

2013-01-01

9/11 and The War on Terror: Iraq War Narratives and the Sacrifice Model

Janette Galvan

University of Texas at El Paso, jgonzalezz1028@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Galvan, Janette, "9/11 and The War on Terror: Iraq War Narratives and the Sacrifice Model" (2013). *Open Access Theses & Dissertations*. 1823.

https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd/1823

This is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UTEP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UTEP. For more information, please contact lweber@utep.edu.

9/11 AND THE WAR ON TERROR: IRAQ WAR NARRATIVES AND THE
SACRIFICE MODEL

JANETTE GALVAN

Department of Political Science

APPROVED:

Tony Payan, Ph.D., Chair

Cigdem V. Sirin, Ph.D.

Charles H. Martin, Ph.D.

Benjamin C. Flores, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

Copyright ©

by

Janette Galvan

2013

Dedication

To my husband Luis Rene Galvan and our daughter Kairi Lynette Galvan.

9/11 AND THE WAR ON TERROR: IRAQ WAR NARRATIVES AND THE
SACRIFICE MODEL

by

JANETTE GALVAN

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at El Paso

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Political Science

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

August 2013

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my committee, Dr. Tony Payan, Dr. Cigdem V. Sirin, and Dr. Charles H. Martin, for their guidance, support and patience that helped guide me through this thesis project. I would also like to thank my family for their love and support to never give up on my education.

Abstract

What are Americans willing to sacrifice for war and during war? In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, American citizens weighed a trade-off between their security and their civil freedoms because of fear of another terrorist attack. The reasoning was that United States citizens were patriotic and in being so they were willing to sacrifice some civil liberties to win the war on terror to prevent future terrorist attacks, thereby ensuring their future safety and then, perhaps, recover the sacrificed civil freedoms. This thesis project focuses on the sacrifices Americans willingly made for and during the war on terror, sold to them as necessary to ensure that no future terrorist attacks occurred again.

The American public was willing to make sacrifices for the Iraq War and these sacrifices are under three categories of blood, freedom and treasure. I plan to explore these three types of sacrifices more in depth by measuring the American public's willingness to give them up to win the war against terrorism and prevent another terrorist attack. Blood as a sacrifice measures the number of Americans willing to volunteer and enlist in the United States Armed Forces. I also will measure as an addition to this category the American public's acceptable tolerance level for American casualties. Blood as a sacrifice will focus on these distinct categories, which is their willingness to be a soldier, go to war and how many casualties¹ were worth fighting for the war. Freedom as a sacrifice will measure how much liberty the American public was willing to give the government and allow its usage of the Patriot Act, stricter airport security, use of wiretaps, and torture of suspected terrorists. Treasure as a sacrifice will measure how much money in taxes Americans were willing to pay for the war and fund the military. Freedom as a sacrifice will

¹ Casualties: Specifically, measuring only U.S. Military Fatalities and not a broad sense of term that does not include injuries, MIA deaths, and other wounds sustained in the War in Iraq by U.S. Military Soldiers

measure how much liberty the American public was willing to give the government and allow its usage of the Patriot Act, stricter airport security, use of wiretaps, and torture of suspected terrorists.

The time period of this study encompasses the first three years of the Iraq War and the types of sacrifices Americans were willing to make during those years of the Iraq War. This study will also explore how the war narratives interacted with the kinds of sacrifices Americans were willing to make during those three years, offering a sacrifice model to explain these types of sacrifices. The relationship between the war narratives and public sacrifice is therefore central to this study. The hypotheses in this study are formulated for each war narrative found in the literature and the sacrifices that the American public was willing to make to win the war. This paper is a theory-testing thesis of an in-depth case study of the Iraq War from 2003 to 2005 where I presume the war narrative employed by the government led to a specific sacrifice model and showcases a tradeoff between national security and civil freedoms.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	v
Abstract.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	viii
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Figures.....	x
Introduction.....	1
The Puzzle.....	3
Literature Review and Conceptual Framework.....	6
Theoretical Framework.....	14
Hypotheses.....	21
Methodology.....	24
Case Selection.....	26
Analysis.....	27
Framing Rhetoric.....	30
Findings.....	35
1.1 Bush Administration Speeches 2003-2005.....	35
1.2 Blood as a Sacrifice.....	36
1.3 Freedom as a Sacrifice.....	44
1.4 Treasure as a Sacrifice.....	48
Sold Stories.....	50
Conclusion.....	51
References.....	56
Vita.....	70

List of Tables

Table 1: After 9/11 Iraq War Narratives.....	13
Table 2: After 9/11 Sacrifice Model.....	54
Table 3: After 9/11 Rhetoric's of Sacrifice: Characteristics.....	54
Table 4: After 9/11 Rhetoric's of Sacrifice: Common Traits.....	55
Table 5: After 9/11 Iraq War Narratives Predictions.....	23
Table 6: After 9/11 Iraq War Level of Sacrifice Results.....	49

List of Figures

Figure 1: Iraq Coalition Military Fatalities by Year.....	36
Figure 2: Navy Recruiting Reserve Enlisted Goals/Accessions.....	43
Figure 3: Navy Recruiting Enlisted Active Goals/Accessions.....	43
Figure 4: Air Force Recruiting Facts and Statistics FY 2000 through FY 2012.....	43
Figure 5: Air Force Recruiting Facts and Statistics FY 2002 through FY 2011.....	44

Introduction

In 2003, the United States initiated the Iraq War. It was sold to Americans as part of a War on Terrorism. It has been several years since the invasion of Iraq, yet, questions remain on the whole topic of the war itself. Americans in the Iraq War were looking for success in a quick fashion to immediately stop terrorism. In the beginning, Americans felt extremely passionate about the war. They considered participation in the Iraq War a patriotic response to the 9/11 attacks made by terrorists one and a half years earlier from the invasion in Iraq.

Most of the American public supported the invasion of Iraq because they believed in defending the nation against terrorists. In the aftermath of 9/11 a Gallup Poll in December 2002 asked the American public if they would favor or oppose an invasion of Iraq with ground troops to remove weapons of mass destruction and 58% favored the invasion (Gallup Poll, 2012). More than 70% of Americans supported the war in Iraq when incorporating survey questions focusing on the removal of Saddam Hussein from power. CBS News from 2003 to 2005 conducted a survey poll questioning if the United States did the right thing in going to war with Iraq. In 2003, 69% favored staying in Iraq and 25% responded that the U.S. should have stayed out of Iraq. In 2005 the public was mostly divided, with 41% favoring staying in Iraq and 55% saying the U.S. should have stayed out (Roberts, 2005). Faced with these numbers, which look like many in times of war since at least the Vietnam War, the inevitable question is how much were Americans willing to sacrifice for it? (Gershkoff and Kushner 2005, 525)

Moreover, the Bush Administration was not shy about making connections between the attacks of September 11 and Iraq. Between 2001 and 2005, the American public was exposed to constant “patriotic rhetoric.” In the eyes of the administration and most of the American people, the struggle with terrorism had become a war, and the use of military force was one of its

available instruments. “President George W. Bush announced in the 2002 National Security Strategy that: The gravest danger our nation faces lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology. Our enemies have openly declared that they are seeking weapons of mass destruction, and evidence indicates that they are doing so with determination. The United States will not allow these efforts to succeed” (Bush, 2002). Faced with these numbers one can question what was the motivation behind the American public’s willingness to stay in Iraq and what changed when public opinion turned against it and the willingness of the same public to stay decreased? If their motivation was to ensure a greater security for the United States in hopes of helping to prevent another terrorist attack, then one can legitimately further ask, how much were Americans willing to sacrifice for the Iraq War? In this thesis I plan to take this question one step further and ask how much the American public was willing to sacrifice their civil freedoms in terms of material and immaterial sacrifices. These sacrifices are measured in terms of what some scholars call blood, freedom and treasure. The first corresponds to the willingness of Americans to tolerate war deaths. The second corresponds to the willingness of Americans to sacrifice their personal rights, such as privacy. The third corresponds to the ability of Americans to pay higher taxes or reductions in benefits to pay for the costs of war.

The Puzzle

United States history shows cases of war when presidents have made pronouncements before the citizenry such as, “Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country” (Marks 2008, 1). This constant self-sacrifice rhetoric has in fact been part of the life of Americans throughout U.S. history. During most wars, Presidents have asked Americans to make sacrifices. The enormous sacrifices that the generation of our grandparents made during World War II are but one example. It was, therefore a, matter of time, before the government was to ask new sacrifices for the War on Terror. Americans after the 9/11 attacks were bombarded by constant patriotic self-sacrifice and terror filled rhetoric to stop terrorism. Eventually, they were also going to be asked to support an offensive against Iraq.

American citizens were asked, in the terror-focused rhetoric of the post-September 11 world, to sacrifice away some of their civil freedoms, in the forms of greater powers in the hands of the government to tap private communications or be searched quite heavily at airports across the nation. The Bush Administration used fear as a tactic to persuade Americans to bargain their civil freedoms away for greater national security. Famous debates emerged on the tradeoffs between freedom and security. The use of fear by the Bush Administration was later employed to harness support for the war in Iraq as part of a larger war against terrorism. Americans were subjected to constant and repetitive exposure within their rhetoric-filled speeches against terrorism. The war on terror was in fact the cloak under which the Iraq War was sold to the American public. According to Kellner (2007), in “Bushspeak and the Politics of Lying: Presidential Rhetoric in the War on Terror,” “the Bush Administration used fear to mobilize consent for its hard right-wing domestic and foreign policies, and to gain support for Iraq they utilized a discourse of fear, evoking images of nuclear mushroom attacks, chemical and

biological weapons of attack, and purported connections between the Hussein regime and Al Qaeda to attack the United States” (Kellner 2007, 635).

In “The Politics of Fear after 9/11” by (Prewitt et al., 2004), the authors describe fear as a motivating indicator more so after the 9/11 attacks. They say fear has many layers that ultimately after the 9/11 attacks motivated and helped manipulate a nation into seeking vengeance. The interplay between fear and war was in full display.

In the end, the Bush Administration was successful in selling the Iraq War to the American public. We engaged the War on Terror and then the Iraq War and offered President Bush the benefit of the doubt. Indeed, as it was evident through the media, Americans were fearful of another terrorist attack and understood security to be primordial to the preservation of the United States. Given the history of various wars fought by the United States, we can also assume that Americans understood the costs and were willing to make sacrifices to restore security, that is, to prevent future terrorist attacks by winning the war against terrorism and later gave their support for the Iraq War under the same guise. Yet, the present financial crisis suggests that the War on Iraq was paid on credit. Inflating our national debt and leading us to the greatest national debt this nation has ever seen. This suggests that the American public may not have been willing to pay for the war. The tolerance for body bags also appears to have been rather low. President Bush understood this, when he blocked media coverage of the body bags and coffins returning from the war. This also suggests that the public may not have been that willing to pay for the war in blood. There appears to have been greater willingness, however, to grant the government the ability to search and seize and to invade our private communications at an unprecedented level. The American public also tolerated the permanent detention, without due process, of prisoners of war and even American citizens. This suggests that the American public

did see a value in sacrificing some degree of civil freedoms in exchange for security. But limits to this soon emerged, suggesting that such price had a limit too. Thus, the question I want to explore is how much material and immaterial civil sacrifices were Americans willing to make for the Iraq War in exchange for security and overall for winning the war against terrorism? To explore this problem, we must look at war narratives present during the Iraq War and measure what types of rhetoric was sold to the American public in selling these war narratives for willingness to sacrifice for the war. In other words, this thesis presupposes that the rhetorical cloak used by any administration is intimately connected with the kind of sacrifices that the public is willing to make in a war. How an administration sells a war to the public largely determines what kind of sacrifices the public is willing to make to pay for that same war.

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

As already intimated, many questions surfaced over the handling of the Iraq War since its beginning, but questions regarding what Americans were willing to sacrifice to pay for that war have not been fully addressed. I suggest that this question has to be explored along with the war narratives used by the administration in order to discern that willingness to sacrifice for war. This is not to say that the question is new. It has been asked in the past. Previous scholars have asked what Americans were willing to sacrifice for war and during the war, although they have never related that question to the war narratives used during a conflict. Thus, it is important to begin with a brief review of the literature on war narratives. Kathe Callahan, Melvin J. Dubnick, and Dorothey Olshfski's (2006) article on "War Narratives: Framing Our Understanding of the War on Terror" has explored the concern over how war narratives have shaped Americans view on policies since September 11, 2001 and during the beginning of the War on Terror. These authors could not distinctively claim exact war narratives as a basis for their study, but they did find "clear indications that narratives reflecting local political and organizational task environments have emerged" (Callahan, Dubnick, and Olshfski 2006). The war narratives explored in this article focus on public-service employees in various government organizations that were affected with the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and who were more susceptible to changes it has caused to American public policy. These government employees showed a common war story on the war on terror since it was unexpected and swift in judgment. The authors focused on common war stories experienced in previous wars to the war on terror and came up with four war narratives distinctive to our current war experiences. The first narrative is the Garrison State narrative, second is the Temporary State narrative, third the Enemy Within narrative and fourth,

the Glass Firewall narrative. In this thesis, I use these same narratives and weave them into the general arguments of what Americans were or were not willing to sacrifice for the Iraq War.

The Garrison State narrative implies that, when faced with a threat, a society that national security is its number one focus and is therefore “completely and permanently transformed” to become this “war machine” that is surrounded by a constant threat of a possible war sprouting (Callahan 2006, 558).

Such a drastic change in our society and a fresh incident in our memory are the events that took place on September 11, 2001 where America stood still and watched in horror as acts of terrorism changed the American public forever. The American public first was in a state of shock during the 9/11 terrorist attacks against the United States by Islamic terrorists. The American public on that day was led by all major media outlets to focus on New York City, The Pentagon, and Pennsylvania where the selected airline flights were hijacked by Islamic terrorists from Saudi Arabia and other Arab nations. Such a horrific terrorist attack on September 11, 2001 marked our society with an immense sense of unity to come together as a nation to permanently change our views against war and terrorism forever.

After the September 11 attacks in the United States, it is understandable to state the American public was feeling patriotic and surrounded by a garrison state narrative aura. The American public was recovering from a terrible emotional loss to their nation’s national security. They later faced a possible war against terrorism from whom the Bush Administration was constantly fueling to them as a necessary war to not let such a horrific day go unpunished and to ultimately not let another event like that occur again on American soil.

The American public became a war machine to possibly support the actions proposed to them by the Bush Administration and to also curtail any efforts of terrorists to obtain weapons of

mass destruction. After 9/11 the American public's wounds were added salt with any mention of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of suspected terrorist groups through constant media exposure, presidential speeches and speeches by other elite officials in the Bush Administration.

The Garrison State narrative reflects the understanding that we must gather around our country, the United States, and defend it. This type of action has consequences that the public may need to face and be willing to accept as a permanent life changing decision. With the Garrison State narrative the American public may never be the same again after taking such hasty responses like going to war after 9/11. A citizen in this war narrative would be willing to make "personal sacrifices" and be totally committed to the war effort in order to win the war (Callahan 2006, 560). Citizens of this war narrative understand the war will not be won in less than a month but probably in years and are willing to make that choice but how far are they willing to go to win the war? What are people under the Garrison State narrative willing to sacrifice? Is a "personal sacrifice" meaning someone's life, a way of life, or both? Are Americans willing to join the United States Armed Forces in order to win the war against terrorism and sacrifice their life in the process if necessary? (Callahan 2006, 560) How much are Americans willing to tolerate military casualties to win the war against terrorism in Iraq? These are some of the questions to be explored further down, that is whether the response of the United States fell within this war narrative and if it was sold to the American public by the Bush Administration and former President George W. Bush through his speeches in order to gain support for the war against terrorism.

The Temporary State narrative "reflects the belief that measures taken during war are necessary but short term. The Temporary State narrative reflects the ancient Roman doctrine *inter arma silent leges*, idiomatically, in time of war, the laws are silent. Public silence and

violations of civil liberties are accepted because the condition is temporary. The belief is that the sooner we eliminate the enemy, the sooner life will return too normal. Someone who hears the temporary state narrative would agree that the violation of individual liberties is permissible, as long as it is short term” (Callahan 2006, 559).

After witnessing the events on 9/11, when you hear the Temporary State narrative it is understandable as a United States American citizen one would accept some violations of civil liberties if it means to prevent and protect against another terrorist attack. That’s what the Temporary State narrative suggests and that it is perfectly normal for rational decisions of what is right and wrong to go out the window and just focus on what is necessary at the time to make sure the future is clear of dangers. With the Temporary State narrative we are more likely to throw away any Constitutional liberties given to us by our founding fathers for a “short term” if it means to get rid of terrorism (Callahan 2006, 559).

On that morning of September 11, 2001, Islamic terrorists hiding within the United States as normal American citizens to attack major locations within the United States hijacked U.S. Airlines. The Temporary State narrative if in effect would not allow these hijacks to take place because it asks for stricter and longer delays in the security screening and baggage claim line before boarding a plane. The American public would see this war narrative as a temporary delay in their daily lives but necessary to ensure they are safe from a possible terrorist attack. The question to explore specifically related to this war narrative is whether airport security rules and regulations and torture of captured suspected terrorists are temporary and the government intends to end them after the threat has faded or whether the government considers these measures permanent. How much are Americans willing to sacrifice in airport security screenings and many other aspects of their daily lives in order to prevent another terrorist attack and win the war

against terrorism and how permanent do they expect the measures to accomplish security to be? Are they willing to be racially profiled and judged before boarding a plane? How much are Americans willing to sacrifice torturing terrorists in order to prevent another terrorist attack and win the war against terrorism? When do they expect these to end?

The Temporary State narrative allows for civil liberties to be ignored and not protected in order to capture suspected terrorists or any form of threat to be stopped. The Patriot Act falls under the Temporary State narrative and the Enemy Within narrative where it temporarily freezes civil freedoms and identifies the terrorist within our borders, as the enemy and places this good versus evil notion in the minds of Americans. The American public within these two war narratives may be willing to sacrifice their privacy for the greater good to fight against the evil that terrorism has become after the events that took place on 9/11. The American public may also be willing to sacrifice privacy for security if it means to seek out their emotional vengeance against terrorism and suspected terrorists in permitting torture against them.

The Enemy Within narrative “stresses its similarity to the anticommunist perspective that dominated the late 1940s through the mid-1950s. This narrative emphasizes that the threat to our security emanates from within our borders, and as good Americans we should ferret out dangerous individuals. These individuals live among us and it is our duty to identify them and denounce them—in other words, turn them in. The enemy in this war might very well be our own neighbor, and therefore we have to keep a watchful eye on one another and report any suspicious activity” (Callahan 2006, 559).

On September 11, 2001, the hijackers were living among Americans and carrying on normal daily life routines without any suspicion of their planned terrorist plot against the United States. After 9/11, The Patriot Act was enacted and stressed the need to curtail some civil

liberties to weed out the suspicious terrorists. The Patriot Act was passed by Congress to aid government agencies like the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and local law enforcement to track and capture suspected terrorist communications that threatened the United States national security. It not only scoped out possible terrorists trying to enter the United States but also to help remove those already within our borders. The Patriot Act was supposed to be a temporary public policy but it turned into a full out trade-off between security and liberty.

George W. Bush and his administration came under scrutiny for their defense of torturing suspected terrorist detainees in prison. George W. Bush and his administration adopted the “ticking-bomb scenario” towards defending torture of suspected terrorists (Hannah 2006, 623). The “ticking-bomb scenario” is where a country or government within that country that suspects you have a bomb hidden somewhere plans to go after you and defuse that bomb from exploding (Hannah 2006, 623). In order for that government to gain intelligence of where that bomb is located, it needs to outweigh the costs versus the benefits from the suspected individual and in the most extreme fashion by using torture techniques. Once the government gains this information, it can locate the bomb and defuse it. And once the bomb is diffused, everything can return to normalcy. The bomb is another meaning for terrorist in the context under analysis in this thesis. The “ticking-bomb scenario” means it can occur in any moment and be set off to cause horrific damage (Hannah 2006, 624). This “ticking-bomb scenario” is the furthest away from being ethical and can be even seen as unacceptable morally but it is actually accepted as a great tool used against terrorism (Hannah 2006, 630). It presents the greatest sense of urgency and it is a powerful rhetorical tool to demand extreme sacrifices in exchange for the recovery of security. The Bush Administration and President George W. Bush viewed this scenario as a

justified method to not only gain information on suspected terrorist cells and possible plots against the United States but also as a temporary defense mechanism aiding in the global fight against terrorism (Hannah 2006, 630).

The Glass Firewall narrative “reflects two parallel administrative worlds—one civilian and one military—that operate simultaneously and in full view of each other. These parallel worlds are separated by a legal and organizational firewall that protects each from interference by others. During wartime, the military expects to call the shots without political interference. Someone who hears this narrative would agree with a statement regarding the expertise of the military and its ability to protect us. As civilians, we should go on with our lives, comfortable, in the knowledge that the military will protect us” (Callahan 2006, 559).

The Glass Firewall narrative adopts the notion that the American public will give almost if not full control of military proceedings to the military and allow the military to protect them from terrorism. Under this war narrative the American public is willing to give the military all the support they need in “all resources” they may need (Callahan 2006, 560). Nobody wants the war to come to their homeland so under this war narrative they are willing to provide all the necessary resources and power needed to fuel the armed forces into war. In the United States, Americans are seen as very patriotic and support their troops in almost everything they do so its not unusual to see this war narrative accepting patriotic support from its people to rally around their men and women in the armed forces and ultimately their government in power.

Each war narrative has emotional motivators in each description centering on a response after 9/11 that includes the Iraq War and preventing any future terrorist attacks. They center on the American public sharing a common “collective threat” (Stern 1995, 218). It creates this idea of a national enemy to the United States and therefore the American public should identify

against it. This threat is terrorism and is fueled by the public wanting to seek revenge for losing loved ones in 9/11 and loved one's serving in the war in Iraq.

The Table 1. below shows characteristics of these narratives present after 9/11 and during the Iraq War.

Table 1. After 9/11 Iraq War Narratives

After 9/11 Iraq War Narratives	
Garrison State narrative	<p><i>Following the Leader...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Become a War Machine to protect against threats to national security • Rally-around-your-country • Support the war effort • Not a quick war but rationalize the risk will outweigh the costs • Personal sacrifices will be made
Temporary State narrative	<p><i>Temporary Loss of Rights is Good...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term violation of Civil Liberties • Temporary Airport Security Delays are accepted • Eager to catch the enemy so things can be normal again • Accept torturing of suspected terrorists if temporary • Civil sacrifices will be made
Enemy Within narrative	<p><i>Surveillance is key...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep a watchful eye on suspected terrorists • Allow wiretaps • Support the Patriot Act • Enemy may be your neighbor • Privacy sacrifices will be made
Glass Firewall narrative	<p><i>The military is our backbone...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patriotic support to let them call the shots • Give Military more police power • Provide most if not all resources to military • Military sacrifices will be made

The Theoretical Framework

People choose a difficult path because they see a clear benefit at the end of the tunnel, one that compensates for the hardships of the trek. Mechanisms under this theory make a sacrifice futile, of course, if the net benefits are not in their best self-interest. In other words, there was a miscalculation by the actor on what the benefits really were and what she was giving up. These mechanisms of this theory underline a common rhetoric in history where man is asked to sacrifice for the common greater good.

According to Paul C. Stern in his article of “Why Do People Sacrifice for Their Nations?,” in case of a “collective threat” in the rational choice theory “threat increases identification and willingness to contribute” (Stern 1995, 224). “When the threatened group is a nation-state, the prediction is that a foreign attack or military threat leads to stronger identification with the nationals of the nation-state and increased support for the regime in power” (Stern 1995, 221). The phrase that often makes its appearance in the United States is “Politics ends at the water’s edge.” This prediction seems plausible, as we have seen it play out in history during World War II where national identity or nationalism increased because people rallied around the flag and felt very patriotic and also felt honored and privileged to be called Americans. The unexpected attacks during World War II and 9/11 both share a triggering event that shaped public opinion. On these nationalistic sentiments, regimes build the narrative they are going to use to justify military action. Here, again, the claim is that the narrative does determine the shape of the sacrifices that nationals are willing to make in the aftermath of the security crisis. We are a more media based nation where that horrific event in history was broadcasted throughout the world through a constant stream of imagery. If anything, the power of the media today should only contribute to strengthen our hypothesis that nationalism will stronger, as the

media stokes it, and identification with other nationals will be even deeper, and therefore, the potential sacrifices might be further influenced by how the government uses these sentiments to sow its narrative and ultimate justification for military action. The conditions of today constitute, therefore, an even more fertile ground to test our hypotheses regarding the relationship between the regime's construction of a narrative and the sacrifices that people are willing to make.

Stern's (1995) article elaborates the reasons why people are willing to make sacrifices for their nation and he uses sacrificing one's life as an example for his article. A willingness to die for one's nation is, of course, the ultimate sacrifice. I however plan to explore through four war narratives present in the Iraq War three sacrifices Americans were willing to make for their nation at war. Stern further suggests towards the end of his article that national identity for loyalty and sacrifice may need more analysis and generate more questions focusing on social and emotional mechanisms that can help further explain individual support for their nation at war.

Moreover, Francois Debrix's (2005) article focuses not only on social and emotional mechanisms that are used to define why people identify themselves with a nation and separate themselves internally and objectively from their outside selves to justify their actions against a common threat. In "Discourses of War, Geographies of Abjection: Reading Contemporary American Ideologies of Terror" by Francois Debrix (2005) we see where national identity is centered mostly around social and emotional mechanisms that Stern suggested his study needed further analysis of to help identify why people sacrifice for their nation, specifically at war. Julia Kristeva's theory suggests the idea of abjection and objecting yourself from your state of being to focus on a common or plausible threat: "a risk, a horror, or a terror that seems to emanate from an exorbitant outside or inside and that must be ejected beyond the tolerable or the thinkable" (Debrix 2005, 1158). Abjecting yourself means to step away from yourself in a situation and also

embrace it to better succeed. In the Iraq War and War on Terror the public must step away from terror and play this good versus evil game but at the same time in order to win must understand its meaning of terror. Kristeva's (1982) theory places the United States into a state of identification where Americans must identify themselves in the war against terror. U.S. elites use these abject forms of speech to tell Americans "who they are and where they are" (Debrix 2005, 1160). This type of discourse is used to justify war actions against terror. Kristeva's (1982) showcases three theories that embody the rhetoric of sacrifice that George W. Bush and his administration exposed the American public to after 9/11 and during the War in Iraq. These theories ask from the public to step out of their comfort zone, which is their inside internal selves, and make sacrifices that in ordinary circumstances they may not make but in times of war are seen as necessary, patriotic and justified for their outside selves, which is their country.

In Debrix's (2005) article these three theories of rhetoric ask for internal sacrifices to prevent an outside force of terror to invade the United States and alter its democratic way of life. Kaplan's (2002) theory of rhetoric focuses mainly on the leader of a country as the warrior fights and leads against a common threat and places political power first before moral values. This theory ultimately asks for the people through their patriotism to sacrifice internal values in order for the war against terrorism to be a success and their sacrifices worthwhile. Hanson's (2002) theory of rhetoric is similar to Kaplan's theory in acting quickly against an attack like 9/11 but uses vengeance as justification alone to go to war against terrorism and rallying around the president and the United States. Ledeen's (2002) theory of rhetoric emphasizes the importance of the Patriot Act and its restrictions are good because they allow the CIA and FBI to use surveillance against possible terrorist networks and help prevent another terrorist attack like 9/11. This theory of rhetoric also places the country in a good versus evil stance. These three

discourses of the war against terrorism use internal sacrifices in order to win the war against terrorism and justify its actions in the process as an overall good versus evil war.

Kaplan's (2002) theory of "the way of the warrior" adopts the notion of "warrior ethics" and "pagan ethics," where you must make tough decisions during war and usually, these tough decisions are made by leaders like the president of the United States (Debrix 2005, 1160). Kaplan's (2002) theory of rhetoric places great importance to the political regime in power at the time and that political power comes first above all other notions. Kaplan's (2002) theory of rhetoric places morals and ethical behavior second. For example, if this theory were in practice it would place a political party's agenda above anything else in policies and even above ethical and moral values like democratic values. We have seen this type of warrior behavior by George W. Bush in the beginning of the War in Iraq where he wanted to attack first and ask questions later as a response to the terrorist attacks against the United States on 9/11, then gain power by taking out Saddam Hussein, then help with humanitarian efforts in Iraq and help rebuild its country, and finally promote democracy last. Kaplan's (2002) theory of rhetoric shows a slippery slope of events from political power to democratic efforts. You must make sacrifices from the inside like freedom, blood, and treasure, for the war against terror to be a success. A leader must be willing to make these internal sacrifices. In Kaplan's (2002) theory of rhetoric he emphasizes the motivation of patriotism to fuel the fire for Americans to justify their lack of morals to make these internal sacrifices worthwhile. Kaplan (2002) expresses this different form of thinking and shows how to think during war and become a war machine. He shows you that it is important as a thinker to support and make sacrifices to fight against terrorism. He teaches Americans to identify the evil enemy which is terrorism and abject it outside the United States' territory.

Hanson's (2002) theory of rhetoric uses vengeance and aggression as a motivator to justify the war against terror and takes place during the "autumn of war" (Debrix 2005, 1163). Meaning, it takes place in the beginning or right after a catastrophic horrific event like 9/11. People will gather around their nation and against a common enemy. Hanson's (2002) theory rallies against the enemy and the enemy under the Bush Administration is terrorism. This rally around your leader and country and flag tactic doesn't need any justification according to Hanson's theory of rhetoric. Hanson's (2002) theory of rhetoric sees Islamic thoughts of terrorism as a fatal problem to a democratic way of life, to the American way of life, and that is enough to justify a series of actions by the U.S. government. The Bush Administration and President George W. Bush personally didn't feel much need to justify their rally around the flag appeal to the American public or many of United States efforts against terrorism right after 9/11 and in the beginning of the War in Iraq because of their sense of urgency to act quickly against radical terrorists that could strike at any moment with weapons of mass destruction. The rhetoric was always covered by the idea that the president's first job is to protect the American people. This, by the way, is not the first time that presidents have acted with this broad and vague justification in mind (Debrix 2005, 1164).

In Debrix's (2005) article, Ledeen's (2002) theory of rhetoric focuses more on the "War against the Terror Masters" and that is tyranny according to George W. Bush and his administration after 9/11 and the War in Iraq. Under this theory of rhetoric, if you are the enemy of the United States you are seen as evil against good and anybody who promotes evil, such as terrorism, is against the ideas of the United States and therefore an enemy. Ledeen's (2002) theory of rhetoric asks for a stronger homeland security system first. Secondly, it asks for a prison for terrorists if deemed necessary. Lastly, it asks to demolish their regime in power in any

state that may support or harbor them. This theory also greatly supports the Patriot Act and mimics its guidelines, something significant given that the Patriot Act was in and of itself controversial and considered by many much of a sacrifice of American liberties. In addition, Ledeen's (2002) theory of rhetoric promotes the usage of the CIA and FBI's surveillance powers as necessary tools to fight against evil terrorists and to protect the American people from future attacks. In general, all countries that are even remotely associated with terrorism are seen as evil enemies—a highly moralistic language is included—of the United States and the United States fights against the ideology of terror (Debrix 2005, 1166).

These three scholars ask Americans to re-evaluate themselves and look for a greater meaning about being an American during the war against terrorism. They also help promote a crusade against any evil and anti-American views by asking Americans to make internal sacrifices and abject them in any way shape or form necessary in order to prevent another terrorist attack and move the outside threat away from the United States and ultimately defeat it. The question that arises with these discourses is if it's a war against terror or a war with Iraq? George W. Bush and the Bush Administration make the War in Iraq at one with the war against terror as a whole. They connect the two and link anything remotely associated with terror against the United States and anything having to do with 9/11 to promote their idea of war and promote their sacrificed focused rhetoric to the American public.

Gershkoff's and Kushner's (2005) article explored George W. Bush's presidential speeches and the Bush Administration's constant rhetoric that connected the War in Iraq with their War against Terror is "Shaping Public Opinion: The 9/11-Iraq Connection in the Bush Administration's Rhetoric" by Amy Gershkoff and Shana Kushner. This article makes the argument that the Bush Administration connected the War on Terror and 9/11 and then looks at

Bush's speeches showing that in them there is hardly any information directly related to Iraq. But the article goes on to show that there is present a constant rhetoric that eventually influenced public opinion. These authors look at various possible theories that may have helped shape public opinion and support for the Iraq War. They look at constant rhetoric surrounding the Bush Administration from 2001 to 2003. One of the theories these authors explored was the rally-around-the-flag theory that can apply to the garrison state narrative. This theory in times of crisis is more likely to convince Americans to rally-around-the-flag which in turn can increase support for the president and his political agenda. This phenomenon is based more on patriotism and in their article patriotism alone cannot be the only account for the high support for the war. They build their own theory called the Iraq-as-war-on-terror theory, which links the Iraq War to the 9/11 attacks in a constant stream of rhetoric from the Bush Administration.

Overall, there is an important literature, although still developing, that shows that presidential rhetoric is not unrelated to support for public policy. In fact, as the literature has begun to show, the rhetorical images that a nation's leaders use are not only designed to rally the public around governmental policies but it is designed specifically to advance certain agendas, including the ideological agendas of leaders. In some sense, this thesis makes the argument that such is the case in the Iraq War in 2003.

Hypotheses

These war narratives play a significant part in giving shape to the American public's perspective during the first few years of the Iraq War. I further explore how much Americans were willing to sacrifice for war after experiencing a triggering event like 9/11 that questioned their patriotism and I relate the relationship between the kinds and depth of sacrifice that American were willing to make and the model of rhetoric used by the Bush administration to sell the Iraq War and other important security and national defense public policies. In doing so, I continue the empirical work on the four war narratives explained above, which create a base guideline for the American public's perspective on the War on Iraq. In other words, I posit that the four war narratives present in the Iraq War influence the sacrificial model that applies to American citizens vis-à-vis the war and keep a close relationship to the three sacrifice categories of blood, treasure, and freedom. These sacrifice categories are based on the sacrifices the American public was willing to make from 2003 to 2005, the harshest years of the Iraq War, and which were motivated by the constant public exposure to the rhetoric of the American elite, particularly government officials of the President George W. Bush administration. Besides the president, the elite or key players included Vice President Dick Cheney, former secretary of defense Donald Rumsfeld and other public opinion advocates in the administration. The independent variables are the four war narratives in which I gave a detailed definition in the literature review and the dependent variables are the models of sacrifices where I measure Americans willingness to sacrifice fewer than fewer than three categories. The Garrison State narrative will lead to a higher willingness to sacrifice blood but, but it may not lead to a high tolerance in terms of freedom and treasure. The Glass Firewall narrative will lead to a higher willingness to sacrifice treasure, but may not lead to a high tolerance in terms of freedom and

blood. The Temporary State narrative will lead to a higher willingness to sacrifice freedom, but may not lead to a high tolerance in terms of blood and treasure. The Enemy Within narrative will lead to a higher willingness to sacrifice freedom, but may not lead to a high tolerance in terms of blood and treasure.

How much are Americans willing to give up, to sacrifice, and to pay to prevent another terrorist attack by winning the war against terrorism? That is the fundamental question. And to answer this question I will measure Americans willingness to sacrifice freedom, blood and treasure. The first measurement is in terms of civil freedoms in how much are they willing to let the government limit their civil freedoms to support the war effort. By imposing the Patriot Act, for example, the American public is letting the government limit their civil freedoms to prevent a future terrorist attack. I will also look at how people feel being racially profiled in airports and about torturing suspected terrorists if it's a temporary adjustment. This might be more closely related to the Temporary State narrative. In the Enemy Within narrative we see that Americans are obviously allowing the government to tap into their communications as a tolerated action because the enemy may live among us. In this regard, many Americans were willing to say: I don't have anything to hide, therefore, I can let the government tap into my communications or only those who have something to hide oppose this measure and so forth. I will thus measure how much Americans were willing to be wiretapped, racially profiled and tolerate the arrest of American citizens in order to recover their security—a type of sacrifice that most related to the Enemy Within narrative. The second element of the sacrificial model is blood. Here, we attempt to see what narrative a tolerance for body bags or a willingness to die for one's nation by signing up for the military relates to. I hypothesize that this kind of sacrifice relates more closely to the Garrison State narrative, because the enemy is outside and citizens are called to defend the nation

by going outside of it to fight the enemy. It should also suggest a higher tolerance for body bags coming home and the dead treated as heroes defending the American way. The third component of the dependent variable is treasure. It is a material way of measuring how much Americans were willing to pay in terms of higher taxes to support the war. This type of sacrifice should be more likely associated with the Glass Firewall narrative, given that the military is seen as the ultimate defender of the American way and it should be given all the resources possible to create that firewall around us. Thus, these hypotheses are the examples of how I posit that what one is willing to sacrifice is closely related to the narrative the administration utilizes to sell the war to the public. I call the categories, combinations, and types of sacrifices—blood, treasure, or freedom—the sacrifice model. I believe that the dependent variables can also exhibit different levels of measurement from low, medium, high and highest, although this analysis only focuses on the types of sacrifice and not punctiliously on the levels. With this sacrifice model typology, I plan to discover which war narrative was sold to the American public and or, in what order first if more than one was sold to the public.

Table 5. After 9/11 Iraq War Narratives Predictions

Narratives		Garrison State Narrative	Glass Firewall Narrative	Temporary State Narrative	Enemy Within Narrative
Sacrifices	Blood	<i>High Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>
	Freedom	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>High Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>High Level of Sacrifice</i>
	Treasure	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>High Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>

Methodology

Since this thesis is a theory-testing thesis, it takes the war narratives proposed by the authors cited above and crosses them with the three types of sacrifices that Americans are or are not willing to make in times of crisis (blood, treasure, and freedom). The methodological technique I will use to make these crosses between the war narrative and the sacrifice model, based primarily on the predictions of each sacrificial model as explained above, during the Iraq War is a textual analysis of speeches from elite public officials like former President George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, former secretary of defense Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice. These speeches will provide my study with data from 2003 to 2005 to identify the narrative they used. I will analyze these speeches to see how many times these elite officials used in their rhetoric a war narrative that corresponds to one of the four narratives presented above. After analyzing the key speeches given by the Bush Administration, and determining what narrative they used, I will go on to analyze what I believe Americans were willing to sacrifice, e.g., more taxes, serving for your country, tolerate high military casualties, and even give up some of their civil freedoms in new laws such as the Patriot Act. To confirm the sacrificial model, I will also collect public opinion poll data from the American public's tolerance for military casualties and casualty data of the Iraq War from 2003 to 2005. I will also gather data from U.S. Armed Forces websites and local offices of enlistment retention data of how many Americans enlisted in the United States Armed Forces. I will also collect data of surveys from 2003 to 2005 that show public support for the Patriot Act and its variation over time as measurement of what Americans were willing to sacrifice. I will also collect public opinion polls of Americans willingness to tolerate terrorist torture and racial profiling in airports. I will also look at public opinion polls of Americans willingness to pay taxes to fund the war effort. This

data will help answer my questions regarding how the Iraq War was sold to the American public, that is, which war narrative or narratives were used in selling the Iraq War to the American public. I will then match that rhetoric to one or another of the models of war narratives presented above. Finally, I will assess what Americans were willing to sacrifice in terms of their civil freedoms in order to ensure their safety.

Case Selection

I chose the Iraq War as a case study because the Administration went out of its way to sell this war as a war of necessity to recover future safety from terrorist attacks and used that narrative to make the case for various kinds of sacrifices by the American public. Thus these four war narratives would be perfect to use as a base guideline to discern which or what combination was used by the Bush Administration to sell the war and thus, successfully cross the war narratives with the sacrifices I plan to measure. These four war narratives were already established by previous academic scholars, which I mention in the literature review, which derived them from the Iraq War. I wanted to test them from the first few years of the war to see the level of sacrifices the American public was willing to make along the three types of sacrifices that generally are asked of any public at war. Thus, the Iraq War is an ideal test case for this thesis.

I also chose the Iraq War case study because of the 9/11 terrorist attacks were a triggering event that shocked the public into re-evaluating their patriotism and willingness to sacrifice. This Iraq War case study can help generalize an understanding of why the American public sacrificed civil freedoms for the Iraq War and “gain a clear scientific value from investigating” a connection between the American public’s willingness to sacrifice civil freedoms during the Iraq War and the four war narratives (Berg, 330). Eventually with my thesis results, perhaps other scholars can explore other case studies similar to the Iraq War like Pearl Harbor and make a comparative case study.

Analysis

The terrorist attacks on 9/11 were a triggering event that changed the American public's views on security, leadership, and their perspective on life permanently. So, it is not surprising that George W. Bush would use that horrific event as a constant repetitive reminder to the American public of what could possibly occur again if certain measures aren't enforced and if the War in Iraq isn't won.

Before observing my data to see what sacrifices were mentioned and how many were mentioned within the speeches, I first look at what type of rhetoric was used by President George W. Bush and his Administration to motivate the American public in acting upon these types of sacrifices: blood, freedom, and treasure.

George W. Bush throughout his presidential speeches mentions the importance of the War in Iraq. He elaborates throughout his presidential speeches that the Iraq War was no ordinary war against two countries but a war against an unseen enemy called terror. George W. Bush combined the Iraq War as a war on terror and created in the minds of Americans the belief of good versus evil within the two countries. The majority of his speeches encompass his rhetoric of sacrifice. He urges the American public to have a sense of duty and need to sacrifice for their country. This constant sacrifice is fueled by a sense of fear that still lingers in the back of the American public's mind through the imagery from that dreadful day. The American public is showered with this constant request for sacrifice to help remember and prevent another terrorist attack. George W. Bush uses this type of sacrifice rhetoric with the use of weapons of mass destruction discourse that helps push his rhetoric of sacrifice throughout his presidency. The Bush Administration also aided the president in his efforts to constantly repeat this rhetoric of sacrifice through his patriotic and terror-focused discourse throughout their speeches as well.

President George W. Bush stated in his “Freedom in Iraq & Middle East: Address at the 20th Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy” that “by definition, the success of freedom rests upon the choices and the courage of free people’s and upon their willingness to sacrifice.” “Americans amply displayed our willingness to sacrifice for liberty. The sacrifices of Americans have not always been recognized or appreciated; yet they have been worthwhile. Freedom is worth fighting for, dying for, and standing for” (George W. Bush, November 6, 2003, 16).

Americans were exposed through a constant repetitive patriotic-focused rhetoric that used imagery of the 9/11 attacks to boost up the public’s patriotic Americanism to fuel their sense of national identity towards their country and to defend it at whatever cost necessary. The Bush Administration used this rally-around-the-flag approach towards the American public and added a little flair of their agenda by adding a rally-around-the-president-and-the-Administration type of discourse. Their constant repetitive rhetoric focused around being American and what it means to be patriotic. It almost felt as if you are not patriotic if you did not support the Bush Administration and your president with their foreign policy agenda to go to war against Iraq and seek vengeance as justice for the 9/11 attacks (Kellner, 2007; Zarefsky, 2004).

Americans were not only exposed to a constant repetitive patriotic-focused rhetoric but also a terror-focused rhetoric that used patriotism as a mere stepping-stone to justify its reasoning. George W. Bush in his speeches after 9/11 he states “we are at war” and his definition stayed the same after his September 20, 2001 speech to the American public (Zarefsky, 2004). George W. Bush used his terror-focused rhetoric throughout his speeches during his presidency, which characterized and defined his speeches around a stance of deep patriotic roots. The Bush Administration used terror filled imagery of possible weapons of mass destruction facilities

located in Iraq and housed by Saddam Hussein. The Bush Administration in this specific rhetoric used various terror-fueled words that were repeated constantly to the American public via its media outlets and speeches by the President and his administration. This rally-around-the-president-and-the-Bush-Administration supported by patriotism and terror-focused rhetoric both supported the Bush Administration agenda against the War on Terror. The rhetoric used by George W. Bush specifically targeted words like terror, terrorist, weapons of mass destruction, and preventative discourse to name a few which defined his war against terrorism terror-focused rhetoric (Zarefsky, 2004). Those terror-fueled words were centered-around Iraq being a terrorist country that possibly had weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons, and other terroristic views against the United States (Kellner, 2007) (Zarefsky, 2004).

Presidential rhetoric can change the public's views on a particular issue. According to Zarefsky (2004), the presidents' rhetoric defines and characterizes a particular agenda that can constantly repeat itself throughout his presidency to encompass his leadership efforts to their policies. How better to see how presidential rhetoric affects the American public than through the United States mouthpiece: the president and his presidential speeches. Presidential speeches and the speeches by members of his political party like former Secretary of Defense, Donald H. Rumsfeld, former Secretary of State and Secretary Advisor to the President, Condoleezza Rice, and former Vice President, Dick Cheney rhetoric that mirrored George W. Bush rhetoric also helped shape public opinion against the War in Iraq and against terrorism to possibly make sacrifices for their country (Zarefsky, 2004).

Framing Rhetoric

George W. Bush and his administration helped not only shape public opinion after 9/11 to focus on fighting the War in Iraq but also helped mold it against the United States number one enemy: terrorism. They framed people's understanding of the war and their sacrifices. They helped frame this rhetoric of patriotism around constant patriotic imagery of soldiers fighting the war to never forget 9/11. They also helped frame this good versus evil theme into their speeches of who is the number one enemy of the United States and what Americans can do to help the war effort—by making necessary sacrifices.

People already have an understanding or a moral compass they follow to base their choices on, and on a daily basis use this life compass to decide what is the rational choice and what the beneficial choice of the day is. It is not surprising that the Bush Administration and George W. Bush framed this life compass to invoke the “sunk-cost trap” that William A. Boettcher III and Michael D. Cobb use in their research of “Don't Let Them Die in Vain: Casualty Frames and Public Tolerance for Escalating Commitment in Iraq,” to measure people's behaviors to investments as consumers and in their case casualties during times of war (Boettcher and Cobb 2009, 681).

The central contribution of this article is very interesting in that it not only explains how people frame an already existing idea or sacrifice in their mind but help mold it into a justification for their decision in the first place. Boettcher and Cobb (2009) explore this duel between the benefits outweighing the costs and show that people almost always try to get the best price of things and in this case blood, freedom and treasure. They want to make sure they get the best deal with the less amount of costly effort. They don't plan on purchasing an electronic device that they find boring or wasting their money on clothes that may be too small

or too big for them. They want the best for their buck. This behavior investment transforms the public into consumers that plan on doing great in an unknown potential business adventure. Mostly or if not at times, these so-called business adventures aren't always entirely successful and lead people to continue investing on a lost project. This method is what banks use to project ideas that may be doing poorly in order for them to do a 180° degree turn and return a good profit.

George W. Bush and the Bush Administration in their speeches use patriotic self-sacrifice and terror is enemy number one investment behavior to help frame their already existing ideas of rhetoric to frame the American public's idea of sacrifice. The American public won't make personal sacrifices unless they feel their benefits will be worthwhile if not honorable and not in vain. It's hard for the American public to foretell if their steps towards sacrifice are going to be worthwhile. They put their hope in what they already know as right and what they feel is necessary at the time. They may also be motivated by fear as I mentioned above or by patriotic means but they still make a sacrifice investment for an uncertainty of success.

The American public as consumers desire quick results and request that payment with success of winning the war. Benefits to the American public during war would remain constant but their costs for those benefits are uncertain. George W. Bush and his administration understood in order to justify and keep gathering support for the war against terrorism and the Iraq War they needed to keep on riding the bandwagon. Within the elite rhetoric Bush and the Bush Administration seemed to have promised quick results and didn't deliver those results and they did not deliver them either in a quick fashion. Through their elite rhetoric they continue to justify their actions for going to war and why the American public should continue to sacrifice. The American public is the consumers and the government elites like Bush and his

administration are the political industry acting as government industry elites to promote self-sacrifice against terrorism as their part in helping the war effort back home. They use their power as government industry elites to sell to the American public the idea for going to war was justified and their continuous sacrifice for it will yield results if not now in the future. The end result according to these government industry public officials, like Bush and his administration is winning the war against terrorism and that includes the War in Iraq.

Bush's presidential speeches and his administration's speeches not only framed a generalization of patriotic and terror filled rhetoric within their speeches but also framed these rhetoric's of sacrifice around issues. This issue framing is based around what you can do for your country as a patriot and as a citizen. It helped identify Americans as patriotic Americans to rally-around-their-country and rally-around-the-President-and-the-Administration. Bush and his administration centered on issues that touch deep into Americans hearts; the military is one of them. They focused on issues like the military, national security and 9/11.

The issue of the military is very important to the American public because it's deeply rooted in our nation's history as well as our own family history. Most Americans have or have had a family member serve in the United States Armed Forces. So, it is not surprising that any issue involving the safety and well being of the United States military is extremely important. They are our backbone and our support system. Bush and his administration in their speeches constantly used personal stories of military families sacrificing overseas and in our homeland for the war effort against terrorism to help prevent another 9/11. As consumers we will be willing to do whatever it takes to help our military as Bush and his administration boldly state within their speeches help frame their patriot self-sacrifice rhetoric and Iraq War on Terror self-sacrifice rhetoric. The issue of our national security jointly with the possibility of being in danger of

another possible future attack after 9/11 sends shivers of fear down any Americans' spine. Within their post 9/11 rhetoric's of sacrifice you can see they used a constant stream of war on terror imagery of possible biochemical weapons that can cause destruction to the American people if not dealt with immediately. This terror filled self-sacrifice rhetoric labeled terrorism as the United States' number one enemy. It helped identify Americans against terror. The issue of our national security also helped the Bush administration and Bush to use within their elite rhetoric patriotic propositions to fight against terrorism and protect our nation from another 9/11. It introduced the Patriot Act and its various restrictions on civil freedoms. Within these elite speeches you can see how the Patriot Act alongside its powers to enhance its surveillance on our national security fence can possibly frame this issue among the public to allow some restrictions on their civil freedoms and privacy like allow wiretaps, torture possible terrorists and racial profiling in airport security to possibly help protect their national security as an overall beneficial result to their costly sacrifices.

The main issue seen within the elite rhetoric is that we must do our part to prevent another 9/11. Bush and his administration do a good job in constantly repeating 9/11 imagery into people minds to remember and to never forget the lives lost that day. They use this good versus evil theme that places terrorism as the evil opponent that we must help overcome with our continuous sacrifices to win against the war on terror. Throughout most if not all their speeches it doesn't seem to fail the constant reminder of 9/11 and what could repeat itself if not prevented in completing our mission to win the war.

As I mentioned above these issues are framed not only by the rhetoric present to the American public but also by emotional indicators the American public already possesses and gets after 9/11. These two rhetoric's of sacrifice alongside the war narratives present during the

War in Iraq have emotional motivators centering on a response after 9/11 to identify an American as either *All for One and One for All* or *Terrorism is Enemy #1*. These two rhetoric's are framed around issues shared among the American public during the Iraq War and around a common national enemy: terrorism. The public within these self-sacrifice rhetoric's are shaped to not only identify against a "common threat," but also to seek revenge and fuel their emotional fire with anger against terrorism to win the war (Stern, 1995).

Findings

1.1 Bush Administration Speeches 2003-2005:

I looked at Presidential speeches from former President George W. Bush to the American public from 2003 to 2005 from *Vital Speeches of the Day*. In the speeches of former President George W. Bush given to the American public from 2003 to 2005 I measured three sacrifices constantly exposed to the public through his patriotic self-sacrifice rhetoric and Iraq War on Terror self-sacrifice rhetoric. I also analyzed speeches from three other public officials close to the Bush Administration. I looked at Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice speeches from 2003 to 2005 to see if they also asked the American public to make certain self-sacrifices in order to win the war against terrorism and help prevent another terrorist attack. I measured blood, freedom, and treasure as sacrifices asked from the American public to sacrifice for their freedom, liberty and to be victorious against the war on terror as trade-offs for better national security.

Throughout the dialogue of these speeches “blood” was the sacrifice mostly mentioned more than freedom and treasure towards the American public. Blood was mentioned eighty-five (85) times throughout the speeches. Freedom was mentioned twenty-nine (29) times throughout the speeches. Lastly, treasure was mentioned also only twenty-nine (29) times throughout the speeches. Blood as a sacrifice was constantly exposed to the public as a necessary sacrifice needed to win the war. Specifically, George W. Bush would share throughout his speeches stories of soldiers and their families making the ultimate sacrifice for their service as the “highest call of citizenship” (Progress in Afghanistan and Iraq, Bush July 1, 2003). Bush constantly used his patriotic rhetoric of the American public’s duty to sacrifice and especially towards the military families. “Many Americans are serving and sacrificing to keep this country

safe and we thank them for their sacrifice and we mourn the dead and now vow to never forget their sacrifice because they served after the attacks on September 11, 2001” (Defending the War in Iraq, Bush July 9, 2004, 34).

Year	US	UK	Other	Total
2003	486	53	41	580
2004	849	22	35	906
2005	846	23	28	897
2006	823	29	21	873
2007	904	47	10	961
2008	314	4	4	322
2009	149	1	0	150
2010	60	0	0	60
2011	54	0	0	54
2012	1	0	0	1
Total	4486	179	139	4804

Figure 1. Iraq Coalition Military Fatalities By Year
iCasualties: Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom Casualties

1.2 Blood as a sacrifice:

How much are Americans willing to sacrifice in U.S. military casualties to win the war against terrorism in order to not experience another terrorist attack? As mentioned above I measured through theory testing how many times Former President George W. Bush mentioned “blood” as a sacrifice in going to war throughout his speeches and what type of rhetoric accompanied this sacrifice. In my findings of Americans’ willingness to sacrifice blood I found that blood as a sacrifice ranked highest in the Bush Administrations’ discourse throughout their speeches from 2003 to 2005.

As I mentioned above in the speeches by George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice there is a high level of blood sacrifice asked from the public and the public is willing to sacrifice their military for a greater cost which is to prevent another terrorist attack and win the war against terrorism. Blood was mentioned eighty-five (85) times

throughout the speeches and constantly refreshed in the public's memory of the uniformed men and women's sacrifice also shared by their families.

I also measured blood by looking at public opinion polls taken of Americans sharing their opinion of what is an acceptable number of casualties of our United States Military to achieve their goal of winning against the war on terrorism. I also looked at how sensitive they are to military casualties by measuring the costs versus the goals. As I mentioned above casualties is narrowed down to focus only on military fatalities and not a broad term of the meaning which is not referring to injuries, MIA soldiers and other wounds sustained during the war but just focusing on fatalities. The ABC News/Washington Post Poll asked a series of monthly polls from March 2003 to October 2005 that asked Americans of what they felt was an acceptable amount of military sacrifice to win the war on terror. Question: Thinking about the goals versus the cost of this war, so far in your opinion has there been an acceptable number of U.S. (United States) military casualties in Iraq?

The American public in March 2003 felt there was a 58% amount acceptance of U.S. military casualties in Iraq. From March 2003 on to the end of that year the percentage gradually went down and kept going down to 25% by October 2005. The public early on in the beginning of the Iraq War felt it was a little over a 50% acceptance rate of U.S. military casualties in Iraq and were willing to sacrifice "blood" to win the war in Iraq. They also did expect there would be a quick war and few casualties as shown in the Time/CNN/Harris Interactive Poll, (February, 2003) where the American public was asked, If the United States goes to war with Iraq, which of the following do you think is the most likely outcome?... A quick war, with few casualties and a U.S. victory, a long war, with many casualties and a U.S. victory, withdrawal without victory: where 46% was rendered for a quick war, with few casualties and a U.S. victory, 42% was

rendered for a long war, with many casualties and a U.S. victory, as 8% was rendered for a withdrawal without victory and lastly 4% was not sure in their response (Time/CNN/Harris Interactive Poll, February, 2003).

Blood as a sacrifice in these polls measuring Americans' acceptance of U.S. military casualties for an Iraq War victory against terrorism yields a high level of willingness to sacrifice blood in 2003 in terms of military casualties. Ironically, this wouldn't be surprising since the Iraq War started in that year. Although, 42% of Americans predicted a long war, with many casualties as long as it provided a U.S. victory. It is also not surprising that Americans gradually changed their level of blood sacrifice from 2003 to 2005 since the war was still taking its course and no victory had been declared.

I also measured in terms of numbers from the iCasualties website from the beginning of the War in Iraq the casualties thus far and you can see that from 2003-2012 there have been approximately a total of 4,486 Iraq Coalition Military Fatalities for the United States Armed Forces alone. If you include the United Kingdom and other nations then the numbers would increase. In 2003 the total of U.S. military fatalities was 486 and increased to 849 in 2004 and 846 in 2005. The American public is willing to sacrifice their military in terms of tolerance for military casualties if the benefits outweigh the costs. The American public rationalizes the risks associated with the benefits and tries to analyze in their minds that the right choice is to stay the course and finish what they started to ultimately honor those who've sacrificed so much in the process; honor their service so it is not done in vain. The American public is willing to sacrifice their uniformed men and women if it means they will win the war against terrorism and help prevent another terrorist attack. This willingness is present in the speeches of the Bush Administration and former President George W. Bush's self-sacrifice rhetoric. According to

former President George W. Bush on March 17, 2003, in a “Message to Saddam Hussein”, “the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war, and every measure will be taken to win it. Americans understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past. War has no certainty, except certainty of sacrifice” (Bush 2003, 69). Americans know their sacrifice and especially those in the United States Armed Forces including their families understand the duty they face to their country at war. Throughout the other speeches by George W. Bush and the Bush Administration from 2003 to 2005 they surround themselves in a constant patriotic aura with a mixture of terrorism is enemy #1. Through the constant repetitive elite rhetoric I found that terror to the American people was not just seen as a criminal act but a means to go to war (Bush 2004, 106).

“The war on terror is our fight” and “is not a figure of speech but an inescapable calling of our generation” to remember the fallen and to “honor their sacrifice” by finishing the mission (Bush 2004, 117). This is the type of self-sacrifice rhetoric George W. Bush and his administration exposed to the American public. They not only instilled this type of fight for your country patriotic warrior ethics present in both rhetoric’s of sacrifice after 9/11 but also shared with the American public on a more personal level by actually sharing stories of military individuals who lived these blood sacrifices. This type of textual discourse was present mostly with George W. Bush’s Presidential speeches where he mentions letters sent to him from soldiers overseas sharing in the fight against terrorism to not re-live a 9/11 and also honoring their families if that soldier died overseas fighting the war effort by presenting them in his speech or in person. These types of methods used by George W. Bush and the Bush Administration renders a more personal level connection with the American public to show that these Americans being honored are facing the exact same loss of life, memories, fears, and blood sacrifices. This

type of issue framing within the rhetoric's of sacrifice experienced after 9/11, you can see how the American public is more willing to share in these types of sacrifices if it means to honor their loved one's life, military service and to make sure if anything that their sacrifice isn't made in vain. Their speeches frame blood as an issue for the American public to invest their lives to sacrifice for not only the greater good as national security but for their honor.

Not only did I plan to measure blood in terms of military casualties but also in terms of volunteering for war itself after 9/11. Within the text of George W. Bush and his administration I found that the American public was willing to sacrifice another year or years in the military to win the war against terrorism. Some men in women in uniform would re-enlist right at the moment when George W. Bush was finishing his speech to the nation as their "highest call of citizenship" and sacrifice (Bush, 2003). The personal level of connection shared within these speeches is also present when it comes to measuring blood in terms of volunteering for war or enlisting in the United States Armed Forces. George W. Bush gives other types of stories within his speeches of how some men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces volunteered for their service and know those risks associated with the military, and feel the need to protect not only their nation but their families as well. They never want to bring the fight back home to their loves ones and not have their children experience another terrorist attack like they witnessed on 9/11. "If we can eliminate whatever threat we can on foreign soil, I would rather do it there than have it come [home] to us" (Bush 2005, 20).

I collected data from Public Affairs offices from all four branches of the United States Armed Forces including their Reserves of their retention numbers. Their retention numbers indicate how many men in women volunteered to join the military. I also interviewed a recruiter from the Air Force whom gave me detailed accounts of how willingly "people of all ages would

walk into a recruiting office and ask what they needed to do to enlist and do their part in serving the nation” (D'Andrea, 2012). I specifically focused only on the data from 2003 to 2005 although I had data for some military branches since after 9/11.

The Air Force recruiting goals and accessions from 2003 to 2005 gradually decreased from 37,144 enlisted active duty in 2003 to 34,362 enlisted active duty in 2004 but drastically decreased to 19,222 enlisted active duty in 2005. I also collected for this specific branch the top 3 reasons why people enlist and patriotism as the duty to serve your country is one of them. From 2003 to 2005 patriotism stays constant as the top first or second reason for joining the Air Force.

In the Navy Recruiting Facts and Statistics from 2003 to 2005 you see a gradual decrease in accessions in enlistments from both active duty and reserve in the Navy. In 2003 under active duty enlistments you can see that the goal was met for 12,772 enlistments. That number gradually decreased the next two years and their accession goals were not met. In 2003 under the Navy Reserve enlistments you can see that their goals were met all three years but still those goals gradually decreased from 41,376 in 2003 to 39,868 in 2004 and 37,704 in 2005.

The Army Active Duty and Army Reserve enlistments from 2003 to 2005 show that under the Army Active Duty accessions increased in 2003 from 74,132 to 77,587 in 2004 but came back down in 2005 to 73,255. Under the Army Reserve enlistment data you can see that from 2003 only 27,365 people enlisted and decreased thereafter to 21,095 in 2004 and 19,400 in 2005.

In the United States Marine Corp. enlistment data from 2003 and 2005 showed a fluctuation from 2003 to 2005. In 2003 they achieved 38,685 enlistments with 32,526 in Active Duty and 6,159 in the Reserves. In 2004 they achieved 36,794 enlistments with 30,629 in Active

Duty and 6,165 in the Reserves. In 2005 they achieved 38,881 enlistments, which increased from the previous year with 32,955 in Active Duty, and 5,926 in the Reserves.

In observing enlistment accessions from 2003 to 2005 in each branch it is safe to say there was a gradual decrease in enlistments. This meant that the American public was less willing each year to volunteer to go to war or let alone the United States Armed Forces. There were enlistments that showed motivation for patriotism as their reason for joining but still no significant increase in enlistment data between the years of 2003 to 2005.

The level of blood sacrifice was low in terms of enlistment data I gathered from the four-armed branches of service. The Garrison State narrative did yield a high level of willingness to sacrifice for blood but only for casualty tolerance as long as the war was quick and not lengthy. People were willing to sacrifice blood in 2003 but as the war progressed that level decreased. That reason is because the war is lengthy and no victory has been declared and that keeps on bringing more loss of U.S. soldiers which the American public is not willing to sacrifice. Their benefits are not being met in a quick fashion and their costs are increasing and are uncertain which rationally the public does not support. The Bush Administration and George W. Bush rhetoric sold more the American public the idea of honoring your country by volunteering for war and making the ultimate sacrifice to win the war and the war against terrorism. They sold more the Garrison State narrative, which not only changed the American public forever after 9/11 but changed their views on life and their mission in life as well. They were not willing to volunteer for war and especially with no set victory yet in Iraq but were willing to sacrifice some casualties if it meant a quick war because they rationalized their costs and benefits.

FY	Goal	Accessions
2005	11,491	9,788
2004	11,000	11,246
2003	12,000	12,772

Figure 2. Navy Recruiting Reserve Enlisted Goals/Accessions

FY	Goal	Accessions	End-Strength
2005	37,635	37,704	365,900
2004	39,700	39,868	373,800
2003	41,359	41,376	382,235

Figure 3. Navy Recruiting Enlisted Active Goals/Accessions

Fiscal Year	Non Prior Service Goal	Prior Service Goal	TOTAL Entered Active Duty
2000	34000	300	35217
2001	34000	600	35381
2002	36013	1270	37967
2003	36000	1000	37144
2004	33327	753	34362
2005	18860	40	19222
2006	30710	40	30889
2007	27760	40	27801
2008	27760	40	27848
2009	31780	200	31,983
2010	29,384	200	29,584
2011	27,965	250	28,265
2012	28,757	280	29,037

Figure 4. Air Force Recruiting Facts and Statistics FY 2000 through FY 2012

Air Force Recruiting Goals and Accessions FY 2000 through FY 2012

Fiscal Year	Non Prior Service Goal	Prior Service Goal	TOTAL Entered Active Duty
2000	34000	300	35217
2001	34000	600	35381
2002	36013	1270	37967
2003	36000	1000	37144
2004	33327	753	34362
2005	18860	40	19222
2006	30710	40	30889
2007	27760	40	27801
2008	27760	40	27848
2009	31780	200	31,983
2010	29,384	200	29,584
2011	27,965	250	28,265
2012	28,757	280	29,037

AFRS/PA Current as of October 2012

Figure 5. Air Force Recruiting Facts and Statistics FY 2002 through FY 2011

1.3 Freedom as a sacrifice:

How much are Americans willing to sacrifice their civil freedoms to win the war against terrorism in order to not experience another terrorist attack? The public is willing to sacrifice their civil freedoms because they feel it's a "necessary" sacrifice to help win the war on terrorism and prevent another terrorist attack. (Ayres, McHenry & Associates Poll, May 2004) As seen in the Ayres, McHenry & Associates Poll taken on May 2004, 56% of the public felt it was necessary to have the Patriot Act to help prevent another terrorist attack.

"Which statement comes closer to your view about the Patriot Act passed after 9/11 (September 11, 2001, the date of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon)?...The Patriot Act gave to law enforcement officials the same tools to fight terror that they already had to fight crime, and it is a necessary step to protect the country from another

terrorist attack. The Patriot Act uses terrorism as an excuse to extend the power of the federal government to pry into people's private lives, and it tramples on Americans' civil liberties.” In this survey poll about 56% of the public felt the Patriot Act was necessary, 33% felt the Patriot Act hurts civil liberties while, 11% Didn't know or had no opinion (Ayres, McHenry & Associates Poll, May 2004).

Now are they willing to go a little further and allow wiretaps to prevent another terrorist attack? The Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll taken in July, 2003 asked the public, "After the 9/11 (2001) terrorist attacks (on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon), Congress passed the Patriot Act which, in part, gives federal officials wider authority to use wiretaps and other surveillance techniques. Some people say the Patriot Act is a necessary and effective tool in preventing terrorist attacks, while others say the act goes too far and could violate the civil liberties of average Americans. Which comes closer to your view--overall, would you say the Patriot Act is a good thing for America or a bad thing for America?" This survey rendered 55% felt the Patriot Act is good, 27% felt it was bad, 9% had mixed feelings about the Patriot Act and 9% were also not sure about their feelings towards the Patriot Act (Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll, July 2003).

The Public feels from 2003 to 2005 through a series of polls that show they are 55% to 57% willing to say the Patriot Act through its wiretaps is a good effective tool to prevent another terrorist attack. From 2003 to 2005 their willingness to sacrifice freedom increased and showed a high level of sacrifice to allow wiretaps.

I found that in terms of measuring for Americans willing to sacrifice freedom in terms of torturing suspected terrorists there was a very low level of sacrifice. According to iPoll data from 2004, Americans were asked, “if thinking about the abuse and torture of Iraqi prisoners by

American military personnel at the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, which of the following comes closer to your point of view? In this case, the abuse and torture of the prisoners were justified and understandable because we are at war against terrorists. Abuse and torture of prisoners is always wrong, even in the case of war against terrorists. Around 18% of the public surveyed felt justified in torturing terrorist prisoners because we are at war, 72% it is always wrong and even in the case of war against terrorists, 7% felt some of both is justified and wrong, while 3% were not sure” (NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll, June 2004).

As I mentioned above I measured how many of the American public favored sacrificing possibly being racially profiled in airports as part of the airport security checks. In the iPoll database in a survey question conducted in 2004 by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. “(In order to combat international terrorism, please say whether you favor or oppose each of the following measures.)...Using racial profiling in airport security checks? Around 44% were in favor, 50% were oppose, and 5% were not sure or declined to comment” (Global Views 2004: American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy Survey, July 2004).

In 2005 that number increased to oppose such airport security checks in another public opinion survey conducted by National Conference for Community and Justice. “It has been reported that some security officers stop airline passengers of certain religious or ethnic groups because the officers believe that these groups are more likely than others to commit certain types of crimes. This practice is known as religious or ethnic profiling. Do you approve or disapprove of the use of religious or ethnic profiling by airport security officers? Around 39% approved such airport security checks, 54% disapproved, 5% did not know how they felt, and 2% refused to answer this survey question” (Intergroup Relations Survey, January 2005).

Racial profiling rendered a low level of willingness to sacrifice freedom and continued to

do so from 2004 to 2005 as the American public felt it violates civil freedoms and racially discriminate against a certain race after 9/11. Although the majority disapproved such airport security checks it still shows that the American public is somewhat divided and raises the doubt that they possibly would be willing to sacrifice racial discrimination to prevent another terrorist attack.

In 2003 to 2005, through George W. Bush's speeches and other elite public officials like Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, and Condoleezza Rice in their dialogue rendered a low level of sacrifice for freedom, regarding, their promotion of keeping the Patriot Act in effect and renewing some of its provisions to strictly monitor potential terrorist attacks.

Although discourse over the Temporary State narrative and the Enemy Within narrative were not mentioned as much as the other two narratives, it still rendered a high level of sacrifice for the Patriot Act's general civil freedom restrictions. The Patriot Act was not exposed as much as the other sacrifices in the Presidential speeches and the speeches of the Bush Administration the end result for freedom as a sacrifice yielded a willingness to trade-off privacy in terms of wiretapping to obtain possible terrorist activity to help fight the war on terror. The majority of the American public was not willing to sacrifice airport security checks that could racially discriminate people and also not willing to torture suspected terrorists to release possible information of other terrorists. These results could be associated to the fact that the American public was constantly exposed with possible terrorism imagery and 9/11 imagery that the Patriot Act restrictions on privacy didn't seem that bad to favor. In this paper's case it didn't seem that bad to sacrifice your privacy and being wiretapped. We also need to keep in mind that although these findings showed the majority of people did not want to be racially profiled as per these survey questions we must keep in mind face validity in which they could possibly answer no to

racial profiling as a quick response but actually might be racist but don't want to come off as racists in these surveys.

1.4 Treasure as a sacrifice:

How much are Americans willing to sacrifice treasure to pay for the war in Iraq and win the war against terrorism? In the CBS News/New York Times Poll taken in September, 2005, the American public was asked if they would be willing or not willing to pay more in taxes in order to pay for the war with Iraq? Majority of 77% of the public in this survey were not willing to pay for taxes for the Iraq War, 20% were willing, and 3% did not know or would not answer" (CBS News/New York Times Poll, September, 2005).

The American public was not willing to pay more money in taxes to pay for the war effort as their sacrifice. As a result treasure rendered a low level of sacrifice. Treasure as a sacrifice was not something people wanted to give up and didn't mind giving up immaterial but would rather borrow and obtain a tax cut that would later add on to the budget deficit.

In 2003 to 2005, despite George W. Bush's speeches and other elite public officials like Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, and Condoleezza Rice; in their dialogue the American public's willingness to sacrifice treasure renders a low level of sacrifice. The Bush Administration didn't sell treasure to the public as much in their dialogue as it did sell blood as a sacrifice. If we look at polls on this sacrifice we see the public is not willing to sacrifice treasure.

The Bush Administration and George W. Bush's rhetoric mentioned many times how thankful they were of our nations military and their sacrifice needs more funding to provide them with the best resources. So, it is not shocking that the Glass Firewall narrative which supports military funding was the second most mentioned in their elite rhetoric that was sold to the public as a necessary sacrifice to win the war.

Table 6. After 9/11 Iraq War Level of Sacrifice Results

Narratives		Garrison State Narrative	Glass Firewall Narrative	Temporary State Narrative	Enemy Within Narrative
Sacrifices	Blood (<i>High Level of Discourse</i>)	<i>High Level of Sacrifice</i> (Casualty Tolerance) <i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i> (Enlistments)	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>High Level of Sacrifice</i> (Wiretaps)
	Freedom (<i>Low Level of Discourse</i>)	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i> (Torture Suspected Terrorists) <i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i> (Racial Airport Security Checks)	<i>High Level of Sacrifice</i> (Wiretaps)
	Treasure (<i>Low Level of Discourse</i>)	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i> (Taxes)	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>	<i>Low Level of Sacrifice</i>

Sold Stories

The war narratives in the Iraq War were constantly present and repeated to the public so its not surprising that the Garrison State narrative was the most sold to the public. Blood as a sacrifice was high in terms of U.S. military casualty tolerance if the war would be short-term but a low level of sacrifice rendered when volunteering for war. One can suggest this narrative was more appealing to the public because of their emotional ties to military life. In various speeches given by George W. Bush and his administration you see a constant reminder to never let those who've died for the Iraq War go in vain and to still fight for their cause. When you hear anything regarding the U.S. Armed Forces you can't help but feel patriotic and willing to be supportive in any which way you can for all those who have or are currently serving. This narrative is full of patriotic self-sacrifice and having it constantly repeated through speeches and other forms of media can persuade a nation to follow their loyal roots. Not only was the public reminded to remember those who have fallen but to also fear for another possible terrorist attack and to not let that happen again so its through fear, constant patriotic and terroristic self-sacrifice rhetoric that persuaded the public to follow the Garrison State narrative.

Conclusion

The Iraq War was sold to the American public as a war fighting terrorism and justifies avenging 9/11 as the right thing to do. The war on terror slipped onto our laps unknowingly through the persuasion to go to war with Iraq. The Bush Administration asked from its citizens to make self-sacrifices to help win the war and never let another terrorist attack occur on U.S. soil. Americans were asked to sacrifice blood, freedom, and treasure in order to win the war. This thesis measured these sacrifices and tested its war narratives that were broadcasted through the Bush administrations' constant patriotic and terroristic filled self-sacrifice rhetoric. Through the mixture of both self-sacrifice rhetoric's present in these narratives a constant theme of good versus evil played out in the public's mind of what path to take and what sacrifice to make to win the war. The public felt that sacrificing their civil freedoms like wiretapping was acceptable but other restrictions on personal liberties were not. They also felt that paying more taxes for the war was not something they were too keen on doing and ultimately, the public felt the need to sacrifice more blood in terms of having a tolerance for fatalities although, painful, it was tolerable if it meant it was short-term and not prolonged. Since I only measured the first few years it's safe to say the public came in full force to make certain sacrifices but lost steam shortly after seeing it wasn't going to be a quick war but a long one and terrorism is a battle that's more complicated than originally thought. The public wasn't ready to fight the war on terrorism just yet because they were under the impression they were only fighting the war in Iraq and were secretly slipped this battle against terrorism. The sacrifice model showed what sacrifices the public was willing to make to win the war but in this overall good versus evil battle there needs to be more sacrifices that may be lengthy that the public isn't quite willing to make at the moment and not in this war.

This research project should advance the literature in measuring a society's publics' willingness to make certain sacrifices during war when they are motivated by a constant stream of war narratives broadcasted by the society's government public officials in power. People after reading this research project can see that a society can be motivated to sacrifice in times of war and against terrorism.

My limitations while contributing to this research were due to not having a direct website with more graphs on military enlistment statistics for each branch as I would have hoped to have had because I was not allowed such access by the public affairs office of each branch. I was however, provided by their public affairs office through email a list of the statistical data accounts of enlistments for my research. Some, military branches were gracious in providing me a website and graphs but not all military branches. I had to forcefully go by what their email told me and by their phone conversations of the statistical data.

My primary focus of this research project was to identify the relation between the sacrifice model and the war narratives present after 9/11 and the Iraq War. Each narrative had its own unique focus audience and did not compliment each other given my findings. The Garrison State narrative was mentioned the most throughout the political speeches but that's not to say the other narratives weren't equally as important. It is just that their sacrifice was focused more based at home than in Iraq. For example, the Enemy Within narrative would be presumed to be based more of a sacrifice going on at home than in Iraq. So, each narrative basically has a stronger focus either at home, in Iraq or both. The Glass Firewall narratives focus was based at home for what could be done abroad for Iraq and my findings showed people were not willing to contribute to something far away when it involved their money. The Temporary State narrative was a sacrifice based abroad to help fight a war and terrorism so that was a sacrifice that did not

compliment the Enemy Within narrative as seen in my findings. The Garrison State narrative focused equally between home and abroad around blood as a sacrifice and may be a possible explanation for its high level of sacrifice and constant exposure to the American public as a sacrifice you can make at home to enlist for your country and make the ultimate sacrifice if necessary abroad in Iraq for your people back home and fight against terrorism. When I first came across these narratives I noticed there was no middle ground for sacrifice as a medium level since each narrative had a specific focus: at home, abroad or both. There was either a very high level of willingness to sacrifice or a very low level of sacrifice. One of the limitations I can also add is that the survey questions could have face validity as an effect to this different measurement level of sacrifice that could have yielded a middle ground but that can be further explored with more time and more in-depth research.

Table 2. After 9/11 Sacrifice Model

Sacrifice Model	
Blood	<p>Volunteer for the U.S. Armed Forces;</p> <p>Sustain high levels of support to go to war</p> <p>Tolerate high number of casualties</p>
Freedom	<p>Accept wiretapping of phones and other communications</p> <p>Racially profile individuals in airports and other facilities of national security importance</p> <p>Tolerate torture of suspected terrorists and criminals, possibly exceeding the Constitution and accepted norms</p>
Treasure	<p>Pay more taxes to fund U.S. Armed Forces</p>

Table 3. After 9/11 Rhetoric's of Sacrifice: Characteristics

After 9/11 Rhetoric's of Sacrifice: Characteristics	
<p>Patriotic Self-Sacrifice Rhetoric</p> <p><i>All for One and One for All</i></p>	<p>Iraq War on Terror Self-Sacrifice Rhetoric</p> <p><i>Terrorism is the New World Enemy</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rally-around-the-United States • Patriotic American Identity • 9/11 Imagery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rally-around-the-President-and-the Bush Administration • War on Terror Imagery (WMD) etc. • Americans against Terror Identity • Patriot Act

Table 4. After 9/11 Rhetoric's of Sacrifice: Common Traits

After 9/11 Rhetoric's of Sacrifice: Common Traits	
Patriotic Self-Sacrifice Rhetoric <i>All for One and One For All</i>	Iraq War on Terror Self-Sacrifice Rhetoric <i>Terrorism is the New World Enemy</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Support United States Armed Forces •Remember 9/11 and seek Vengeance/Justice •Good vs. Evil Theme 	

References

- ABC News/Washington Post Poll. (March 2003 to October 2005). Retrieved May-21-2013 from the iPOLL Databank, *The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut*.
http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html
- America Speaks Out About Homeland Security Survey (February, 2004) Retrieved May-22-2013 from the iPOLL Databank, *The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut*. http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html
- Ayres, McHenry & Associates Poll, (May 2004). May 3, 2004 - May 6, 2004.
Retrieved May-21-2013 from the iPOLL Databank, *The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut*.
http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html
- Bush, George W. November 6, 2003. "Freedom in Iraq & Middle East: Address at the 20th Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 16.
- Bush, George W. March 17, 2003. "Message to Saddam Hussein." *Presidential Rhetoric*. 69. www.PresidentialRhetoric.com/speeches/03.17.03.html
- Bush, George W. February 23, 2004. "Speech to the Republican Governors Association." *President Rhetoric*. 106.
www.PresidentialRhetoric.com/speeches/02.23.04.html
- Bush, George W. July 12, 2004. "Defending the War in Iraq." 117. *Presidential Rhetoric*. www.PresidentialRhetoric.com/speeches/07.12.04.html
- Bush, George W. March 19, 2004. "Address One Year After Operation Iraqi Freedom."

- Presidential Rhetoric*. 108. www.PresidentialRhetoric.com/speeches/03.19.04.html
- Bush, George W. July 1, 2003. "Progress in Afghanistan & Iraq." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
www.PresidentialRhetoric.com/speeches/07.01.03.html
- Bush, George W. March 8, 2005. "Speech at the National Defense, University of Fort
Lesley, J. McNair." *Presidential Rhetoric*. 20. Marine Sergeant.
www.PresidentialRhetoric.com/speeches/03.08.05.html
- Bush, George W. 2005. "Remembering Veterans." *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 72 (3): 66-
72.
- Bush, George W. 2005. "Iraq." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 72 (4): 98-104, 7.
- Bush, George W. 2005. "President Bush Sworn-Into Second Term." *Vital Speeches of the
Day*. 71 (8): 226-228, 3.
- Bush, George W. 2005. "President Commemorates 60th Anniversary of V-J Day." *Vital
Speeches of the Day*. 71 (22): 642-678, 5
- Bush, George W. 2005. "Working Together." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 71 (10): 290-
294, 5.
- Bush, George W. February 26, 2003. "Address to the American Enterprise
Institute." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/02.26.03.html>
- Bush, George W. June 5, 2003. "Remarks to Troops in Sayliya, Qatar."
Presidential Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/06.05.03.html>
- Bush, George W. March 19, 2003. "War Message." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/03.19.03.html>
- Bush, George W. April 3, 2003. "Remarks to Marines at Camp Lejeune."

Presidential Rhetoric.

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/04.03.03.html>

Bush, George W. July 1, 2003. "Progress in Afghanistan and Iraq." *Presidential*

Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/07.01.03.html>

Bush, George W. September 7, 2003. "Update in the War on Terror." *Presidential*

Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/09.07.03.html>

Bush, George W. November 6, 2003. "Freedom in Iraq and Middle East: Address at the 20th Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy."

Presidential Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/11.06.03/html>

Bush, George W. December 14, 2003. "Address on the Capture of Saddam Hussein"

Presidential Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/12.14.03.html>

Bush, George W. April 13, 2004. "Prime-Time News Conference." *Presidential*

Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/04.13.04/html>

Bush, George W. July 9, 2004. "Defending the War in Iraq." *Presidential Rhetoric*

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/07.09.04.html>

Bush, George W. August 2, 2004. "Remarks on Intelligence Reform and the 9/11 Commission." *Presidential Rhetoric.*

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/08.02.04.html>

Bush, George W. September 23, 2004. "Press Conference with Prime Minister Allawi."

Presidential Rhetoric.

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/09.23.04.html>

Bush, George W. January 7, 2003. "Economic Policy." *Presidential Rhetoric.*

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/01.07.03.html>

Bush, George W. January 28, 2003. "State of the Union Address." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/01.28.03.html>

Bush, George W. March 26, 2003. "Remarks at MacDrill Air Force Base." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/03.26.03.html>

Bush, George W. May 1, 2003. "The End of Combat in Iraq." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/05.01.03.html>

Bush, George W. June 16, 2003. "Remarks to Small Business Owners in New Jersey." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/06.16.03.html>

Bush, George W. July 30, 2003. "George W. Bush Press Conference." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/07.30.03.html>.

Bush, George W. September 23, 2003. "Address to the United Nations." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/09.23.03.html>

Bush, George W. November 19, 2003. "Address to the Whiteball Palace." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/11.19.03.html>

Bush, George W. January 20, 2004. "State of The Union Address." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/01.20.04.html>

Bush, George W. March 19, 2004. "Address One Year After Operation Iraqi Freedom." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/03.19.04.html>

Bush, George W. May 24, 2004. "Outline for the Future of Iraq." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/05.24.04.html>

Bush, George W. July 12, 2004. "Defending the War in Iraq." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/07.12.04.html>

Bush, George W. November 4, 2004. "The Next 4 Years—Press Conference."

Presidential Rhetoric.

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/11.04.04.html>

Bush, George W. January 20, 2005. "Second Inaugural Address." *Presidential Rhetoric.*

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/01.20.05.html>

Bush, George W. January 30, 2005. "Response to Elections in Iraq." *Presidential*

Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/01.30.05.html>

Bush, George W. February 2, 2005. "State of the Union Address." *Presidential*

Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/02.02.05.html>

Bush, George W. March 8, 2005. "Speech at the National Defense University Fort

Lesly, J. McNair." *Presidential Rhetoric.*

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/03.08.05.html>

Bush, George W. March 16, 2005. "Press Conference." *Presidential Rhetoric.*

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/03.16.05.html>

Bush, George W. May 27, 2005. "2005 Commencement Address at U.S. Naval

Academy: Annapolis, Maryland." *Presidential Rhetoric.*

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/05.27.05.html>

Bush, George W. June 9, 2005. "Renewing the Patriot Act: Columbus, Ohio."

Presidential Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/06.09.05.html>

Bush, George W. June 28, 2005. "War Update: Fort Bragg, NC." *Presidential Rhetoric.*

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/06.28.05.html>

Bush, George W. July 4, 2005. "Independence Day Oration: Morgantown, West

Virginia." *Presidential Rhetoric.*

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches.07.04.05.html>

Bush, George W. July 11, 2005. "Progress Report in the War on Terror: Address at the FBI Academy Quantico, Virginia." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/07.11.05.html>

Bush, George W. July 20, 2005. "The Future of the Patriot Act, Baltimore, Maryland." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/07.20.05.html>

Bush, George W. November 11, 2005. "Veterans Day Address: Defending the War in Afghanistan, Pennsylvania." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/11.11.05.html>

Bush, George W. November 30, 2005. "Iraq War Strategy: Speech at the U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, Maryland." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/11.30.05.html>

Bush, George W. December 7, 2005. "Rebuilding Iraq: Speech to the Council on Foreign Relations Washington, DC." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/12.07.05.html>

Bush, George W. December 12, 2005. "The Struggle for Democracy in Iraq: Speech to the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/12.12.05.html>

Bush, George W. December 14, 2005. "Elections in Iraq: Speech at the Woodrow Wilson Center." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/12.14.05.html>

Bush, George W. December 17, 2005. "The Patriot Act and The National Security Agency." *Presidential Rhetoric*.
<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/12.17.05.html>

Bush, George W. December 18, 2005. "Transition in Iraq: Prime Time Address from the Oval Office." *Presidential Rhetoric*.

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/12.18.05.html>

Bush, George W. December 19, 2005. "Wiretaps and The War: The Year—End Press Conference." *Presidential Rhetoric*.

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/12.19.05.html>

Bush, George W. July 9, 2004. "Defending the War in Iraq." *Presidential Rhetoric*.

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/07.09.04.html>

Bush, George W. October 18, 2004. "Homeland Security and the Presidential Agency." *Presidential Rhetoric*.

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/10.18.04.html>

Bush, George W. September 14, 2004. "Remarks to the National Guard Association."

Presidential Rhetoric. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/09.14.04.html>

Bush, George W. July 14, 2004. "American Values." *Presidential Rhetoric*.

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/07.14.04.html>

Bush, George W. July 20, 2004. "Remarks at Missouri Campaign Rally." *Presidential Rhetoric*. <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/07.20.04.html>

Bush, George W. September 2, 2004. "Now We Go Forward Viva Bush! Viva Bush! Viva Bush! Nomination Acceptance Address; 2004 Republican National Convention." *Presidential Rhetoric*.

<http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/09.02.04.html>

Bush, George W. February 15, 2005. "The Budget." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 71 (9): 282-288, 7.

Bush, George W. June 1, 2004. "We Will Not Fail." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 70 (16): 482-486, 5.

Bush, George W. September 15, 2003. "The Economy is Beginning To Grow." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 69 (23): 709-712.

Bush, George W. April 15, 2004. "Iraq Will Be Free." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 70 (13):386-388, 3

Bush, George W. September 15, 2003. "Freedom's Cause." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 69 (23): 706-708, 3

Bush, George W. May 15, 2003. "Combat Operations in Iraq have Ended." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 69 (15): 450, 3

Bush, George W. November 15, 2005. "Remembering Veterans." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 72 (3): 66-72, 7

Bush, George W. April 1, 2003. "President Says Saddam Hussein Must Leave Iraq Within 48 Hours." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 69 (12): 354, 3

Bush, George W. December 18, 2005. "The War on Terror: Success in Iraq." *Vital Speeches of the Day*.

Bush, George W. August 20, 2005. "The Presidents Radio Address." *Vital Speeches of The Day*.

Bush, George W. September 2002. "The National Security Strategy of the United States." *Vital Speeches of the Day*.

Bush, George W. August 22, 2005. "Remarks to the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Convention in Salt Lake City, Utah." *Vital Speeches of the Day*.

Callahan, Kathe; Melvin J. Dubnick, and Dorothy Olshfski's. Jul. – Aug., 2006. "War

- Narratives: Framing Our Understanding of the War on Terror.” *Public Administration Review*. 66 (4): 554-568
- “iCasualties: Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom Casualties”
last accessed Dec. 7, 2012. <http://icasualties.org/>
- CBS News/New York Times September 9-September 13, 2005. iPOLL Databank,
The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut. http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html
- Cheney, Dick. December 2005. “The War in Iraq.” *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 72 (4): 104-107, 4
- Cheney, Dick. September 15, 2004. “Seeing Our Cause To Victory.” *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 70 (23): 711-714, 4.
- Cheney, Dick. August 15, 2003. “Overcoming The Threat Of Terror.” *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 69 (21): 642-645
- Cobb, Michael D. and William A. Boettcher III (October 2009). “Don't Let Them Die in Vain”: Casualty Frames and Public Tolerance for Escalating Commitment in Iraq.” *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. Sage Publications, Inc. Vol. 53, No. 5, pp. 677-697
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20684610>
- Debrix, François. 2005. “Discourses of War, Geographies of Abjection: Reading Contemporary American Ideologies of Terror.”
Third World Quarterly, Taylor & Francis, Ltd. 26 (7) (2005): 1157-1172. <http://0-www.jstor.org.lib.utep.edu/stable/4017809>
- Duss, Matthew, and Peter Juul. 2011. “Update: The Iraq War Ledger. A Look at the War’s Human, Financial, and Strategic Costs.” *Center for American Progress*.

1-6. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/military/news/2011/12/13/10841/update-the-iraq-war-ledger/>

Edwards, James. 2001-2005. "Total Force Recruitment Missions and Achievements."

Public Affairs. *Marine Corps Recruiting Command*. james.edwards@marines.usmcs.mil

Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll (July 2003). Retrieved May-22-2013 from the iPOLL

Databank, The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of

Connecticut. http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html

Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll (April, 2004) Retrieved May-22-2013 from the iPOLL

Databank, *The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of*

Connecticut. http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html

Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll (June, 2005) Retrieved May-22-2013 from the iPOLL

Databank, *The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of*

Connecticut. http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html

Gallup Poll Organization (December 2002). iPOLL Databank, *The Roper Center for*

Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut.

http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html

Gelpi, Christopher, Feaver, and Reifler. 2006. "Success Matters Casualty Sensitivity and

the War in Iraq." President and Fellow of Harvard College and the Massachusetts

Institute of Technology. International Security. *The MIT Press*.

30 (3) :7-46. <http://www.jstor.org.lib.utep.edu/stable/4137486>

Gershkoff, Amy; Shana Kushner. September, 2005. "Shaping Public Opinion: The 9/11-

Iraq Connection in the Bush Administration's Rhetoric." *Perspectives on Politics*

American Political Science Association. 3 (3): 525-537.

Global Views 2004: American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy Survey, Jul, 2004.

Retrieved May-22-2013 from the iPOLL Databank, *The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut*.

http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html

Global View 2004: American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy Survey, July, 2004

iPOLL Databank, *The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut*. http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html

Hannah, Matthew. September 2006. "Torture and the Ticking Bomb: The War on Terrorism as a Geographical Imagination of Power/Knowledge." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 96 (3): 622-640. *Taylor & Francis, Ltd. on behalf of the Association of American Geographers*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4124436>

Hanson, Victor Davis. 2002. "An Autumn of War: What America Learned from September 11 and the War on Terrorism." *New York: Anchor Books*, 16

Jervis, Robert. Fall 2003. "Understanding the Bush Doctrine." *Political Science Quarterly*. 118 (3): 365-388. The Academy of Political Science. <http://0www.jstor.org.lib.utep.edu/stable/30035780>

Kaplan, Robert D. 2002. "Warrior Politics: Why Leadership Demands a Pagan Ethos." *New York: Random House*. 15

Kellner, Douglas. December 2007. "Bushspeak and the Politics of Lying: Presidential Rhetoric in the War on Terror." *Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress. Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 37 (4): 622-645. Shadows of Democracy in Presidential Rhetoric. <http://0www.jstor.org.lib.utep.edu/stable/27552281>

Kristeva, Julia. 1982. "Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection." *New York: Columbia*

University Press. 1.

Ledeen, Michael. 2002. "The War Against the Terror Masters: Why It Happened, Where We Are Now, How We'll Win." *New York: St Martin's Press.*

<http://0www.jstor.org.lib.utep.edu/stable/3689022>

Marks, Alexandra. November 2, 2008. "Sacrifice theme returns to US politics. Both McCain and Obama cite." *The Christian Science Monitor.*

<http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2008/1102/sacrifice-theme-returns-to-us-politics>

McCombs, Charlene G. 2000-2011. Air Force Recruiting Facts and Statistics FY 2000 Through FY 2012. Air Force Recruiting Facts and Statistics FY 2002 through FY 2011. HQ AFRC/RS Advertising.

NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll, Jun, 2004. Retrieved May-22-2013 from the iPOLL Databank, The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut. http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html

Navy Recruiting Facts and Statistics. <http://www.cnrc.navy.mil/facts-and-stats.htm>

Prewitt, Kenneth; Eric Alterman, Andrew Arato, Tom Pyszczynski, Corey

Robin and Jessica Stern. Winter 2004. "The Politics of Fear After 9/11

Social Research." 71 (4): 1129-1146. FEAR: ITS POLITICAL USES &

ABUSES. *The New School.* <http://0www.jstor.org.lib.utep.edu/stable/40971995>

Rice, Condoleezza. June 26, 2003. "Remarks at the International Institute for Strategic Studies. Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs."

International Institute for Strategic Studies. London, United Kingdom

Roberts, Joel. CBS News (October 10, 2005). <http://www.cbsnews.com/2100->

500160_162-930772.html

Rumsfeld, Donald. 2004. "Terrorism." *Vital Speeches Of The Day*, 70 (21): 642-645.

Rumsfeld, Donald. June 1, 2003. "What We Learned From the War

TRANSFORMATION TAKES MONEY." *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 69 (16):

482, 7.

Stern, Paul C., June 1995. "Why Do People Sacrifice for Their Nations?"

Political Psychology. International Society of Political Psychology. 16 (2): 217-235.

<http://0www.jstor.org.lib.utep.edu/stable/3791830>

Sunstein, Cass R. (Winter 2004). "Fear and Liberty." *Social Research*, 71 (4): 967-996

FEAR: ITS POLITICAL USES & ABUSES. *The New School*. <http://0->

www.jstor.org.lib.utep.edu/stable/40971987

Taking America's Pulse III - Intergroup Relations Survey, Jan, 2005. iPOLL Databank,

The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of

Connecticut. http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html

Time/CNN/Harris Interactive Poll, February 2003. Retrieved May-21-2013 from the

iPOLL Databank, *The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of*

Connecticut. http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html

Welker, Kathleen. Army Recruiting Statistics. 2001-2006. Army Accessions: Active

Duty and Reserve. *US Army Recruiting Command*. Fort Knox, KY.

kathleen.welker@usarece.army.mil. <http://www.facebook.com/USAREC>

Zarefsky, David. 2004. "Presidential Rhetoric and the Power of Definition."

Presidential Studies Quarterly. 34 (3): 607-619. The Public

Presidency. Wiley on behalf of the Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress.

<http://0-www.jstor.org.lib.utep.edu/stable/27552615>

9/11 Attacks - 102 Minutes That Changed America. 1996-2013. *A&E Television*

Networks, LLC. www.history.com/topics/9-11-attacks/interactives/witness-to-911

Vita

Janette Galvan is a native of Mission, Texas. She graduated from La Joya Senior High School in 2006. She received her Bachelor's Degree in Political Science and minors in English, Spanish and Journalism from the University of Texas-Pan American in the fall of 2008. She was accepted into the political science graduate program in the fall of 2009.

Permanent address: 7030 Palo Blanco Dr.
Mission, Texas, 78572

This thesis was typed by Janette Galvan.