrades, and give thanks for being home from a war that after 12 long years is finally coming to an end.

Tonight this Chamber speaks with one voice to the people we represent: It is you, our citizens, who make the state of our Union strong.

And here are the results of your efforts: the lowest unemployment rate in over 5 years; a rebounding housing market; a manufacturing sector that's adding jobs for the first time since the 1990s; more oil produced at home than we buy from the rest of the world, the first time that's happened in nearly 20 years; our deficits cut by more than half. And for the first time in over a decade, business leaders around the world have declared that China is no longer the world's number-one place to invest, America is.

That's why I believe this can be a breakthrough year for America. After 5 years of grit and determined effort, the United States is better positioned for the 21st century than any other nation on Earth.

The question for everyone in this Chamber, running through every decision we make this year, is whether we are going to help or hinder this progress. For several years now, this town has been consumed by a rancorous argument over the proper size of the Federal Government. It's an important debate, one that dates back to our very founding. But when that debate prevents us from carrying out even the most basic functions of our democracy—when our differences shut down Government or threaten the full faith and credit of the United States—then we are not doing right by the American people.

Now, as President, I'm committed to making Washington work better and rebuilding the trust of the people who sent us here. And I believe most of you are too. Last month, thanks to the work of Democrats and Republicans, Congress finally produced a budget that undoes some of last year's severe cuts to priorities like education. Nobody got everything they wanted, and we can still do more to invest in this country's future while bringing down our deficit in a balanced way, but the budget compromise should leave us freer to focus on creating new jobs, not creating new crises.
And in the coming months, let's see where else we can make progress together. Let's make this a year of action. That's what most Americans want: for all of us in this Chamber to focus on their lives, their hopes, their aspirations. And what I believe unites the people of this Nation—regardless of race or region or party, young or old, rich or poor—is the simple, profound belief in opportunity for all: the notion that if you work hard and take responsibility, you can get ahead in America.

Now, let's face it, that belief has suffered some serious blows. Over more than three decades, even before the great recession hit, massive shifts in technology and global competition had eliminated a lot of good, middle class jobs and weakened the economic foundations that families depend on.

Today, after 4 years of economic growth, corporate profits and stock prices have rarely been higher, and those at the top have never done better. But average wages have barely budged. Inequality has deepened. Upward mobility has stalled. The cold, hard fact is that even in the midst of recovery, too many Americans are working more than ever just to get by, let alone to get ahead. And too many still aren't working at all.

So our job is to reverse these trends. It won't happen right away, and we won't agree on everything. But what I offer tonight is a set of concrete, practical proposals to speed up growth, strengthen the middle class, and build new ladders of opportunity into the middle class. Some require congressional action, and I am eager to work with all of you. But America does not stand still, and neither will I. So wherever and whenever I can take steps without legislation to expand opportunity for more American families, that's what I'm going to do.

As usual, our First Lady sets a good example. [Applause] Well—[applause]. Michelle's "Let's Move!" partnership with schools, businesses, local leaders has helped bring down childhood obesity rates for the first time in 30 years. And that's an achievement that will improve lives and reduce health care costs for decades to come. The Joining Forces alliance that Michelle and Jill Biden launched has already encouraged employers to hire or train nearly 400,000 veterans and military spouses.

Taking a page from that playbook, the White House just organized a College Opportunity Summit, where already, 150 universities, businesses, nonprofits have made concrete commitments to reduce inequality in access to higher education and to help every hard-working kid go to college and succeed when they get to campus. And across the country, we're partnering with mayors, Governors, and State legislatures on issues from homelessness to marriage equality.

The point is, there are millions of Americans outside of Washington who are tired of stale political arguments and are moving this country forward. They believe—and I believe—that here in America, our success should depend not on accident of birth, but the strength of our work ethic and the scope of our dreams. That's what drew our forebears here. That's how the daughter of a factory worker is CEO of America's largest automaker; how the son of a barkeep is Speaker of the House; how the son of a single mom can be President of the greatest nation on Earth.

Opportunity is who we are. And the defining project of our generation must be to restore that promise. We know where to start: The best measure of opportunity is access to a good job.
With the economy picking up speed, companies say they intend to hire more people this year. And over half of big manufacturers say they're thinking of insourcing jobs from abroad.

So let's make that decision easier for more companies. Both Democrats and Republicans have argued that our Tax Code is riddled with wasteful, complicated loopholes that punish businesses investing here and reward companies that keep profits abroad. Let's flip that equation. Let's work together to close those loopholes, end those incentives to ship jobs overseas, and lower tax rates for businesses that create jobs right here at home.

Moreover, we can take the money we save from this transition to tax reform to create jobs rebuilding our roads, upgrading our ports, unclogging our commutes, because in today's global economy, first-class jobs gravitate to first-class infrastructure. We'll need Congress to protect more than 3 million jobs by finishing transportation and waterways bills this summer. That can happen. But I'll act on my own to slash bureaucracy and streamline the permitting process for key projects so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.

We also have the chance, right now, to beat other countries in the race for the next wave of high-tech manufacturing jobs. My administration has launched two hubs for high-tech manufacturing in Raleigh, North Carolina, and Youngstown, Ohio, where we've connected businesses to research universities that can help America lead the world in advanced technologies. Tonight I'm announcing, we'll launch six more this year. Bipartisan bills in both Houses could double the number of these hubs and the jobs they create. So get those bills to my desk. Put more Americans back to work.

Let's do more to help the entrepreneurs and small-business owners who create most new jobs in America. Over the past 5 years, my administration has made more loans to small-business owners than any other. And when 98 percent of our exporters are small businesses, new trade partnerships with Europe and Asia—the Asia-Pacific will help them create more jobs. We need to work together on tools like bipartisan trade promotion authority to protect our workers, protect our environment, and open new markets to new goods stamped "Made in the U.S.A."

Listen, China and Europe aren't standing on the sidelines, and neither should we. We know that the nation that goes all-in on innovation today will own the global economy tomorrow. This is an edge America cannot surrender. Federally funded research helped lead to the ideas and inventions behind Google and smartphones. And that's why Congress should undo the damage done by last year's cuts to basic research so we can unleash the next great American discovery. There are entire industries to be built based on vaccines that stay ahead of drug-resistant bacteria or paper-thin material that's stronger than steel. And let's pass a patent reform bill that allows our businesses to stay focused on innovation, not costly and needless litigation.

Now, one of the biggest factors in bringing more jobs back is our commitment to American energy. The all-of-the-above energy strategy I announced a few years ago is working, and today, America is closer to energy independence than we have been in decades.

One of the reasons why is natural gas. If extracted safely, it's the bridge fuel that can power our economy with less of the carbon pollution that causes climate change. Businesses plan to
invest almost $100 billion in new factories that use natural gas. I'll cut redtape to help States get those factories built and put folks to work, and this Congress can help by putting people to work building fueling stations that shift more cars and trucks from foreign oil to American natural gas.

Meanwhile, my administration will keep working with the industry to sustain production and jobs growth while strengthening protection of our air, our water, our communities. And while we're at it, I'll use my authority to protect more of our pristine Federal lands for future generations.

Well, it's not just oil and natural gas production that's booming, we're becoming a global leader in solar too. Every 4 minutes, another American home or business goes solar, every panel pounded into place by a worker whose job cannot be outsourced. Let's continue that progress with a smarter tax policy that stops giving $4 billion a year to fossil fuel industries that don't need it so we can invest more in fuels of the future that do.

And even as we've increased energy production, we've partnered with businesses, builders, and local communities to reduce the energy we consume. When we rescued our automakers, for example, we worked with them to set higher fuel efficiency standards for our cars. In the coming months, I'll build on that success by setting new standards for our trucks so we can keep driving down oil imports and what we pay at the pump.

And taken together, our energy policy is creating jobs and leading to a cleaner, safer planet. Over the past 8 years, the United States has reduced our total carbon pollution more than any other nation on Earth. But we have to act with more urgency, because a changing climate is already harming Western communities struggling with drought and coastal cities dealing with floods. That's why I directed my administration to work with States, utilities, and others to set new standards on the amount of carbon pollution our power plants are allowed to dump into the air.

The shift to a cleaner energy economy won't happen overnight, and it will require some tough choices along the way. But the debate is settled. Climate change is a fact. And when our children's children look us in the eye and ask if we did all we could to leave them a safer, more stable world, with new sources of energy, I want us to be able to say, yes, we did.

Finally, if we're serious about economic growth, it is time to heed the call of business leaders, labor leaders, faith leaders, law enforcement and fix our broken immigration system. Republicans and Democrats in the Senate have acted, and I know that members of both parties in the House want to do the same. Independent economists say immigration reform will grow our economy and shrink our deficits by almost $1 trillion in the next two decades. And for good reason: When people come here to fulfill their dreams—to study, invent, contribute to our culture—they make our country a more attractive place for businesses to locate and create jobs for everybody. So let's get immigration reform done this year.

[Applause] Let's get it done. It's time.

The ideas I've outlined so far can speed up growth and create more jobs. But in this rapidly changing economy, we have to make sure that every American has the skills to fill those jobs. The good news is, we know how to do it.
Two years ago, as the auto industry came roaring back, Andra Rush opened up a manufacturing firm in Detroit. She knew that Ford needed parts for the best selling truck in America, and she knew how to make those parts. She just needed the workforce. So she dialed up what we call an American Job Center, places where folks can walk in to get the help or training they need to find a new job or a better job. She was flooded with new workers. And today, Detroit Manufacturing Systems has more than 700 employees. And what Andra and her employees experienced is how it should be for every employer and every job seeker.

So tonight I've asked Vice President Biden to lead an across-the-board reform of America's training programs to make sure they have one mission: train Americans with the skills employers need and match them to good jobs that need to be filled right now. That means more on-the-job training and more apprenticeships that set a young worker on an upward trajectory for life. It means connecting companies to community colleges that can help design training to fill their specific needs. And if Congress wants to help, you can concentrate funding on proven programs that connect more ready-to-work Americans with ready-to-be-filled jobs.

I'm also convinced we can help Americans return to the workforce faster by reforming unemployment insurance so that it's more effective in today's economy. But first, this Congress needs to restore the unemployment insurance you just let expire for 1.6 million people.

Let me tell you why. Misty DeMars is a mother of two young boys. She'd been steadily employed since she was a teenager, put herself through college. She'd never collected unemployment benefits, but she'd been paying taxes. In May, she and her husband used their life savings to buy their first home. A week later, budget cuts claimed the job she loved. Last month, when their unemployment insurance was cut off, she sat down and wrote me a letter, the kind I get every day. "We are the face of the unemployment crisis," she wrote. "I'm not dependent on the government. Our country depends on people like us who build careers, contribute to society, care about our neighbors. I'm confident that in time, I will find a job, I will pay my taxes, and we will raise our children in their own home in the community we love. Please give us this chance."

Congress, give these hard-working, responsible Americans that chance. Give them that chance. [Applause] Give them the chance. They need our help right now. But more important, this country needs them in the game. That's why I've been asking CEOs to give more long-term unemployed workers a fair shot at new jobs, a new chance to support their families. And in fact, this week, many will come to the White House to make that commitment real. Tonight I ask every business leader in America to join us and to do the same, because we are stronger when America fields a full team.

Of course, it's not enough to train today's workforce. We also have to prepare tomorrow's workforce, by guaranteeing every child access to a world-class education. Estiven Rodriguez couldn't speak a word of English when he moved to New York City at age 9. But last month, thanks to the support of great teachers and an innovative tutoring program, he led a march of his classmates through a crowd of cheering parents and neighbors from their high school to the post office, where they mailed off their college applications. And this son of a factory worker just found out, he's going to college this fall.
Five years ago, we set out to change the odds for all our kids. We worked with lenders to reform student loans, and today, more young people are earning college degrees than ever before. Race to the Top, with the help of Governors from both parties, has helped States raise expectations and performance. Teachers and principals in schools from Tennessee to Washington, DC, are making big strides in preparing students with the skills for the new economy: problem solving, critical thinking, science, technology, engineering, math.

Now, some of this change is hard. It requires everything from more challenging curriculums and more demanding parents to better support for teachers and new ways to measure how well our kids think, not how well they can fill in a bubble on a test. But it is worth it, and it is working. The problem is, we're still not reaching enough kids, and we're not reaching them in time. And that has to change.

Research shows that one of the best investments we can make in a child's life is high-quality early education. Last year, I asked this Congress to help States make high-quality pre-K available to every 4-year-old. And as a parent as well as a President, I repeat that request tonight. But in the meantime, 30 States have raised pre-K funding on their own. They know we can't wait. So just as we worked with States to reform our schools, this year, we'll invest in new partnerships with States and communities across the country in a Race to the Top for our youngest children. And as Congress decides what it's going to do, I'm going to pull together a coalition of elected officials, business leaders, and philanthropists willing to help more kids access the high-quality pre-K that they need. It is right for America. We need to get this done.

Last year, I also pledged to connect 99 percent of our students to high-speed broadband over the next 4 years. Tonight I can announce that with the support of the FCC and companies like Apple, Microsoft, Sprint, and Verizon, we've got a down payment to start connecting more than 15,000 schools and 20 million students over the next 2 years, without adding a dime to the deficit.

We're working to redesign high schools and partner them with colleges and employers that offer the real-world education and hands-on training that can lead directly to a job and career. We're shaking up our system of higher education to give parents more information and colleges more incentive to offer better value so that no middle class kid is priced out of a college education.

We're offering millions the opportunity to cap their monthly student loan payments to 10 percent of their income, and I want to work with Congress to see how we can help even more Americans who feel trapped by student loan debt. And I'm reaching out to some of America's leading foundations and corporations on a new initiative to help more young men of color facing especially tough odds to stay on track and reach their full potential.

The bottom line is, Michelle and I want every child to have the same chance this country gave us. But we know our opportunity agenda won't be complete, and too many young people entering the workforce today will see the American Dream as an empty promise, unless we also do more to make sure our economy honors the dignity of work and hard work pays off for every single American.

Today, women make up about half our workforce, but they still make 77 cents for every dollar a man earns. That is wrong, and in 2014, it's an embarrassment. Women deserve equal
pay for equal work. She deserves to have a baby without sacrificing her job. A mother
deserves a day off to care for a sick child or a sick parent without running into hardship. And
you know what, a father does too. It is time to do away with workplace policies that belong in
a "Mad Men" episode. [Laughter] This year, let's all come together—Congress, the White
House, businesses from Wall Street to Main Street—to give every woman the opportunity she
deserves. Because I believe when women succeed, America succeeds.

Now, women hold a majority of lower wage jobs, but they're not the only ones stifled by
stagnant wages. Americans understand that some people will earn more money than others,
and we don't resent those who, by virtue of their efforts, achieve incredible success. That's
what America is all about. But Americans overwhelmingly agree that no one who works full-
time should ever have to raise a family in poverty.

In the year since I asked this Congress to raise the minimum wage, five States have passed
laws to raise theirs. Many businesses have done it on their own. Nick Chute is here today with
his boss, John Soranno. John's an owner of Punch Pizza in Minneapolis, and Nick helps make
the dough. [Laughter] Only now he makes more of it. [Laughter] John just gave his
employees a raise to 10 bucks an hour, and that's a decision that has eased their financial
stress and boosted their morale.

Tonight I ask more of America's business leaders to follow John's lead: Do what you can to
raise your employees' wages. It's good for the economy. It's good for America. To every
mayor, Governor, State legislator in America, I say: You don't have to wait for Congress to
act; Americans will support you if you take this on.

And as a chief executive, I intend to lead by example. Profitable corporations like Costco see
higher wages as the smart way to boost productivity and reduce turnover. We should too. In
the coming weeks, I will issue an Executive order requiring Federal contractors to pay their
federally funded employees a fair wage of at least 10 dollars and 10 cents an hour. Because if
you cook our troops' meals or wash their dishes, you should not have to live in poverty.

Of course, to reach millions more, Congress does need to get on board. Today, the Federal
minimum wage is worth about 20 percent less than it was when Ronald Reagan first stood
here. And Tom Harkin and George Miller have a bill to fix that by lifting the minimum wage
to 10 dollars and 10 cents. It's easy to remember: 10-10. This will help families. It will give
businesses customers with more money to spend. It does not involve any new bureaucratic
program. So join the rest of the country. Say yes. Give America a raise. Give them a raise.

There are other steps we can take to help families make ends meet, and few are more effective
at reducing inequality and helping families pull themselves up through hard work than the
earned-income tax credit. Right now it helps about half of all parents at some point. Think
about that: It helps about half of all parents in America at some point in their lives. But I agree
with Republicans like Senator Rubio that it doesn't do enough for single workers who don't
have kids. So let's work together to strengthen the credit, reward work, help more Americans
get ahead.

Let's do more to help Americans save for retirement. Today, most workers don't have a
pension. A Social Security check often isn't enough on its own. And while the stock market
has doubled over the last 5 years, that doesn't help folks who don't have 401(k)s. That's why,
tomorrow, I will direct the Treasury to create a new way for working Americans to start their own retirement savings: MyI—MyRA.

It's a new savings bond that encourages folks to build a nest egg. MyRA guarantees a decent return with no risk of losing what you put in. And if this Congress wants to help, work with me to fix an upside-down Tax Code that gives big tax breaks to help the wealthy save, but does little or nothing for middle class Americans. Offer every American access to an automatic IRA on the job so they can save at work just like everybody in this Chamber can.

And since the most important investment many families make is their home, send me legislation that protects taxpayers from footing the bill for a housing crisis ever again and keeps the dream of homeownership alive for future generations.

One last point on financial security: For decades, few things exposed hard-working families to economic hardship more than a broken health care system. And in case you haven't heard, we're in the process of fixing that. Now, a preexisting condition used to mean that someone like Amanda Shelley, a physician's assistant and single mom from Arizona, couldn't get health insurance. But on January 1, she got covered. On January 3, she felt a sharp pain. On January 6, she had emergency surgery. Just one week earlier, Amanda said, and that surgery would have meant bankruptcy.

That's what health insurance reform is all about: the peace of mind that if misfortune strikes, you don't have to lose everything. Already, because of the Affordable Care Act, more than 3 million Americans under age 26 have gained coverage under their parent's plan. More than 9 million Americans have signed up for private health insurance or Medicaid coverage. Nine million.

And here's another number: zero. Because of this law, no American—none, zero—can ever again be dropped or denied coverage for a preexisting condition like asthma or back pain or cancer. No woman can ever be charged more just because she's a woman. And we did all this while adding years to Medicare's finances, keeping Medicare premiums flat, and lowering prescription costs for millions of seniors.

Now, I do not expect to convince my Republican friends on the merits of this law. [Laughter] But I know that the American people are not interested in refighting old battles. So again, if you have specific plans to cut costs, cover more people, increase choice, tell America what you'd do differently. Let's see if the numbers add up. But let's not have another 40-something votes to repeal a law that's already helping millions of Americans like Amanda. The first 40 were plenty. [Laughter]

We all owe it to the American people to say what we're for, not just what we're against. And if you want to know the real impact this law is having, just talk to Governor Steve Beshear of Kentucky, who's here tonight. Now, Kentucky is not the most liberal part of the country. That's not where I got my highest vote totals. [Laughter] But he's like a man possessed when it comes to covering his Commonwealth's families. They're our neighbors and our friends, he said: "They're people we shop and go to church with, farmers out on the tractor, grocery clerks. They're people who go to work every morning praying they don't get sick. No one deserves to live that way."
Steve's right. That's why tonight I ask every American who knows someone without health insurance to help them get covered by March 31. [Applause] Help them get covered. Moms, get on your kids to sign up. Kids, call your mom and walk her through the application. It will give her some peace of mind, and plus, she'll appreciate hearing from you. [Laughter]

After all, that's the spirit that has always moved this Nation forward. It's the spirit of citizenship, the recognition that through hard work and responsibility, we can pursue our individual dreams, but still come together as one American family to make sure the next generation can pursue its dreams as well.

Citizenship means standing up for everyone's right to vote. Last year, part of the Voting Rights Act was weakened, but conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats are working together to strengthen it. And the bipartisan Commission I appointed, chaired by my campaign lawyer and Governor Romney's campaign lawyer, came together and have offered reforms so that no one has to wait more than a half hour to vote. Let's support these efforts. It should be the power of our vote, not the size of our bank accounts, that drives our democracy.

Citizenship means standing up for the lives that gun violence steals from us each day. I've seen the courage of parents, students, pastors, police officers all over this country who say, "We are not afraid." And I intend to keep trying, with or without Congress, to help stop more tragedies from visiting innocent Americans in our movie theaters, in our shopping malls, or schools like Sandy Hook.

Citizenship demands a sense of common purpose, participation in the hard work of self-government, an obligation to serve our communities. And I know this Chamber agrees that few Americans give more to their country than our diplomats and the men and women of the United States Armed Forces. Thank you. Tonight, because of the extraordinary troops and civilians who risk and lay down their lives to keep us free, the United States is more secure. When I took office, nearly 180,000 Americans were serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today, all our troops are out of Iraq. More than 60,000 of our troops have already come home from Afghanistan. With Afghan forces now in the lead for their own security, our troops have moved to a support role. Together with our allies, we will complete our mission there by the end of this year, and America's longest war will finally be over.

After 2014, we will support a unified Afghanistan as it takes responsibility for its own future. If the Afghan Government signs a security agreement that we have negotiated, a small force of Americans could remain in Afghanistan with NATO allies to carry out two narrow missions: training and assisting Afghan forces and counterterrorism operations to pursue any remnants of Al Qaida. For while our relationship with Afghanistan will change, one thing will not: our resolve that terrorists do not launch attacks against our country.

The fact is, that danger remains. While we've put Al Qaida's core leadership on a path to defeat, the threat has evolved as Al Qaida affiliates and other extremists take root in different parts of the world. In Yemen, Somalia, Iraq, Mali, we have to keep working with partners to disrupt and disable those networks. In Syria, we'll support the opposition that rejects the agenda of terrorist networks. Here at home, we'll keep strengthening our defenses and combat new threats like cyber attacks. And as we reform our defense budget, we will have to keep faith with our men and women in uniform and invest in the capabilities they need to succeed in future missions.
We have to remain vigilant. But I strongly believe our leadership and our security cannot depend on our outstanding military alone. As Commander in Chief, I have used force when needed to protect the American people, and I will never hesitate to do so as long as I hold this office. But I will not send our troops into harm's way unless it is truly necessary, nor will I allow our sons and daughters to be mired in open-ended conflicts. We must fight the battles that need to be fought, not those that terrorists prefer from us: large-scale deployments that drain our strength and may ultimately feed extremism.

So even as we actively and aggressively pursue terrorist networks through more targeted efforts and by building the capacity of our foreign partners, America must move off a permanent war footing. That's why I've imposed prudent limits on the use of drones. For we will not be safer if people abroad believe we strike within their countries without regard for the consequence.

That's why, working with this Congress, I will reform our surveillance programs, because the vital work of our intelligence community depends on public confidence, here and abroad, that privacy of ordinary people is not being violated.

And with the Afghan war ending, this needs to be the year Congress lifts the remaining restrictions on detainee transfers and we close the prison at Guantanamo Bay. Because we counter terrorism not just through intelligence and military actions, but by remaining true to our constitutional ideals and setting an example for the rest of the world.

You see, in a world of complex threats, our security, our leadership, depends on all elements of our power, including strong and principled diplomacy. American diplomacy has rallied more than 50 countries to prevent nuclear materials from falling into the wrong hands and allowed us to reduce our own reliance on cold war stockpiles. American diplomacy, backed by the threat of force, is why Syria's chemical weapons are being eliminated.

And we will continue to work with the international community to usher in the future the Syrian people deserve, a future free of dictatorship, terror, and fear. As we speak, American diplomacy is supporting Israelis and Palestinians as they engage in the difficult but necessary talks to end the conflict there, to achieve dignity and an independent state for Palestinians and lasting peace and security for the State of Israel, a Jewish state that knows America will always be at their side.

And it is American diplomacy, backed by pressure, that has halted the progress of Iran's nuclear program and rolled back parts of that program for the very first time in a decade. As we gather here tonight, Iran has begun to eliminate its stockpile of higher levels of enriched uranium. It's not installing advanced centrifuges. Unprecedented inspections help the world verify every day that Iran is not building a bomb. And with our allies and partners, we're engaged in negotiations to see if we can peacefully achieve a goal we all share: preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

These negotiations will be difficult. They may not succeed. We are clear eyed about Iran's support for terrorist organizations like Hizballah, which threatens our allies. And we're clear about the mistrust between our nations, mistrust that cannot be wished away. But these negotiations don't rely on trust. Any long-term deal we agree to must be based on verifiable action that convinces us and the international community that Iran is not building a nuclear
If John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan could negotiate with the Soviet Union, then surely a strong and confident America can negotiate with less powerful adversaries today.

The sanctions that we put in place helped make this opportunity possible. But let me be clear: if Iran's leaders do not seize this opportunity, then I will be the first to call for more sanctions and stand ready to exercise all options to make sure Iran does not build a nuclear weapon. But if Iran's leaders do seize the chance—and we'll know soon enough—then Iran could take an important step to rejoin the community of nations, and we will have resolved one of the leading security challenges of our time without the risks of war.

Now, finally, let's remember that our leadership is defined not just by our defense against threats, but by the enormous opportunities to do good and promote understanding around the globe: to forge greater cooperation, to expand new markets, to free people from fear and want. And no one is better positioned to take advantage of those opportunities than America.

Our alliance with Europe remains the strongest the world has ever known. From Tunisia to Burma, we're supporting those who are willing to do the hard work of building democracy. In Ukraine, we stand for the principle that all people have the right to express themselves freely and peacefully and to have a say in their country's future. Across Africa, we're bringing together businesses and governments to double access to electricity and help end extreme poverty. In the Americas, we're building new ties of commerce, but we're also expanding cultural and educational exchanges among young people. And we will continue to focus on the Asia-Pacific, where we support our allies, shape a future of greater security and prosperity, and extend a hand to those devastated by disaster, as we did in the Philippines, when our Marines and civilians rushed to aid those battered by a typhoon, and who were greeted with words like, "We will never forget your kindness" and "God bless America."

We do these things because they help promote our long-term security, and we do them because we believe in the inherent dignity and equality of every human being, regardless of race or religion, creed or sexual orientation. And next week, the world will see one expression of that commitment, when Team U.S.A. marches the red, white, and blue into the Olympic Stadium and brings home the gold. [Laughter]


The President. My fellow Americans, no other country in the world does what we do. On every issue, the world turns to us, not simply because of the size of our economy or our military might, but because of the ideals we stand for and the burdens we bear to advance them. No one knows this better than those who serve in uniform.

As this time of war draws to a close, a new generation of heroes returns to civilian life. We'll keep slashing that backlog so our veterans receive the benefits they've earned and our wounded warriors receive the health care—including the mental health care—that they need. We'll keep working to help all our veterans translate their skills and leadership into jobs here at home. And we will all continue to join forces to honor and support our remarkable military families.
Let me tell you about one of those families I’ve come to know. I first met Cory Remsburg, a
proud Army Ranger, at Omaha Beach on the 65th anniversary of D-day. Along with some of
his fellow Rangers, he walked me through the program and the ceremony. He was a strong,
impressive young man, had an easy manner, he was sharp as a tack. And we joked around and
took pictures, and I told him to stay in touch.

A few months later, on his 10th deployment, Cory was nearly killed by a massive roadside
bomb in Afghanistan. His comrades found him in a canal, face down, underwater, shrapnel in
his brain. For months, he lay in a coma. And the next time I met him, in the hospital, he
couldn’t speak, could barely move. Over the years, he’s endured dozens of surgeries and
procedures, hours of grueling rehab every day.

Even now, Cory is still blind in one eye, still struggles on his left side. But slowly, steadily,
with the support of caregivers like his dad Craig and the community around him, Cory has
grown stronger. And day by day, he’s learned to speak again and stand again and walk again.
And he’s working toward the day when he can serve his country again. "My recovery has not
been easy," he says. "Nothing in life that's worth anything is easy." Cory is here tonight. And
like the Army he loves, like the America he serves, Sergeant First Class Cory Remsburg
never gives up, and he does not quit. Cory.

My fellow Americans, men and women like Cory remind us that America has never come
easy. Our freedom, our democracy, has never been easy. Sometimes, we stumble, we make
mistakes; we get frustrated or discouraged. But for more than 200 years, we have put those
things aside and placed our collective shoulder to the wheel of progress: to create and build
and expand the possibilities of individual achievement, to free other nations from tyranny and
fear, to promote justice and fairness and equality under the law so that the words set to paper
by our Founders are made real for every citizen. The America we want for our kids—a rising
America where honest work is plentiful and communities are strong, where prosperity is
widely shared and opportunity for all lets us go as far as our dreams and toil will take us—
none of it is easy. But if we work together—if we summon what is best in us, the way Cory
summoned what is best in him—with our feet planted firmly in today, but our eyes cast
toward tomorrow, I know it is within our reach. Believe it.

God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.