Conceptual Metaphors of War in News Reports Covering the 2003 Invasion of Iraq by *The New York Times* and *The Daily Star*

Farah Sabbah

Lancaster University, Lancaster

Abstract

This study aims to demonstrate how politically conflicting parties cognitively perceive war through the use of conceptual metaphors of [WAR] which are in turn adopted by journalists in their reporting of a conflict. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) introduced conceptual metaphors as cognitive processes that are commonplace, inescapable and rooted deep into our cognitive unconscious. Unlike our traditional understanding of metaphors, a conceptual metaphor is cognitive, not linguistic. This study analyzes and compares the use of conceptual metaphors of war found in 90 news reports taken from two English Language newspapers, *The New York Times,* which is published in the United States of America, and *The Daily Star,* which is published in Lebanon. The news reports are analyzed using conceptual metaphors of war and more specifically their metaphorical entailment identified by Lakoff as [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR]. This study concludes that though the two newspapers are reporting the same events, there are discrepancies in the way the participants in this war (the coalition, Saddam Hussein's government, and the Iraqi people) are conceptualized across the prewar, war, and postwar period.

1 Introduction

The aim of this study is to illustrate how cognition shapes the way we express our understanding of the goings-on in the world around us via language. A massive volume of studies from various disciplines demonstrates that, due to human nature and the nature of news itself, the mass media simply cannot provide a perspective that is totally free from subjective interpretations of events (Curren, 2002; Fairclough, 1995; Fowler, 1991; Hartley, 1990; Stocking & Gross, 1989; Willis, 2003). In fact, Fairclough (1995) argues that news is seen as operating within a social system. Parts of our cognition interact with our social environment, allowing us to understand and express events through language (Lakoff, 1992, 1995; Lakoff, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). In this study, 90 news reports appearing in two English language newspapers, *The New York Times,* published in The United States of America, and *The Daily Star*, published in Lebanon are selected and analyzed in order to identify the conceptual metaphors used for constructions of events and its participants in news reports covering the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

Many linguists, including critical discourse analysts, have been particularly interested in metaphor as a powerful rhetorical strategy in political media discourse (Billig & Macmillan, 2005; Charteris-Black, 2004; Chilton, 2004; Chilton & Schäffner, 2002; Chilton & Ilyin, 1993; Lakoff, 1992, 1995, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Scheithauer, 2007; Semino, 2008; Semino & Masci, 1996). Chilton (2005) argues that in order for critical discourse analysis (CDA) to take a more explanatory stance rather than a solely descriptive one, it should be best to introduce the cognitive dimension. This study illustrates how one of the research components within the cognitive framework, conceptual metaphor theory, can at least partially explain why reported events are constructed in a particular manner. In order to do so, this study uses conceptual metaphors, which deal with the categories and concepts that fill our mental space and provide a mental representation of our experience (Chilton & Schäffner, 2002; Lakoff, 1992, 1995, 2002; van Dijk, 2006). Conceptual metaphors as presented by Lakoff (1992, 1995, 2002) and Lakoff and Johnson (1980) are based on the premise that cognitive abilities are not completely reliant on language. Instead, language reflects the way we understand and experience the world through understanding a particular concept in terms of another, hence the term "metaphor" (Croft & Cruse, 2004).

The significance of the study is that it aims to analyze and compare the news reports of two newspapers which are published in geographically, culturally, and socially different parts of the world. Furthermore, the study analyzes the coverage of the same international event, which allows us to identify the similarities and differences between newspapers across the

world. The present study also contributes to the growing literature on metaphor in the construction of events and their participants in the news media.

This paper is organized as follows: section II will define conceptual metaphors and present the narratives that result from the use of certain WAR metaphors. These are the metaphors of WAR that emerge from this text analysis of news reports. Section III will present the collection of news reports that are analyzed. This is followed by section IV which presents and compares the findings of the analysis in addition to discussing the use of [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR] metaphor in these news reports. Finally, I conclude with a general summary of the major findings of this study.

2 Conceptual Metaphors of War

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) introduced 'metaphors' as cognitive processes that are commonplace, inescapable, and rooted deep in our cognitive unconscious. As Lakoff (1992) states in his article *Metaphor and War,* "indeed, there is an extensive, and mostly unconscious, system of metaphor that we use automatically and unreflectively to understand complexities and abstractions". Unlike our traditional understanding of metaphors, a conceptual metaphor is cognitive, not linguistic. The mind allows us to understand a concept such as [LOVE], [TIME], and [ARGUMENT] by relating it to certain characteristics of another concept. For example, [ARGUMENT] is mapped unto [WAR] where such a conceptual mapping makes some potential entailments, e.g.: **speakers** correspond to **soldiers**, **evidence** corresponds to **weapons**, and **convincing/not convincing** corresponds to **victory/defeat** in battle. This conceptual mapping leads us to produce linguistic utterances like: "he **defended** his point of view", "he **laid down** his evidence", "he **cornered** him", and "he **won** the debate". This study uses metaphors suggested by Lakoff (1991) which pertain to war because the news reports cover the events of the war against Iraq in 2003. The conceptual metaphors pertaining to war will provide an understanding of how journalists of *The New York Times* (NYT) and *The Daily Star* (DS) construct the events of the war against Iraq in 2003 based on these shared conceptual metaphors.

The research question that this study discusses in terms of conceptual metaphors is: how do The New York Times and The Daily Star categorize the participants in the war according to [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR]?

3 The Data

This study analyzes 45 news reports from each newspaper, which makes a total of 90 news reports that cover the war in three stages: the period representing the preparations and negotiations for war (August 2002-February 2003), the events during the war (March 2003-April 2003), and the aftermath beginning from the fall of Saddam until his capture (May 2003- December 15[37], 2003). The news reports from *The New York Times* (NYT) were retrieved from the Lexis-Nexis online database, and the news reports from *The Daily Star* (DS) were stored in the archives of the Jafet library at the American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon in the form of microfilm. The news reports were collected in two phases: first, the keywords "Iraq" and "war" with the dates between August 2002 and December 15, 2003 were used to retrieve all the reports that cover the Iraqi war in 2003 from *The New York Times.* Similarly, all the news reports covering the Iraqi war of 2003 from *The Daily Star* were collected from the same time period based on the same keywords[38]. The second phase was to select the reports from both newspapers which covered exactly the same event, to make sure that each report from *The New York Times* had an equivalent report published in *The Daily Star*. The total number of reports was 45 reports for each newspaper. Of course, this selection left out the news reports published by *The Daily Star* which reported events that *The New York Times* did not and vice versa.

4 [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR]: Settling the Moral Account

In principle, a war usually needs to be morally justified. Therefore, a definition of morality according to Lakoff (2002) is required to understand the way people define what is morally good and what is morally bad. According to Lakoff (1992), one of the ways morality is conceptualized is by considering it a matter of keeping the moral books balanced. A wrongdoer, 'criminal', or 'sinner' must settle the moral books by giving back what has been taken, recompensing, or being punished. Justice, therefore, is the balancing of books.

---

[37] December 15, 2003 is the day Saddam Hussein was captured. I decided to consider this date the end point of the period that this data covers.

[38] *The Daily Star* did not have correspondents reporting the events in Iraq. It relied on agencies such as Reuters for information and then compiled the information from various agencies to prepare its news story. That was not the case with *The New York Times* which had journalists who were embedded in the army. That is why the news reports published by *The New York Times* had more coverage about military operations and combat.

The West usually presents the wrongdoer as someone who must "pay for his/her debt to society" to settle moral accounts (Lakoff, 1992). If the wrongdoer refuses to settle his moral account, then a [HERO] must step up and go after the criminal to give back to the affected party what has been taken from them. Whether this conceptualization of morality is universal or not remains an area that requires further investigation. To investigate whether a conceptual metaphor is universal or not, a researcher will need to see whether or not it exists in other typologically unrelated languages (Kövecses, 2010). Since this study only analyzes news reports in English, the issue of universality is not very relevant to the research question that this study addresses.

In the context of war, the moral accounting metaphor entails what is referred to as [THE CLASSIC FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR]. After analyzing statements made by American officials (most notably the President) regarding the Gulf War in 1991, Lakoff (1992) identifies the characters of the fairy tale. The metaphor [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR] has a cast of characters that include: a [VILLAIN], a [VICTIM], and a [HERO]. Each of these characters has certain attributes. For example, the [HERO] is moral, courageous, rational, unwilling to negotiate with villains, and compelled to defend the [VICTIM]. The [VICTIM] is the innocent character who is living in the shadow of the evil [VILLAIN], enduring his/her cruel treatment. In Lakoff's analysis of the Gulf war, The United States is supposedly the one who fits the profile of the [HERO]. The [VILLAIN], in this case Iraq, on the other hand, is amoral, vicious, irrational, and may be cunning and calculating; therefore, one cannot negotiate with the [VILLAIN].

Lakoff (1992) then narrates the typical scenario of [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR] which begins with the villain who has committed a crime against an innocent victim. This crime creates an imbalance of power and a moral imbalance. That is when a hero comes along to face the villain either alone or by bringing in some help. Typically, the journey to reach the villain is difficult and requires much sacrifice, yet the hero finally reaches the inherently evil villain and they fight. The hero defeats the villain and rescues the victim. That is when the moral balance is restored and victory is achieved, proving that the hero's sacrifices were worthwhile. The victim and the community honor and thank the hero.

To find out how the NYT and DS categorize the main parties involved in the war in addition to the relationship between them, the texts are analyzed to see how the United States, Saddam Hussein, and the Iraqi people are cast in the scenarios presented by *The New York Times* and *The Daily Star*. I read the articles to follow the events of the war and see if what is being reported in *The New York Times* and *The Daily Star* conforms to [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR]. Then, I selected statements and quotes present in the news report that

signal the kind of relationships that the American-led coalition, Saddam Hussein and his government, and Iraqi citizens have.

The news reports of *The New York Times* mainly show that this war is necessary because it is a matter of good versus evil:

> *(1) "Those who have lived through a struggle of good against evil are never neutral between them," Mr. Bush said (November 21, 2002, The New York Times).*

In *The Daily Star's* news report covering the same event and published on the same day, Bush was not quoted as describing the conflict between the coalition forces and Iraq as a matter of good and evil, but only inserted quotes by Bush that accuse Saddam Hussein of being dangerous and deceiving:

> *(2) He [Bush] said "Should he again deny that this arsenal exists, he will have entered his final stage with a lie, and deception this time will not be tolerated. Delay and defiance will invite the severest consequences" (November 21, 2002, The Daily Star).*

In reporting this event, *The New York Times* seems to do a better job than *The Daily Star* in activating [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR] since it included a quote that not only portrays Saddam in a negative light but also describes the whole nature of the conflict as being good against evil.

After identifying [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR] in the news reports, the following questions ought to be answered:

1. Who is the hero?

2. Who is the villain?

3. Who is the victim?

4. What is the crime?

5. What counts as victory?

The characters in this fairy tale are asymmetrical. The [HERO] is moral and courageous, while the [VILLAIN] is amoral and vicious. The [HERO] in these news reports is the coalition forces led by the United States and Britain, whereas the [VILLAIN] is Saddam Hussein and his Baathist party. I found it inappropriate to label Iraq as the [VILLAIN] as was done in previous

studies (Bates, 2004; Lakoff, 1992). Instead, it would be more accurate in this context (i.e. the Iraqi War of 2003) to label Saddam Hussein as the [VILLAIN] because one of the arguments that were used to justify the war was that the coalition forces were rescuing the innocent Iraqi people from the dictator Saddam Hussein and his "regime". However, Iraq, as a state, is sometimes used to refer to Saddam Hussein due to the [STATE-AS-PERSON] metaphor. Therefore, it was crucial to recognize the instances when the word 'Iraq' is used to refer to the Iraqi people and when the word refers to the Iraqi *government* and ultimately Saddam Hussein.

In-depth qualitative analyses of the news reports suggests that President George W. Bush used two scenarios for justifying the war:

> *(3)   At the end of the meeting, the official said, Mr. Bush gave the go-ahead to the commanders to begin the war at the time they judged best, saying, "For the peace of the world and benefit and freedom of the Iraqi people, I hereby give the order to execute Operation Iraqi Freedom. May God bless the troops." (March 21, 2003,* The New York Times*).*

This war is justified as being for the sake of both the world (self-defense) and the Iraqi people (saving the victims) who have been tortured and segregated by the "evil tyrant" that is Saddam Hussein. The 'Operation Iraqi Freedom' (example 3) reflects what this war is all about: freeing Iraq of the terrorizing dictator. In order to convince the American public of the necessity of sending troops to Iraq, President Bush had to use the self-defense scenario embodied in the search for the weapons of mass destruction.

After justifying the war, each party involved, that is, the coalition led by the United States, Saddam Hussein and his government, and Iraq were labeled as the typical fairy tale characters in the just war.

 [HERO]

The [HERO] character is a moral, courageous and rational character who believes in justice and liberty. He/she exists in asymmetry to the [VILLAIN]'s characteristics. Therefore, because the [VILLAIN] is immoral and irrational, the [HERO] finds that it is his/her responsibility to rescue the victim from the atrocities laid upon by the [VILLAIN]. In an attempt to draw more allies that can further strengthen the [HERO], President Bush asserted that Europe had an obligation to protect its people from imminent threat. When France expressed its hesitation to give its consent to the resolution that allowed war to be waged

against Iraq, President Bush mentioned some of the characteristics of the [HERO] in this scenario:

> *(4)* *"If they're unable to do so, the United States and our friends will act because we believe in peace, we want to keep the peace, we don't trust this man and that's what the Blair report showed today"* Bush said *(September 25, 2002,* The Daily Star*).*

> *(5)* *"We have an urgent duty to prevent the worst from occurring"* *(October 8, 2002,* The New York Times*).*

The European countries (except for France and Russia) and The United States represent what Lakoff (1992) referred to as the [HERO] who is supposed to fight the evil [VILLAIN].

Eventually, after much pressure on the United States to seek alternatives other than war to resolve this problem, President Bush found that there was no other option but to disarm the Iraqi Baathist government by force for it is the [HERO]'s duty to do what is in the best interest of his nation and the victim:

> *(6)* *"So far I haven't seen any evidence that he is disarming. Time is running out on Saddam Hussein; he must disarm,"* said the US leader, who has vowed to lead a *"coalition of the willing"* to disarm Baghdad by force if necessary *(January 15, 2003,* The Daily Star*).*

The Bush administration argued that they could not elide the imminent threat that was approaching them. They had the power to turn things around:

> *(7)* *Now, he said, "we do have the power to write a different story for our time." (November 21, 2002,* The New York Times*).*

That is why on March 21 2003, NYT and DS reported Mr. Bush's decision to launch the war against Iraq. Coalition forces, led by the United States, launched Operation Iraqi Freedom in order to rescue the Iraqi people from this villain. During the war, both newspapers, especially the NYT mentioned the reactions of the Iraqi people.

There were statements quoted in the reports that reflected a positive perception of the coalition as being the Iraqi people's saviors:

> *(8)* *To be asked your nationality, and to answer American or British, is to hear the same response again and again: "America good," "Britain good,"*

often accompanied by raised thumbs, a broad smile and a wrist-wrenching handshake (October 15 2002, The New York Times*).*

In April, President Bush made a statement that declared the coalition forces victorious for they had successfully ousted the Baathist "regime" and set the victims free:

(9)   In his television address to Iraqis, Bush said: "A long era of fear and cruelty is ending…You deserve better than tyranny and corruption and torture chambers. You deserve to live as free people" (April 11, 2003, The Daily Star*).*

The capturing and killing of Oday and Qusay, Saddam Hussein's sons, is another example of the reported events that give the coalition a 'heroic' image. The display of their bodies was a reminder and reassurance to Iraqis that the Hussein family was no longer a threat. As US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld announced:

(10)   "The brutal careers of Odai and Qusai Hussein came to an end, sending a very clear signal to the Iraqis that the Hussein family is finished and will not be returning to terrorize them again" (July 26, 2003, The Daily Star*).*

A comparison of example (10) with the lead sentences that were published in NYT for the same story shows that the NYT emphasizes the negative results of the war during the postwar period:

(11)   American officials displayed the corpses of Uday and Qusay Hussein for a group of journalists today, acknowledging that American morticians had reconstructed their faces with putty and cosmetically repaired wounds the men had sustained in a shootout on Tuesday.

The purpose of displaying the cleaned-up bodies, which were shown on Iraqi television, was to help convince a skeptical Iraqi public that the men killed were indeed the Hussein brothers. The release of photographs on Thursday showing the bloodied faces of the men was met by widespread suspicion across Iraq (July 26, 2003, The New York Times*).*

(12)   The US-led coalition in Iraq showed off the bullet-riddled corpses of Saddam Hussein's two since Friday, anxious to banish any doubt that the notorious brothers had been killed by US forces (July 26, 2003, The Daily Star*).*

Statements (11) and (12) show that though the metaphor of the [HERO] was maintained all throughout the corpus, in the postwar period, the NYT reports started to emphasize the negative side-effects of the war in addition to being more critical of the coalition forces and especially the US forces. This is revealed in the story of the corpse display of Uday and Qusay, Hussein's two sons, where you have a [HERO] who is trying to reassure the [VICTIM] that the [VILLAIN] has been defeated. In (12), DS personifies "doubt" and describes it metaphorically as being banished for "doubt" in the abilities of the US forces does not fit the characteristics of the [HERO]. In fact, "doubt" as is personified here can be analyzed as being an enemy of the [HERO]. Unlike the DS, however, the NYT do not use words to modify the US forces but to describe the Iraqi people. The Iraqi people in (11) are described as being "skeptical". The *struggle* or *urgency* to maintain the image of the [HERO] in (12) published in DS appears to be stronger than in (11) published in NYT. This example is among several where NYT does not properly adhere to the characteristics of the [HERO] which is embodied in the United States government by highlighting negative characteristics or action taken by them:

> *(13)   In a virtual power vacuum, with the relationship between American military and civilian authority seeming ill defined, new political parties, Kurds and Shiite religious groups are asserting virtual governmental authority in cities and villages across the country, sometimes right under the noses of American soldiers (May 3, 2003,* The New York Times*).*

> *(14)   "The Iraqi people have always been prepared for freedom," he [S.S. Nadir, a prominent art critic in Baghdad] said. "But we need help and we are not sure the Americans can provide that" (May 3, 2003,* The New York Times*).*

As examples (13) and (14) illustrate, the atrocities of the war were very evident to the NYT journalists, and they placed some responsibility for the power vacuum on the coalition forces, who are supposed to be running the country. The reason NYT ceased to use the characteristics of the [HERO] is possibly because in the eyes of the NYT journalists, these characteristics do not fully apply to the United States government during the postwar period. On the other hand, one may argue that the [HERO]'s role ends when he/she defeats the [VILLAIN]. Therefore, the plot of [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR] does not really continue after that. Still, portraying the United States government negatively has its implication about what the attitude of the NYT is towards the coalition forces during the postwar period.

As people started raising questions about the postwar plan, many statements from US military officials were nevertheless reported in NYT in their defense:

(15) "Look, it can't be fun to be occupied," he said. "And it's not very much fun, frankly, being an occupying power. But the fact is, life is much better for the Iraqis today than it was six months and much better than it was a year ago. And they know that."(October 27, 2003, The New York Times*).*

Then finally, on December 15, 2003, coalition troops in Iraq finally caught the 'fearsome dictator' Saddam Hussein:

(16) "Ladies and gentlemen, we got him," senior US administrator Paul Bremer told a news conference in Baghdad. "The tyrant is a prisoner" (December 15, 2003, The Daily Star*).*

The capture of Saddam Hussein was certainly a boost for the Bush administration. They proved that they could reach their objectives for they were able to overthrow the [VILLAIN] Saddam Hussein and his Baathist ruling party. The corpus shows that NYT and DS present the [VILLAIN] with certain characteristics that make it evil. So what is the United States standing up against?

 [VILLAIN]

Lakoff (1992) describes the [VILLAIN] as an evil character. You cannot negotiate with the villain because, unlike the [HERO], he/she is immoral, vicious, and may be cunning and calculating. Therefore, the [HERO] has no choice but to fight him/her. The qualitative analysis of the news reports of both newspapers identified statements and quotes that show that Saddam Hussein generally fits the profile. News reports from the NYT and DS focus not only on his evil nature, but also on his irrationality which makes him/her even more of a threat.

<u>*An evil man*</u>. The Bush administration declared after the September 11 attacks that it would lead a war against terrorism in the world. Its first target was Iraq because the coalition forces had reason to believe that the Baathist "regime" was manufacturing or had plans to manufacture weapons of mass destruction. During the prewar period that is analyzed in this corpus (September 2002 to March 2003), Mr. Bush and his allies attempted to convince world leaders of Saddam's evil nature:

(17) "Facing clear evidence or peril, we cannot wait for the final proof -- the smoking gun -- that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud." He continued, "Understanding the threats of our time, knowing the designs and deceptions of the Iraqi regime, we have every reason to assume the worst, and we have an urgent duty to prevent the worst from occurring"(October 8, 2002, The New York Times*).*

When examining the corpus closely, statements made by President Bush and the journalists of NYT and DS illustrate the way the former President of Iraq Saddam Hussein fits the profile of the evil [VILLAIN] well:

> *(18) "He has poisoned his people before, he has poisoned his neighborhood. He is willing to use weapons of mass destruction. And the prime minister continued to make the case, and so will I" (September 25, 2002,* The Daily Star*).*

> *(19) "Tens of thousands of political opponents and ordinary citizens have been subjected to arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, summary execution, and torture by beating and burning, electric shock, starvation, mutilation and rape," he said. "Wives are tortured in front of their husbands, children in the presence of their parents -- and all of these horrors concealed from the world by the apparatus of a totalitarian state" (October 8, 2002,* The New York Times*).*

> *(20) He added, "He blames the suffering of Iraq's people on the United Nations, even as he uses his oil wealth to build lavish palaces for himself, and to buy arms for his country" (October 8, 2002,* The New York Times*).*

> *(21) "We're fighting an enemy that knows no rules of law, that will wear civilian uniforms, that is willing to kill in order to continue the reign of fear of Saddam Hussein, but we're fighting them with bravery and courage," he said at the Pentagon Tuesday (March 26, 2003,* The Daily Star*).*

Saddam Hussein is described as the man who commits crimes against his own people. He tortures, executes innocent people, and causes starvation, mutilation and rape. His amoral character drives him to be so selfish that he spends a fortune on building palaces and buying arms for his country instead of improving the country's economy. Bush's intention to portray Saddam negatively is straightforwardly stated in NYT:

> *(22) He went to great lengths to paint a vivid portrait of Mr. Hussein as an enemy of civilization (October 8, 2002,* The New York Times*).*

An irrational dictator. The NYT characterize the President as having a "messianic complex". Saddam's ambition to become a historical figure is described a psychological illness or an obsession.

At times, NYT directly characterizes his statements and behavior as "defiant":

> *(23)   Today, he was defiant. "Let these discredited people know that Iraq does not set its course on orders from a foreigner, or choose its leadership in accordance with instructions coming from Washington, London and Tel Aviv, but solely in accord with the wishes of the people of Iraq," an official Iraqi News Agency summary said. "In dealing with Iraq, they should learn to behave with respect, or they will repent" (March 19, 2003,* The New York Times*).*

Former President Saddam continued to be defiant without leaving room to rational discussion. Instead, he vowed that Washington, London and Tel Aviv will regret invading Iraq.

Saddam, therefore, is described as having the qualities of the typical villain. First of all, he is amoral and commits crimes against humanity. Secondly, he is irrational which makes him even more dangerous.

As in *The New York Times*, *The Daily Star* reports included discourse that focused mainly on the brutality, tyranny, and defiance of Saddam Hussein. Unlike *The New York Times*, T*he Daily Star* has much less emphasis on irrationality when it comes to the portrayal of Saddam Hussein. This characteristic of the [VILLAIN] was heavily relied on in order to present a solid argument as to why world leaders and the United Nations cannot negotiate with the Baathist ruling party of Iraq by describing Saddam as "defiant", "dictator", "tyrant", and having "messianic complex". *The Daily Star* mostly reported how the US government was becoming impatient with Saddam Hussein's lack of cooperation. This is due to the fact that the anti-war discourse produced by some European leaders (mostly France and Germany) is given almost equal weight as that of the pro-war discourse. In both discourses, the concern is for the well-being of the [VICTIM] of this scenario, the Iraqi people.

 [VICTIM]

As has been already mentioned, the Bush administration used the rescue scenario in its speeches urging world leaders to take notice of the helpless victim who were being abused and persecuted, especially the Shiites and the Kurds of Iraq. During the prewar period, the Americans and the British were happy to see that the Arabs were friendly and supportive of their mission to wipe out the Baathist "regime". The Iraqis who were not as welcoming were mainly the supporters of Saddam and members of his government. The Iraqi people are divided into two groups: those who are yearning for American intervention, hoping for a

better tomorrow, and those who are loyal to Saddam Hussein. In addition, I argue that the Iraqi people seem to switch from the role of the [VICTIM] during the prewar and war period to people who took control over their own fate in the postwar by examining the events, reactions, and statements made about the unstable situation during the postwar period. The implications of this change from a passive [VICTIM] to an active character suggests that the perception of the role of the coalition as a [HERO] may be threatened.

The divided Iraqi people. It is apparent from the corpus that the Iraqi people were divided because some supported the coalition and others supported Saddam Hussein.

In addition to the many quotes and descriptions of the Iraqi people's approval of the invasion during the prewar period, the NYT, did not ignore the other opposing reactions on the street especially the reaction of Saddam's loyalists:

> (24)   *The word among the people never varies: Saddam, Saddam, Saddam, only Saddam can save Iraq, only Saddam can bring Iraqis the proud, independent, prosperous life they crave (October 15, 2002,* The New York Times*).*

On the same day, journalists reported on two different reactions that not all Iraqi people were against ex-President Saddam Hussein.

In the news reports gathered from *The Daily Star* (DS), there are no testimonies by the victims of Saddam Hussein during the prewar period. In fact, there are statements and expressions of support for the former Iraqi President. Testimonies selected and published by both newspapers are helpful in finding out whether the newspapers conform to the metaphor of [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR] thus perceiving the Iraqi people as the [VICTIM]. The [VICTIM] in the [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR] must have a favorable view of the [HERO] (the American-led coalition) and feel threatened by the [VILLAIN] (the Baathist party led by Saddam Hussein). Though analysis of the reports shows that the coalition clearly identifies the Iraqi people as [VICTIMS], the Iraqis themselves do not do so consistently.

On October 11, 2002, Iraqis gathered to demonstrate against the American President:

> (25)   *Demonstrators waved banners reading, "Yes, yes to President Saddam Hussein" and "Death to the US." Some of them raised their rifles, shouting: "Bush, listen carefully, we all love our president"(October 11, 2003,* The Daily Star*).*

This is the only direct statement made by some Iraqi people in the reports during the prewar period. It clearly reflects the division among the Iraqi people. However, during the war period and beyond, the division of the Iraqi people becomes more apparent.

According to the fairy tale, when the [HERO] wins the war against the evil [VILLAIN], the [HERO] is supposed to be received with a warm welcome and gratitude. However, reports in NYT show mixed feelings:

> *(26)   Protests against the American forces here are rising by the day as Iraqis exercise their new right to complain -- something that often landed them in prison or worse during President Saddam Hussein's rule.*
>
> *But no one here is in the mood to note that paradox, as Iraqis confront with greater clarity their complicated reactions to the week-old American military presence here: anger at the looting; frustration at the ongoing lack of everything from electricity to a firm sense of order; fear of long-term United States military occupation.*
>
> *"Down, down U.S.A. -- don't stay, go away!" chanted Ahmed Osman, 30, a teacher among the several hundred Iraqis protesting today in front of the Palestine Hotel downtown, which the marines are both guarding and using as their headquarters to recruit civil servants to reconstruct Iraq's central authority "Bush is the same as Saddam," he said (April 16, 2003,* The New York Times*).*

This example shows that the [HERO] has freed the [VICTIM] from the fear and oppression that they suffered from during the rule of Saddam Hussein. However, the negative reaction towards the Americans strengthens as some Iraqis make statements that make the Americans switch from [HERO] to [VILLAIN] with a powerful quote such as "Bush is the same as Saddam".

As is customary in fairy tales, the tale ends with the [HERO] winning the battle against the evil [VILLAIN]. President George W. Bush declared military operations over, after the fall of the Saddam "regime" and taking over Baghdad, on May 1, 2003. However, the aftermath does not suggest that the Iraqi people lived happily ever after. On the contrary, from the examples discussed, the Iraqi people seem to doubt the American and British troops' good intentions. Nevertheless, fairy tales end when the [HERO] defeats the [VILLAIN]. Both newspapers may have conceptualized this war in terms of [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR]; however, the

analysis of the reports that covered the war and postwar period has shown that the characteristics of the [HERO], the [VILLAIN], and the [VICTIM] did not remain intact.

5 Conclusion

This paper has discussed the conceptual metaphors identified by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Lakoff (1992, 2001, 2004) pertaining to war. Both newspapers were found to construct the events of the 2003 invasion and its involved participants using [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR]. However, the analysis showed that *The New York Times* and *The Daily Star* did not conceptualize the Iraqi people as [VICTIM] consistently throughout the prewar, war, and postwar periods. A difference between the two newspapers was that the Arab English language newspaper *The Daily Star* did not portray Saddam Hussein as irrational as *The New York Times* did. The reason for this may be political due to the fact that Iraq is a neighboring Arab state. Finally, the choice of quotes that journalists from both newspapers inserted into their reports plays an important role in triggering metaphorical entailments such as [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR]. However, as this study shows, the way Bush, for example, conceptualizes the war may not very accurately reflect what the journalists report about the day to day events of the war and postwar. The reports published by NYT during the postwar period show a gradual abandonment of conceptualizing the American-led coalition as the [HERO]. The reports of the conflicts, protests, and insurgencies may have led the reporters to incorporate more of the quotes recorded on the field in Iraq than statements made by American officials. The DS did not have correspondents reporting from the field in Iraq; therefore, they relied heavily on agencies and statements made by officials. The manner in which they introduced and incorporated quotes in their news reports reveals a tendency on the part of the DS to not fully conceptualize Saddam Hussein according to the [VILLAIN]. Finally, the fact that metaphorical entailments such as [THE FAIRY TALE OF THE JUST WAR] seem to have appeared mostly in the quotes leads to the conclusion that metaphorical entailments pertaining to war will most likely appear in quoted material when reporting an incident. This writing style, however, does not seem to distance the journalist from his/her position on the incident being reported. More research should be done on how events involving conflict are conceptualized by journalists and how these conceptualizations are manifested in the news text.

6 References

Billig, M., & Macmillan, K. (2005). Metaphor, idiom, and ideology: the search for 'no smoking guns' across time. *Discourse & Society, 16*(4), 459-480.

Blommaert, J. & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review Anthropology, 29*, 447-466.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

Chilton, P. A., & Ilyin, M. (1993). Metaphor in political discourse: The case of the "Common European House". *Discourse & Society, 4*, 7-31.

Chilton, & Schäffner. (2002). *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (Vol. 4). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curran, J. (2002). *Media and power.* London: Routledge.

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: discourse and ideology in the press.* London: Routledge.

Hartley, J. (1990). *Understanding news*. London: Routledge.

Lakoff, G. (1992). Metaphors and war: The metaphor system used to justify the war in the Gulf. In M. Putz (Ed.), *Thirty years of linguistic evolution* (pp. 463-481). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lakoff, G. (1995). Metaphor, morality, and politics, or, why conservatives have left liberals in the dust. *Social Research, 62*(2).

Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think* (2nd Ed.). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scheithauer, R. (2007). Metaphors in election night television coverage in Britain, the United States and Germany. In A. E. L. Fetzer, G. (Ed.), *Political discourse in the media* (pp. 75-106). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Semino, E., & Masci, M. (1996). Politics is football: metaphor in the discourse of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy. Discourse & Society, 72, 243-269.

Stocking, S. & Gross, P. (1989). *How do journalists think?: A proposal for the study of cognitive bias in news making.* Bloomington, Ind: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.

Stockwell, P. (2000). Towards a critical cognitive linguistics? Retrieved from: http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk on August 15, 2007.

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

Willis, J. (2003). *The human journalist.* Westport, Conn: Praeger.