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This essay will show how conservatism and liberalism is established and maintained in American presidential rhetoric, by analyzing the speeches held by George W. Bush in 2000 and Barack Obama in 2008 at their respective party’s national convention, at the time when they accepted their party’s nomination for the presidency for the first time. By conducting an ideology analysis by examining the language used in the two speeches, and connect that to the metaphors of morality in George Lakoff’s (2002) theory of the Nation-as-Family, the essay will show examples of how the two presidential candidates establish themselves as bearers and protectors of their party’s ideological base and how this can be related to the view on moral in American politics.

The Republican Party connects to conservative ideology and the Democratic Party to liberal ideology. The Nation-as-Family theory involves looking at the relationship between the government and its citizens as that between parents and their children. Connected to conservative ideology is the Strict Father who proclaims authority, obedience and character and connected to liberal ideology is the Nurturant Parent who proclaims nurturing, empathy and equal distribution of opportunities. Connected to Strict Father and Nurturant Parent there exists a number of metaphors of morality that helps organize the language being used.

Although notions of the ‘wrong’ moralities appear in the ‘wrong’ speeches, the results from the analysis clearly indicates that the Nation-as-Family theory is highly valid in displaying the connections between political speeches and the ideological bases to which the speakers adhere.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The American political arena is highly dichotomized between conservative and liberal values, stemming from different views on moral (Lakoff 2002: 11). Each ideological base can be connected to a respective party; the Republican Party that supports conservative values and the Democratic Party that supports liberal values. These values can, in the case of conservatives, be connected to keywords such as ‘authority’ and ‘purity’, while liberals connect more to keywords such as ‘harm’ and ‘fairness’ (Graham et al. 2009: 1035).

David C. Leege et al. claims in *The Politics of Cultural Difference: Social Change and Voter Mobilization Strategies in the Post-New Deal Period* (2002) that today, the issues of most debate in American politics has been brought to the arena by the Republican Party and are based on traditional conservative values (Leege et al. 2002: 7).

The dichotomization between the conservative and liberal base is visible in the speech given by the vice presidential candidate Dan Quayle at the 1992 Republican National Convention, who stated that: ‘The gap between us and our opponents is a cultural divide. It is not just a difference between conservative and liberal. It is a difference between fighting for what is right and refusing to see what is wrong’ (Quayle quoted in Leege et al. 2002: 13). From Dan Quayle’s speech, what emerges is a notion of the struggle between conservatives and liberals, or Republicans and Democrats, not about strictly political issues, but rather about core values in the American society.

In the 1992 election, the Republican Party based their campaign on notions of ‘Family’ (Leege et al. 2002: 14). This view is used throughout American politics, and has even spun the creation of models of analysis regarding the nation as a family, where the government act as parents and the citizens as children (Lakoff 2002: 12-13). By an idea of viewing the relationship between the government and the citizens as that of family, American political leaders has established a base of morality that speaks to the core values of each party’s electorate.

This essay will apply the theory of Nation-as-Family created by George Lakoff (2002) on two speeches by then presidential candidates George W. Bush in 2000 and Barack Obama in 2008 and analyze that data from an ideology analysis using ideal types in order to show evidence of how liberal and conservative ideology is created and maintained in American politics.
2. AIM & RESEARCH QUESTION

By analyzing the language in presidential candidates’ acceptance speeches, held at each respective party’s national convention, with an audience of likeminded persons, and connect it to moral agendas of conservative and liberal American values, the aim for this essay is to apply George Lakoff’s (2002) model of the Nation-as-Family in order to display the use of language connected to the various metaphors of morality, specific for liberal and conservative ideology.¹

The research questions for this essay will be:

- Does the language used in the two speeches connect to liberalism/conservatism?
- Is Lakoff’s theory of the Nation-as-Family valid in analyzing ideology in American politics?

3. METHOD

The general design of the following analysis will be to apply the Nation-as-Family theory on the two selected speeches by George W. Bush (2000) and Barack Obama (2008). By analyzing the language used in the speeches using ideal types in an ideology analysis, the ideological bases of the two candidates and their parties will be described.

3.1 Coding of speeches

In order to provide clear references to the speeches throughout the analysis, direct quotation will be used. Referencing will be made by a coding scheme based on subheadings in the speeches, identified by myself. Each subheading will be marked numerical in consecutive order, and all paragraphs of each subheading will be marked with two decimals in consecutive order to the subheading (e.g. 1.0.1). The reason for using two decimals is that some of the subheadings need to be divided into sub-subheadings (e.g. 5.1.1). The coding of the speeches will be accessible in the Appendix.

¹ Throughout the essay, the words Conservative and Republican are used alternately to refer to the same phenomenon, just as is the case with Liberal and Democrat. Although conservatism and liberalism are ideologies and Republican and Democrat refer to the two parties by the same name, in this essay, each party is considered as a bearer of the connected ideology and therefore, the two ideologies are used interchangeably with each respective party to refer to the same object.
3.2 Nation-as-Family

George Lakoff created the Nation-as-Family theory from examining the 1994 presidential election race, where he took notice of how each candidate (representing either liberalism or conservatism) spoke about moral and how this could be related to different sets of metaphors of governance and which notions of moral the candidates seemed to prefer in order to craft one’s message (Lakoff 2002: 11).

From this, Lakoff has created a model of analyzing the language used in American politics, from the perspective of the relationship between parents and their children. Connected to conservatism is the Strict (authoritarian) Father and connected to liberalism is the Nurturant (caring) Parent, which are used as metaphors for approaches to governance (Lakoff 2002: 13; McAdams et al. 2008: 987).

According to Lakoff, American politicians in general and presidential candidates in particular, use language connected to these metaphors of moral in order to establish their role as protectors of liberal or conservative values, important for the parties’ electorate. From that perspective, applying Lakoff’s model on speeches produced by two late presidents, those speeches should display numerous examples of language that can be connected to the metaphors of Strict Father and Nurturant Parent.

The task at hand is not to identify the explicit use of metaphors in the speeches. Metaphors are to some extent mostly a means to ‘decorate’ the language (Black 1962: 34), and paint a picture for the audience by relating what is said to something familiar: ‘The metaphorical use of an expression consists, on this view, of the use of that expression in other than its proper or normal sense’ (Black 1962: 31). Using metaphors is hence based on our knowledge of the expressions being used, and our ability to understand the similarity between them (Goatly 1997: 16).

The metaphors in the Nation-as-Family theory relate to the view on the relationship between the government and the people as between parents and their children. Rather than to identify the explicit use of metaphors in the speeches, the task at hand is to show how the language used in the speeches connects conceptually to the two ideal types; Strict Father and Nurturant Parent, which are metaphors of displaying the governing of a state as governing a family.

3.2.1 Moral Foundations Theory

It would be worth to briefly mention and consider the other main theory of examining moral in American politics. The idea of Moral Foundations Theory (Haidt & Joseph 2004; Haidt &
Graham 2007) is that it exist a set of five moral virtues which can be identified in various political discourses and in that context, determine which ideology is the dominant. The main difference from the Nation-as-Family theory is that the five moral virtues are not ascribed to a certain ideal type of a certain ideology. Instead, all five virtues are taken into account in analyzing all the material, and when describing the results from the analysis, a pattern of which virtues are connected to which ideology emerges. Moral Foundations Theory is first and foremost a quantitative model, primarily used by counting the occurrence of specific words relating to each moral virtue of the model. Since the present essay is not primarily about identifying the moral aspects in themselves, the Moral Foundations Theory is not suitable for the following analysis.

3.3 Ideology analysis

In conducting an ideology analysis there are multiple ways of approaching the data. The two most common is either to structure the analysis by identifying certain ideal types specific for different ideologies (Bergström & Boréus, ed. 2005: 160). These ideal types are then used as a point of reference when analyzing the data chosen for the analysis and by identifying aspects of the ideal types in the data, the ideologies can be understood. For example, by analyzing speeches from ideal types and exemplify with quotes, an analysis would be able to identify the ideology held by the speaker (Bergström & Boréus, ed. 2005: 162).

The second most common way to structure an ideology analysis is by identifying a certain number of dimensions, or issues, which is specific for an ideology, a party, etc. If certain dimensions are ascribed to e.g. a party, by analyzing the data collected, e.g. speeches and identifying the specific dimensions, the ideology supporting these dimensions are brought to light (Bergström & Boréus, ed. 2005: 164). In the case with dimensions, however, it would be worth noting that the analysis is most successful when the issue at hand is to distinguish certain dimensions’ value to certain ideologies, e.g. by clarifying the differences between liberal and conservative values.

An important aspect when using the first approach of ideal types is that it requires a certain amount of focus and effort in order to clearly define the ideal types. Loosely created ideal types risk being identified as the more loosely defined dimensions of the second approach. Using dimensions are of particular use when analyzing over a longer period of time, where the loosely defined dimensions are given the opportunity to fluctuate, while using ideal types are handier when analyzing a fixed, shorter time span where the fixed ideal types help as a toolbox to keep the analysis on track (Bergström & Boréus, ed. 2005: 172).
The ideal types for the following analysis will be the two major concepts in the Nation-as-Family theory where, for conservatism; the ideal type will be the concept of the Strict Father and for liberalism; the ideal type will be the concept of the Nurturant Parent. The language used in the two speeches will be connected to the moralities of these two ideal types in order to display the connection made to the ideological bases to which the speakers adhere.

3.3.1 Liberalism
As can be derived from the name, the basic tenet of liberalism is liberty. This liberty is first and foremost an individual liberty. Although the liberty of the society as a group is important, the individual liberty stands higher (Ball & Dagger 2011: 46).

Liberalism is based on an idea of progress and development. In order for society to evolve, one cannot dwell in old habits and systems, but have to strive forward. If e.g. society displays social inequalities it is because of old outdated systems that need to be left behind in order to create a more sustainable society (Schlenker et al. 2012: 128).

Liberalism is traditionally divided between neoclassical liberalism and welfare liberalism. The neoclassical strand stresses that the government robs people of their freedom and that the individual should be free to the extent that the state is reduced to a nightwatch state whose job it is to secure the safety and property of the citizens (Ball & Dagger 2011: 70; 79). Welfare liberalism on the other hand, sees government as a tool that can be shaped in order to provide for all citizens. Mostly this is about making sure that everyone’s freedom is secured and that everyone gets an equal opportunity to thrive in society (Ball & Dagger 2011: 71; 79; Schlenker et al. 2012: 129). In some strands, neoclassical liberalism has been labeled conservatism, due to the big opposition to welfare liberal ideas (Ball & Dagger 2011: 72). When it comes to the issue of social welfare, conservatives, as well as neoclassical liberals, claim that such programs are immoral, since they stem from a lack of self-reliance and a self-assertive government (Lakoff 2002: 13).

In the following analysis, when liberalism and/or liberals (and Democrats) are mentioned, what is meant is the welfare liberalism, since it is the ruling version of liberalism in contemporary American politics.

3.3.2 Conservatism
Although somewhat harder to define than liberalism, conservatism is, as can be derived from the name, concerned with conserving traditions and old systems of society known to be functioning (Ball & Dagger 2011: 93). This stems from an idea that the systems has been
adapted throughout history in order to meet the needs of that particular time, and hence, are best to be left alone since they are now adapted to the present needs (Schlenker et al. 2012: 128). Central to conservatism is self-reliance and self-discipline, as e.g. the notion that the immorality of social welfare is stemming from the myth of the original sin when Adam and Eve defied God in the Garden of Eden. Just as Adam and Eve lacked the self-discipline to not eat of the forbidden fruit, the need to be on social welfare is immoral since one has not shown proper self-discipline in managing on one’s own (Lakoff 2002: 13) and is thus an irresponsible citizen taking advantage of those who are showing self-discipline (Cruikshank in Dean, ed. 2000: 68).

The practical implications of conservatism imply that individuals should be as free as possible and be given the opportunity to act freely in a competitive market, where the state does not spend money on apparatuses that hinders those opportunities (i.e. social welfare) (Ball & Dagger 2011: 106; 113; Schlenker et al. 2012: 129).

As mentioned above in the section about liberalism, neoclassical liberals have been accused of being conservatives. Since this position stresses that the government hinders people to thrive, its proponents are seen as old fashioned. In America, this neoclassical liberalism has been labeled as on pair with conservatism (Ball & Dagger 2011: 107), stemming from the fact that when the United States of America was formed after English colonial rule, the variations of liberalisms (which were imported from Europe) came to be seen as ones opposites.

In the following analysis, when conservatism and/or conservatives (and Republicans) are mentioned, what is meant is the American notion of conservatism, which bear as its trademark the notions of neoclassical liberalism, where individual freedom is valued highest in the free competitive market and where the state does not interfere through imposing systems such as social welfare and similar that imposes individual freedom and self-reliance.

3.4 Other approaches
There exists a number of conflicting approaches to analyzing the use of metaphors in political speeches. Jeffrey Scott Mio et al. (2008) takes as a vantage point that speeches containing more metaphors are more inspiring to the audience from perspectives of emotional connections and conveying of messages (Mio et al. 2005: 288). From this, Mio and his fellow authors construct a quantitative study in order to identify the number of metaphors used and relate the findings to the general held notion of a presidents’ charisma.
A somewhat different approach were taken in 2007 when Federica Ferrari claimed that the role of metaphors in speeches is to address the issue of persuasion (Ferrari 2007: 604) and evoke an emotional appeal in the listeners (or readers in cases of text production) (Ferrari 2007: 612). The model she creates is a hybrid, constituted by a focus on 1) Critical Discourse Analysis, 2) rhetorical-argumentative studies, and 3) semantic-cognitive studies in order to: ‘[look] for the founding structure of metaphor in the text’ (Ferrari 2007: 608). Although Mio’s et al. approach is useful in the field of linguistics and Ferrari’s in the study of socio-cultural aspects of metaphoric use, the issue at hand in this essay is to analyze the role of moral in American politics. In the following analysis, the task at hand is not to identify explicit use of metaphors, but rather connect the language used in the speeches to the broad metaphors of Strict Father and Nurturant Parent in the Nation-as-Family theory and hence, these approaches will not play a role in this essay.

3.5 Validity
There are multiple ways of addressing the questions of validity in qualitative analysis. When using ideal types in an ideology analysis, a big advantage is generated since the clear structure of the ideal types helps as a toolbox in the analysis (Bergström & Boréus, ed. 2005: 171). However, in order for the ideal types to be a profitable approach, one needs to be clear about defining the characteristics for each ideology that is due to be analyzed, or the ideal type will be misleading the analysis, providing problem with validity and intrasubjectivity (Bergström & Boréus, ed. 2005: 172).

Intrasubjectivity implies that a researcher should gain similar results from using the same tools for analysis on similar data, at different periods of time (Bergström & Boréus, ed. 2005: 36). In analyzing ideologies from political speeches, similar results should emerge, using the same model, although different representatives deliver the speeches at different times. In constructing clear ideal types in an ideology analysis, satisfying intrasubjectivity should be provided.

For the present essay, the question of validity will be regarded from what Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln (1981) has labeled credibility. This implies that the question of validity is transferred into the more general notion of credibility. Guba and Lincoln suggest that the data at hand is validated from various criteria, of which they should comply with a majority. These criteria deals with aspects such as the history of the data, that it is complete, that the author is the one who is claimed, and ask questions such as: is the data constructed before or after the event to which it was used (Guba & Lincoln 1981: 238-239)?
4. DATA

The data that will be used for the following analysis are the acceptance speeches held by then presidential candidates George W. Bush at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia on 3 November 2000\(^2\) and Barack Obama at the Democratic National Convention in Denver on 28 August 2008.\(^3\)

The two speeches have been collected from the internet resource *The American Presidency Project*\(^4\) and were chosen due to being held by the men who later became Presidents of the United States of America and by the time the speeches were held, for each of the two candidates, the opposing party held the White House.

Since the speeches are delivered to affiliates of the ideology and the party’s agenda, it is presumable that the speakers have no incentive to limit the rhetoric connected to each party’s ideological agenda. Therefore, it is likely that the two speeches will contain numerous examples of traditional conservative and liberal values. Also the fact that the opposing party had held the White House for the previous eight years (which also means that whoever wins, it will be a brand new president since American presidents cannot possess the presidency for more than eight years), is likely to give the speakers an incentive to outline a new and bold strategy for their presidency.

The credibility of the data is valued from the model presented by Guba and Lincoln (1981) above, and although speech writers are commonly used for this kind of speeches, it is presumable that the speeches are reflections of both candidates and their respective opinions. Other aspects of the criteria for credibility are also fulfilled. Since the speeches are transcripts, it can be determined that they (from the place they are collected), were produced after the event and since *The American Presidency Project* is a well-established platform for the issues of American presidential elections, it is credible that the speeches are complete.

5. THEORY

5.1 Moral in American Politics

The basis of moral important to each party is not surprisingly connected to issues of their ideological base. According to Leege et al., what is important for Republicans are traditional conservative values of freedom to gain the fruits of one’s labor, to show personal restraint, to be self-reliant and that the government’s prime role is to secure the safety of the nation’s

\(^3\)http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=78284 (Retrieved: 2012-12-05)
\(^4\)http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php
citizens. For Democrats, what is important are traditional liberal values such as fair
distribution of resources, nurturing of social justice and to have the government to first and
foremost assist its citizens in order for them to prosper (Leege et al. 2002: 47).

The central part of Lakoff’s theory of moral in American politics is the Nation-as-
Family model, where moralities of conservatism and liberalism is divided between the two
overarching concepts of Strict Father and Nurturant Parent, each containing a set of
metaphors of morality.

5.2 Strict Father

The Strict Father Morality takes as its vantage point: ‘that life is difficult and that the world is
fundamentally dangerous’ (Lakoff 2002: 65). The first of two major foci of the Strict Father
Morality is to pursue ones self-interest. This is achieved by being self-reliant and applying
self-discipline (Lakoff 2002: 66). The second major focus is competition. Strict Father sees
the world as a competitive place, and a need for it to be shaped in that fashion in order to self-
discipline to pay off. If there would be no competitiveness, the self-discipline would wither
and people would yield to immoral acts (Lakoff 2002: 69). This was one of the starting points
for the article ‘Family Metaphors and Moral Institutions: How Conservatives and Liberals
Dan P. McAdams et al. notes that when interviewed about what episodes in life has been the
most important in shaping ones personality, conservatives answered in terms of occasions of
strict authoritarian leadership and the values of self-discipline (McAdams et al. 2008: 987).

Although these aspects are central to Strict Father, it is not what will be described in this
essay. Since the focus of this essay is to analyze the role of moral in American politics, what
will be looked upon are mainly different kinds of moral metaphors (see Table 1).

In Table 1, the moralities of Strict Father in Lakoff’s (2002) Nation-as-Family theory
will be described. The table is a compilation of ideas presented in the chapter ‘Strict Father
Morality’ in Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think (Lakoff 2002: 71-94).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Moralities in Strict Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Strength</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Authority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Essence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Wholeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Purity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Self-Interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3 Nurturant Parent

Just as with Strict Father, the Nurturant Parent Morality takes as its vantage point that the world is a hostile environment. However, while the Strict Father’s approach to this reality is strict discipline and obedience of authority, the Nurturant Parent Morality approaches the world from a more humanistic point. Since the world is filled with dangers, it is the parents’ duty to ward off the dangers and secure the safety of their children, in order for them to develop into caring and nurturing individuals themselves (Lakoff 2002: 109).

Central themes in the Nurturant Parent Morality is nurturance of family ties and community, where: ‘Self-fulfillment and the nurturance of others are seen as inseparable’ (Lakoff 2002: 109). Also a big difference from Strict Father that Nurturant Parent emphasizes is that children are encouraged to question and revolt against their parents, since it is seen as a sign that they take responsibility for themselves and their development into rational individuals (Lakoff 2002: 109-110).

Relating to the article ‘Family Metaphors and Moral Institutions: How Conservatives and Liberals Narrate Their Lives’ in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (95:4 2008) mentioned above, when interviewed about which episodes in life that has most
importantly shaped ones personality, liberals talked about episodes that helped them develop empathy and open up to new people and new ideas (McAdams el al. 2008: 987).

In Table 2, the moralities of Nurturant Parent in Lakoff’s (2002) Nation-as-Family theory will be described. The table is a compilation of ideas presented in the chapter ‘Nurturant Parent Morality’ in Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think (Lakoff 2002: 115-131).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 2: Moralities in Nurturant Parent</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Empathy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling with one’s fellow human beings, and abide by the ‘Golden Rule’: to do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Variations are: 1) Absolute Empathy: empathy is shown with no strings attached. 2) Egocentric Empathy: empathy is shown when it corresponds with one’s own values. 3) Affordable Empathy: empathy is shown when one can afford it easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Nurturance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing constant empathy. Nurturance for those in society that for various reasons cannot cope by themselves. The community is responsible of helping in times of crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Self-Nurturance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to be nurturant, oneself has to be nurtured. A selfish person only cares for oneself, but an unselfish person may care so much for others that oneself become in need of nurturing by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Social Nurturance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected with Moral Nurturance, which is more about the individual and the social ties within a community. Moral Social Nurturance is about caring for the group at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Happiness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The search for happiness, which is a criteria in order for a person to be able no nurture well, is central and are to be pursued limitless as long as it does not hinders someone else’s search for happiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Self-Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictates that if one nurture for one’s children, the children will in turn nurture for their children. In this way an ideal society is created. Central features are also to pursue a good education, work and personal interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Fair Distribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair distribution of resources, in order for everyone to receive what they need. Just as a small child needs more paternal care, a teenager may need more financial support. Everyone is equally given what one needs, depending on the circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Growth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a person is helped when in need of help, that person will in turn help another person in need of help. A convicted felon should while imprisoned be given the opportunity to develop skills needed to make an honest living once released.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Self-Interest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict Father claims that actions of self-interest that generates money are of prime interest. Nurturant Parent claim that if money are generated, it is a bonus. What is central is instead the caring function that is provided for society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Outline of analysis

In the following analysis I will analyze the two speeches by George W. Bush and Barack Obama by conducting an ideology analysis using ideal types. The ideal types used for the analysis are the two concepts of the Nation-as-Family, as described by George Lakoff (2002), where the ideal type of the Strict Father will be regarded as equivalent to the Republican Party and the ideal type of the Nurturant Parent will be regarded as equivalent to the Democratic Party. Connected to Strict Father is conservative ideology and connected to Nurturant Parent is liberal ideology. Both ideologies have been outlined above and will not be referred to further in this essay. Instead, reference will be given to the two ideal types and their attached moralities found in Table 1 and 2 which are to be regarded as bearers of the connected ideology.

In order to limit the scope of the analysis, not all moralities of the two ideal types Strict Father and Nurturant Parent will be subject to analysis. In order to downsize the following analysis, limitations will be put to four moralities per ideal type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strict Father:</th>
<th>Nurturant Parent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral Strength</td>
<td>Moral Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Boundaries</td>
<td>Moral Nurturance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Essence</td>
<td>Moral Fair Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Self-Interest</td>
<td>Moral Growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis will be carried out by identifying the language being used in each speech and how this corresponds to the chosen moralities of the two ideal types. Due to limitations of the present essay, notions of Strict Father will only be analyzed in the speech by George W. Bush and Nurturant Parent will only be analyzed in the speech by Barack Obama. Although aspects of Strict Father may appear in the speech by Barack Obama and vice versa, it is more likely that a conservative candidate would use more Strict Father metaphors and a liberal candidate more Nurturant Parent metaphors (Cienki 2005: 282). However, excessive frequency of metaphors of the ‘wrong’ morality in the ‘wrong’ speech will be highlighted since it would prove a falsification of Lakoff’s theory.

It should be stated, that since the speeches were delivered at the very beginning of the election process they may be of a more general character than would be the case later in the election process (Cienki 2005: 284) but since they are delivered to people already affiliated to the party, each speech should provide sufficient material specific for each respective ideology.
6. ANALYSIS

The speeches by George W. Bush at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia, on 3 August 2000 and Barack Obama at the Democratic National Convention in Denver, on 28 August 2008, have been divided into a number of subheadings and named by myself. Each new subheading will, in the analysis, be referred to as ‘chapters’. Each subheading has been assigned a number in consecutive order with two decimals. The paragraphing is the original from The American Presidency Project database.

In the following analysis, reference will be given by the last name of the speaker and the coding scheme assigned to each subheading (e.g. Obama 1.0.1). This will also be the case when direct quotations are provided. All numerical subheadings are to be found in the Appendix.

It should be clarified beforehand that, although it may appear in the text of the following analysis, as that George Bush and Barack Obama make conscious references to the different moralities of Strict Father and Nurturant Parent, this is just the way I prefer to structure the language in the analysis. The speakers are to be regarded as not making clear references to the Nation-as-Family theory, but rather to their respective ideologies.

6.1 George W. Bush 2000

According to Lakoff’s (2002) Nation-as-Family theory, in a political speech by a conservative Republican (like George Bush), there will be a majority of language references to the moralities connected to the concept of Strict Father. Those chosen for this analysis is Moral Strength, Moral Boundaries, Moral Essence and Moral Self-Interest.

Recall that what will be regarded as specific for conservative ideology in this analysis bears the trademarks of traditional neo-classical liberalism which has come to be referred to as conservatism in America. In order to live a moral life for conservatives, one should be allowed to compete on a free market, show self-discipline and self-reliance in order to achieve what is of interest to oneself, since the prosperity from this will trickle down to all of society. The government should be restricted to safe-guarding the property and security of individuals and should abolish systems such as social welfare since it encourages people to show a lack of self-discipline.

In the first chapter, George Bush starts out with simple introduction phrases such as thanking for the support and for the nomination. However, the Strict Father language starts already in the third paragraph when he turns to the nominee of the vice presidency, Dick Cheney, and refer to him as man of integrity, sound judgment and how he will be perfect to
succeed Al Gore (Bush 1.0.3). The Moral Essence deals with a person’s character and George Bush’s language can be read as that Al Gore is lacking in character and therefore America should be proud to have a man of such great character as Dick Cheney to succeed the vice presidency. Bush continues on this path as he talks about his father, the former President of the United States; George Bush Sr, when he states that he is: ‘the most decent man I have ever known’, and that Bush is: ‘proud … to be [his] son’ (Bush 1.0.8). By evoking reference to his father who were once president, Bush is showing how great character he and his family has – a family of presidents.

In chapter two, Bush turns to asking what is asked of America as of today. In the first paragraph he states that: ‘My father was the last president of a great generation. A generation of Americans who stormed beaches, liberated concentration camps and delivered us from evil’ (Bush 2.0.1). With these few words, Bush manages to make reference to three of the chosen moralities of Strict Father. The reference to his father is as in the previous chapter, a reference to Moral Essence, where Bush speaks of his father’s great character, as leader of a great generation. The rest of the paragraph is a reference to the soldiers who fought, died and eventually won the Second World War (henceforth: WWII). Moral Boundaries in the Strict Father is about the paths one take in life and the direction of e.g. a nation. The storming of beaches was a moral action since the soldiers followed the path given to them by their commanders, without deviating from the goals, i.e. liberating the concentration camps. Their rising against evil speaks to Moral Strength, since it deals with the notion that being good is to be upstanding and rising, and those that try to put one down is evil. Hence, to stand up to evil and fight it down is a moral action according to Moral Strength.

As mentioned above, Moral Strength deals with the notion of being upstanding and rising. It also deals with self-reliance and self-discipline. In chapter three, Bush talks about the task at hand; to fix America (after eight years of Democratic rule). Bush states that: ‘Prosperity can be a tool in our hands – used to build and better our country. Or it can be a drug in our system – dulling our sense of urgency, of empathy, of duty’ (Bush 3.0.2). The issue at hand is ‘prosperity’ and how to deal with it. By referring to prosperity as a tool, it speaks to the Moral Strength as something potentially moral, since it can be used to build America; to make America upstanding and rising after the previous years of decay under Democratic rule. However, people addicted to drugs are, according to Moral Strength, lacking in self-discipline, so the notion of prosperity can also be seen as leading to decay, since the notion that America is prosperous can make people less competitive and lacking in self-discipline to make something of it, and hence, prosperity can have the same effect as a drug.
Bush continues to refer to Moral Strength in chapter four, although turning the focus more directly at the previous eight years under President Bill Clinton. In the first paragraph, Bush actually speaks to Moral Boundaries, since he states that the previous administration (Clinton/Gore) has coasted to prosperity, as coasting down a highway, without doing anything (Bush 4.0.1). In the following paragraphs, Bush talks about how the path under Clinton has been downhill since he (=Clinton) did not make use of any of his talents or opportunities, but how the path will be rising with Bush as president. This is a reference to the issue of falling and rising in Moral Strength. To fall and be low is immoral since it shows a lack of self-discipline, while rising and be upright is moral, since it shows that the person is self-reliant in a competitive world (Bush 4.0.2-5).

Chapter five is the longest in the speech and has also been divided into sub-subheadings, each dealing with an issue of great importance where Bush claims that President Clinton has faltered. In 5.1 the issue is education, and Bush claims that seven of ten fourth-graders in schools in poor communities are illiterates. The immorality of this is not directed against the illiterate children, since children cannot be held accountable for the failures of the Clinton presidency. Instead the focus is directed at the previous administration who, according to Bush, has known about the problems but continued along the old trampled paths, which then is an immoral act according to the Moral Boundaries (5.1.1-2).

In 5.3 Bush connects to the previous paragraph, when he accuses the Clinton administration for lack of leadership in the teaching of America’s children. Although overtly this is a reference to the poor education, it is also a covert reference to Moral Strength. In order to become upstanding, striving citizens, children have a right to be guided by their parents. According to Bush, President Clinton has not guided the children of America by providing better opportunities for education, and hence, has acted immoral (5.3.2).

The chapter concludes with a reference to Moral Boundaries, when Bush states that the Democrats will ask for another four years of governing, but that: ‘This is not a time for third chances, it is a time for new beginnings. The rising generations of this country have our own appointment with greatness’ (Bush 5.4.5). The rising generations also connects to Moral Strength, since they are rising to be an upstanding generation, but the main part of the paragraph is about the new beginnings that lay ahead. The Moral Boundaries’ main objective is the paths of life, but it can also be directions to follow and borders to cross. The new beginnings Bush talks about could be seen as a direction for the rising generation to take, and it could also be seen as a reference to pass the borders of the previous eight years and take on a new path towards the appointment with greatness (5.4.5).
Chapter seven marks a break from the focus on Moral Strength, Moral Boundaries and Moral Essence, and deals instead more with Moral Self-Interest connected to some notions of Moral Boundaries. On the issue of Social Security, Bush speaks to the citizens of youth today, when he states that: ‘we will give you the option – your choice – to put a part of your payroll taxes into sound, responsible investments’ (Bush 7.0.6). By stating that it is a free choice to save for retirement, Bush makes a reference to Moral Self-Interest. Moral Self-Interest is an economic ideal about that one should gain the fruits of one’s labor and not be forced to pay unnecessary taxes. Since Bush states that it is optional to pay a part of the taxes for the purpose of Social Security, it speaks to a person’s self-interest. This is further grounded in the concluding paragraph of this section when Bush states that: ‘When this money is in your name, in your account, it’s not just a program, it’s your property’ (Bush 7.0.8). This means that since it is a free choice to pay these taxes, it is not just some governmental program, designed to impose the freedom of the citizens, and could in that instance be regarded as a slight reference to Moral Strength, although that will not be taken into account here.

Chapter eight deals with the cornerstone of Republican politics, i.e. taxes. The chapter begins with Bush criticizing the Clinton administration to have record high taxes on the same level as during WWII (Bush 8.0.1). Since there is no war to fight anymore, there is a big surplus. According to Bush: ‘Some say that growing federal surplus means Washington has more money to spend [while in fact] The surplus is the people’s money’ (Bush 8.0.2-4). This relates to Moral Self-Interest, which states that one should gain the fruits of one’s labor instead of paying too much in taxes. Bush continues on this thread in the following four paragraphs when stating that the abolishment of unnecessary taxes are a principle for him and hence, the Republican Party (Bush 8.0.7-10). The abolishment of the death tax in order for everyone to decide over their own money, earned by hard work and discipline in a competitive free market speaks to Moral Self-Interest.

In chapter nine, Bush makes an impasse of language in the spirit of the first five chapters. The chapter begins with Bush stating that the world is in need of a strong America (i.e. military) to protect the world and lead it to safety (Bush 9.0.1). This speaks to Moral Strength, since it depicts America as the Strict Father who guides the rest of the world to live a safe, (i.e. moral) life. Bush goes on by describing his character as would-be Commander-in-charge.

---

5 Spelled out as *The Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance*. Social welfare for seniors and disabled citizens.

6 Neologism invented by the Republican Party for referring to the Estate Tax.
Chief,\(^7\) from which position he would show proper respect to the soldiers so that in turn, he will earn theirs. This could be seen as a critique of President Clinton as Commander-in-Chief. One aspect of character in Moral Essence is that once the character of a person has been formed it cannot be reversed. Hence, since Bush claims that he will show respect for the soldiers so that he in turn can earn theirs, it could be seen as a reference to a lack of character in President Clinton’s role as Commander-in-Chief, which mean that the only solution is to change to a new Commander-in-Chief (Bush 9.0.2).

In 9.0.4, Bush once again manage to speak to three of the chosen moralities in one sentence, when he states that: ‘When America uses force in the world, the cause must be just, the goal must be clear, and the victory must be overwhelming’ (Bush 9.0.4). The just cause is a reference to Moral Strength, just as the soldiers fighting in WWII mentioned in 2.0.1, who stormed the beaches for the just cause to strike down the evil forces of Nazi Germany. The clear goal is a reference to Moral Boundaries, since it depicts a direction that the use of force has to take. If one has a clear goal to strive towards, the moral action is to follow through and not deviate. The final part about the overwhelming victory is a reference to Moral Essence, since it speaks to the character of America’s armed forces, which will not deviate from the task at hand.

Chapter nine ends with a display of strength, when Bush states that one of the most pressing issues is to break free from outdated treaties and secure America’s borders. Although this could be seen as speaking to Moral Boundaries, Bush does not give a clear solution of how to proceed, and hence, no path to follow is given. Instead it is a reference to Moral Strength, since America should break free from outdated treaties that hold back the nation, and instead rise to secure their own borders by their own strength.

In chapter 11, Bush goes back to speaking in terms of Moral Self-Interest. In this chapter, Bush speaks about his background and what has formed his character as a politician and presidential candidate. He states that in Texas, where he grew up: ‘There was a restless energy, a basic conviction that, with hard work, anybody could succeed’ (Bush 11.0.2). This speaks to Moral Self-Interest, since the conviction that hard work in a competitive world will make for a prosperous life and Bush continues by stating that this notion of prosperity stemming from hard work leads to that: ‘people can chart their own course’ (Bush 11.0.6). This relates to Moral Boundaries since the prosperous life lie in the end of the course of life; a path which, if followed, will help people thrive by their self-interest.

\(^7\) Commander-in-chief is the President’s military title as supreme commander of the United States armed forces.
Chapter 12 continues on the path of Bush’s background when he speaks about the improvements to moral society that has been taken by him, and in essence, the Republican Party in Texas. Bush states that: ‘we improved our schools, … We moved people from welfare to work … [and] We strengthened our juvenile justice laws’ (Bush 12.0.1-3). These are mainly references to Moral Strength, since they deal with fixing something that is low, and making it rise. The quality of the schools was low, so they were raised to a higher standard. One of the key issues of Moral Strength is, as mentioned above, the need for self-discipline and self-reliance. Hence, welfare is seen as extremely immoral since it is a system designed to provide for those who has lacked in the Moral Strength virtues and has to profit on those living moral lives. Elevating people from welfare to work is therefore a corner stone of Moral Strength, since it reduces the number of people living immoral lives. The strengthening of the juvenile justice laws speaks to Moral Essence. Since the character of a person cannot be altered once set, the best way to deal with criminals is to lock them up to safeguard the rest of society.

Chapters 13 and 14 complement each other, where chapter 13 deals with Moral Boundaries. In this chapter, Bush states that he is ready for the task at hand, i.e. the presidency and that he is eager to lead America into a new era of technological development (Bush 13.0.2-4). Chapter 14 connects to Moral Essence and deals with Bush’s visit to a juvenile correction facility where he was shocked by how the juveniles had committed: ‘grownup crimes’ (Bush 14.0.1). Since character cannot be reversed once set, the need for juvenile correction facilities are severe, in order to safe-guard the rest of society. There is a short impasse in the chapter, where Bush speaks about these lost souls, where: ‘drugs promise peace and where sex, sadly, seems like the closest thing to belonging’ (Bush 14.0.5). This is a reference to Moral Strength, since surrendering to sex and drugs as a substitute for peace and belonging is due to lack of self-discipline, which is the central feature of Moral Strength.

Chapter 14 sums up with connecting to Moral Boundaries in chapter 13 when Bush states that these notions build walls in society, between the moral fiber of people of strong character and the moral decay of people with bad character. Moral Boundaries can be applied to the concept of walls, since the tearing down of a wall implies that there is a better road, or path, on the other side (Bush 14.0.8-10).

In chapter 15, Bush speaks about notions of Moral Self-Interest when suggesting that tax credits is to be handed out to those in need, so they can afford private health insurance. According to Moral Strength, welfare dependency is immoral since it stems from a lack of self-discipline, but tax credits, which is central to Republican politics is a way of
circumventing this. Instead of being dependent on welfare, people are given the tax breaks
needed to manage on their own, hence living moral lives (Bush 15.0.4-5).

Chapter 16 is the last chapter providing clear goals of the Republican politics, would
Bush win the election. The chapter mainly deals with the building of character in order to
build a strong moral society. Bush states that: ‘my administration will … encourage after-
school programs that build character, and support mentoring groups that shape and save
young lives’ (Bush 16.0.1). This relates both to Moral Strength and Moral Essence. The
character of young people is built by guiding them in the early stages of life in order for them
to become moral citizens. According to Moral Strength, children have a right to receive moral
guidance from their fathers, and hence, support of programs and study groups that build
color can save young people from surrendering to bad character.

Chapters 19 and 20 are the final chapters staking a path and dealing with issues. Chapter
19 deals with Bush’s character that he will bring to the presidency. He describes the office of
the presidency by speaking of former great presidents such as Theodor Roosevelt, Harry S.
Truman and Ronald Reagan, and by that, makes a covert assumption that he himself should
be counted as belonging to that group of presidents (Bush 19.0.2). By this, and the continuing
references to himself as a man of God and sound judgment speaks to Moral Essence, since all
he does is talking about his character. In turn, however, it leads up to display Bush’s moral
fiber which relates to Moral Strength.

The rest of the speech brushes on all the selected moralities, but mostly deals with
building up to the crescendo, where Bush speaks solely to Moral Strength when he states that:
‘Americans live on the sunrise side of the mountain. The night is passing. And we are ready
for the day to come’ (Bush 22.0.5-7). Moral Strength is being about upright and rising. Bush
implies that the sun is rising over America, and the night, i.e. the evil darkness of the previous
eight years of Democratic rule, is coming to an end and that the Republican Party is ready for
the challenge ahead and America is ready for a new president.

6.2 Barack Obama 2008

According to Lakoff’s (2002) Nation-as-Family theory, in a political speech by a liberal
Democrat (like Barack Obama) there will be a majority of language references to the
moralities connected to the concept of Nurturant Parent. Those chosen for this analysis is
Moral Empathy, Moral Nurturance, Moral Fair Distribution and Moral Growth.

Recall that what will be regarded as specific for liberal ideology in this analysis is the
traditional welfare liberalism which is the strand of liberalism connected to the Democratic
Party in the United States, which stresses individual freedom on the account that no one is discredited by it. In order for liberals to live a moral life, what is stressed is that one shows empathy and nurturance for all. Empathy differs somewhat from the other moralities since it does not involve any practical implications. Instead, empathy is about feeling and caring, which is seen as a corner stone in Nurturant Parent because without empathy, nurturance will not work. To show empathy is to feel with one’s fellow human beings and abide by the Golden Rule: ‘To do unto others as you would have them do unto you’ (Lakoff 2002: 114-115). Variations of this rule occur (see Table 2) and these will be described in the analysis. Other major aspects of Nurturant Parent is the equal distribution of assets and the opportunity to grow morally that should be given to all citizens, no matter the circumstances, but not one of the other moralities is superior to Moral Nurturance, which, as one can derive from the name, is the centerpiece of Nurturant Parent.

In the first two chapters, Barack Obama thanks for the nomination as he direct his regards to the people accompanying him on the journey so far. Some notions of Nurturant Parent occur, but due to limitations of the essay, they will not be dealt with here. Not surprisingly, the first real notion of morality that is presented in the speech is about nurturance, when Obama states that: ‘through hard work and sacrifice, each of us can pursue our individual dreams but still come together as one American family, to ensure that the next generation can pursue their dreams as well’ (Obama 3.0.2). Obama starts out with speaking about how sacrifice can lead to a pursuit of individual freedom. This relates to Moral Nurturance, since a big part of showing nurturance is sacrificing parts of one’s own agenda in order to nurture for others. This may seem as a paradox since liberalism stresses the individual freedom to pursue one’s interests, but important to remember is that this sacrifice can never be inflicted from outside, but must come from the person making the sacrifice. In a family situation, it could be a parent sacrificing a part of one’s income in order to properly nurture one’s children. Obama continues to speak of how America comes together as a family to ensure the opportunities for future generations to pursue their dreams. This also speak to Moral Nurturance, since coming together as a community and making the sacrifices needed to secure the prosperity of one’s children is the corner stone of nurturing in the Nurturant Parent.

While Moral Nurturance is about how one should act in order for something to be achieved, Moral Growth comes into play when this is transferred into action. Moral Growth is about evolving as a person, and a central part of that evolvement is the notion of work. In the paragraph following the above mentioned moralities of nurturance, Obama speaks of the moral growth of America in the 232 years it has been a sovereign nation, since, whenever the
promise of opportunities for future generations has been threatened, the community has come together to secure that promise (Obama 3.0.3). Although this section does not contain any specific actions taken in the securing of opportunities for future generations, it still speaks to Moral Growth since what is presented is not the sacrifice these people throughout history has made, but instead that they actually worked practically to secure the promise of America.

In chapter four, the first reference to Moral Empathy comes when Obama speaks about the present harsh situation for America. Obama speaks about how peoples’ work no longer pays off, how they no longer can pay their mortgages and how they cannot pay the tuition for their children (Obama 4.0.2). This section is all about painting a picture for the audience about the current state of America. It does not propose any sacrifices or possible solutions which would connect it to Moral Nurturance and it does not propose any practical tasks needed to be taken in order to solve the situation, which would connect to Moral Growth. Instead, the section connects to Moral Empathy, since all it does is paint a picture with the intent for the audience to feel for their fellow citizens who cannot make ends meet. As mentioned above there are variations of Moral Empathy (see Table 2). This section refers to the Absolute Empathy, which bears as its trademark that empathy is shown with no strings attached. According to the Golden Rule mentioned above, this would mean a development of the rule to mean: ‘To do unto others like they would have you do unto them’ (Lakoff 2002: 115, original italics). This section does not propose anything that could be seen as inflicting on anyone else unless one chooses to act, and therefore it is a question about showing empathy with no strings attached.

The final three paragraphs of chapter four are prime examples of how Moral Growth and Moral Empathy often cooperate. All three paragraphs start out with a short reference to Moral Growth, since part of this morality deals with the evolvement of a person’s sense of moral. Obama speaks in consecutive order about how America is more decent, generous and compassionate than letting the hardships of average Americans that follow occur (Obama 4.0.5-7). Being decent, generous and compassionate stems from being nurtured as a child in order to grow morally and develop the capacity for empathy. This implies that America should be more morally grown than letting Americans suffer. After this short introductory line of each paragraph, Obama once again speaks to Moral Empathy when he paints the picture of certain episodes of Americans’ hardships. These examples may be drawn from real life or be purely fictional, but no matter which, they connect to yet another variant of Moral Empathy. In difference from the above mentioned description of the Absolute Empathy, this description deals with the notion of Affordable Empathy which, according to the Golden Rule, should be
understood as: ‘To do unto others as you would have them do unto you – providing that you can afford it’ (Lakoff 2002: 116). The reason for the difference is that in 4.0.2, Obama only gives general examples of how it could be situated in America at large, while in these three paragraphs he gives more exact examples. This time, the empathy may require some form of sacrifice from the community, transferring it to Moral Nurturance, and therefore, the notion of Affordable Empathy is brought into the equation.

In chapter six, Obama attacks his opponent in the coming election; John McCain, to be a puppet of George W. Bush’s failed politics. Obama speaks in this section about issues of health care, education and the economy (Obama 6.0.3). While McCain is accused to be on pair with George W. Bush, proclaiming private medical insurance and private education, Obama speaks about how these two issues can make real difference in the lives of ordinary Americans. This relates to Moral Nurturance, since health care and education can be seen as two governmental issues that nurture the people and secures their well-being and moral growth.

Moral Nurturance is as mentioned above about making sacrifices in order to nurture for others. This is extremely visible in the fourth paragraph of chapter six, when Obama speaks of plant workers in Michigan who after being notified that the plant was closing continued to come to work in order to supply the market and the families of the soldiers of the United States armed forces who watch their loved ones leave time after another (Obama 6.1.1). In the case of the plant workers, this connects to Moral Nurturance since the workers sacrifice themselves for a job that soon will not exist in order to sustain the market and by that, nurture the economy. In the case of the soldiers, the sacrifice is being made on two levels. First, as Obama mentions, the families makes a sacrifice since they have one or more members of their household absent, leading to that they are not able to nurture their own family at a satisfying manner and second, the soldiers themselves sacrifice themselves in order to defend the United States and sometimes even sacrifices their lives for that cause.

Chapter six ends with Obama speaking about the failed politics of the Republican Party, and how these policies creates a society where everyone is left on their own. Obama states that if one is: ‘Out of work? Tough luck. No health care? The market will fix it. Born into poverty? Pull yourself up by your bootstraps – even if you don’t have boots. You’re on your own’ (Obama 6.3.1). This paragraph connects to Moral Fair Distribution. Central to this morality is that all assets of society are to be distributed equally and that everyone should receive what they need in order to survive. The individualistic solutions of the Republicans that Obama criticize are central themes in the Strict Father morality, but for Nurturant Parent,
they contradict the very essence of the morality. If one is out of work, has slid into poverty or cannot pay for health care, according to Moral Fair Distribution, it is the community’s moral obligation to make sure that assets are being diverted so that everyone can prosper. It can be close at hand to see this as connecting to Moral Nurturance, and although the distribution of assets would imply some sacrifices to be made, the morality of Moral Fair Distribution only deals with the need for assets to be distributed equally, not the actual nurturing actions.

Chapter seven works somewhat as a follow-up from chapter 6, where Obama spoke about the Republicans, while in this chapter, Obama speaks about how the Democratic Party sees the society. Obama states that the Democrats measure progress by the number of people that find a satisfying work that pays their mortgages and save enough money to send their children to college (Obama 7.0.2). This connects Moral Nurturance, since having just any job does not qualify in the Moral Nurturance. Instead, what is highlighted is that not only does the salary has to be satisfying, so does the work itself. The second part, to be able to send ones children to college is nurturing of the coming generation. For one part, there is the parents nurturing their children, by giving them the opportunity to morally grow and then for the second part, there is also the nurturing of society at large, since the parents sacrifice a certain amount of their income to provide for their children to be useful citizens whom will later provide for their future generations.

In chapter eight, Obama speaks about his mother and how she worked and studied at the same time as she raised her children, and with the help of governmental programs managed to make ends meet (Obama 8.0.2). This is the essence of the Nurturant Parent, that one tries to manage at the top of one’s abilities, and when that do not suffice, the community steps in to provide nurturance. This paragraph first connects to the metaphor of Moral Nurturance, when Obama mentions that her mother both worked and studied at the same time as she raised her children. This implies that she sacrificed both working and studying fulltime in order to properly nurture her children. However, this led to her not making ends meet all the time, so once she turned to food stamps\(^8\) in order to nurture her children. This is an example of how the community, through the governmental programs to which one pays taxes, helps nurturing a fellow citizen in her time of need. The result of this nurturing being that Obama and his sister were able to attend college and subsequently, for Obama, to win the United States presidential election.

\(^8\) Governmental program spelled out as: The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, that provide low-income families with financial aid in order to buy food.
In the rest of chapter eight Obama speaks to Moral Empathy, and this chapter works as a prelude to chapter nine. Connected to the earlier paragraphs of the chapter, Obama speaks about his background and family when he mentions that his grandmother was the one who: ‘taught me about hard work. She’s the one who put off buying a new car or a new dress for herself so that I could have a better life. She poured everything she had into me’ (Obama 8.0.4). Although this can be connected to Moral Nurturance, since Obama’s grandmother sacrificed a lot of things in order to nurture for him, the paragraph actually connects more to Moral Empathy. Since no clear effect of the sacrifices being made by Obama’s grandmother is presented, it is more to be regarded as Obama showing Absolute Empathy for his grandmother and asking the same from the audience.

In chapter nine, Obama start to get to the hard issues. He speaks of the promise of America when he states that: ‘It’s a promise that says each of us has the freedom to make of our own lives what we will, but that we also have the obligation to treat each other with dignity and respect’ (Obama 9.0.1). This speaks to Moral Fair Distribution, since everyone is to have the same opportunities divided equally in order to make of their lives what they want to. To treat everyone with dignity and respect relates to Moral Fair Distribution in the sense that all people are to be treated equally. This would imply a fair distribution of assets such as nurturing for children, health care and income in order for everyone in society to be equal, no matter ones sex, age, ethnicity, etc.

The chapter continues with references to Moral Growth and Moral Nurturance. Obama goes on about speaking of the American promise, that the government should help generate growth and that: ‘businesses should live up to their responsibilities to create American jobs, look out for American workers, and play by the rules of the road’ (Obama 9.0.3). The first part of the government’s role connects to Moral Growth, since it is about providing opportunities for America to grow and be a stronger force. The second part about the businesses’ responsibilities connects more to Moral Nurturance, since these are more about taking care of, and nurture, those that help provide for society as tax payers. By nurturing the workers, the companies fulfill their moral obligation to provide for their workers at the same time as they provide for a moral growth of their workforce and the American society at large.

Chapter 10 is the first in a series of propositions of what Obama would do if he were to be elected President. The first of these propositions is that Obama claims that the taxes will be cut for working families instead of high profit corporations because: ‘in an economy like this, the last thing we should do is raise the taxes on the middle-class’ (Obama 10.0.4). This connects to Moral Fair Distribution, since tax reliefs for those that make less than the richest
of Americans give a more equal society. Also, since poor families are the ones in need of the most nurturance, the middle class should be properly nurtured by the government, so that they in turn can properly nurture the poorer Americans. Obama finishes off by proclaiming that in order for America and the planet to prosper, in 10 years, the dependency on foreign oil will be ended (Obama 10.0.5). This connects to Moral Growth, since it suggests a goal for America to strive towards and a chance to grow as a nation and provide a better environment for the generations to come.

Chapter 11 deals with Obama stating that he will invest in renewable energy sources and provide every American with the opportunity to buy new cars that works with these new standards (Obama 11.0.3). The first part about investment in renewable energy sources deals with Moral Growth, since it proposes that America grow to be more morally responsible in nurturing the environment, while the second part about providing every American with the opportunity to buy a new car connects to Moral Fair Distribution, since it suggests that everyone should have an equal chance in contributing in the moral growth of America.

In chapter 12, Obama delivers a textbook example of the Nurturant Parent when he states that: ‘Now is the time to finally meet our moral obligation to provide every child [sic.] a world-class education, because it will take nothing less to compete in the global economy’ (Obama 12.0.1). For the major part, the sentence connects to Moral Nurturance since it is about the government nurturing the young citizens of the nation, by providing them with a decent education. It can however also be connected to Moral Fair Distribution since it is directed toward every child in America, and that everyone should get an equal chance to a good education. The last part about a good education being necessary in order to compete on the global market connects to Moral Growth, since it implies a growth of American knowledge that will eventually create new wealth for America.

Obama goes on by relating to the first chapters when he spoke about his parents sacrificing a lot in order for him to prosper, and how he will honor this by not resting until this is a reality for all American children. By investing in early childhood education and recruiting new teachers, this should be accomplished. The first part about Obama’s parents and the sacrifices they made relates to Moral Empathy and the variation of Absolute Empathy, since it only tells a story with no strings attached. In the second part where he states that he will not settle for anything less for Americas children, than what was given to him this changes to Affordable Empathy, since it turns to require some kind of sacrifice, but still it is connected to Moral Empathy since Obama has not yet suggested a solution. The third part about investing in early childhood education connects to Moral Nurturance, since this is an
actual sacrifice that has to be made. A part of the taxes for education has to be sacrificed in order to meet these needs. The final part about investing in new teachers connects to Moral Growth, since it implies that supporting their education in exchange for them to act as public servants as teachers, they will grow morally and help America do the same.

If chapter 12 provided a textbook example of Nurturant Parent at large, chapter 14 provides a textbook example of Moral Fair Distribution. Obama states that: ‘now is the time to keep the promise of equal pay for an equal day’s work, because I want my daughters to have exactly the same opportunities as your sons’ (Obama 14.0.3). The connection to Moral Fair Distribution stems from the notion that the equal amount of work should provide the same income, no matter ones sex. Also, since Obama mentions that the opportunities should be the same, according to Moral Fair Distribution, the notion of sex is irrelevant, since the mere mentioning of equal opportunities as a concept implies equal opportunities for everyone, no matter the circumstances.

Chapter 17 deals with the notion of the military which is one of the corner stones of American politics. Once again, Obama criticize the Bush administration for its flaws, this time mostly about the unjust intervention in Iraq and the Republicans’ limitless spending on defense. Obama states that: ‘don’t tell me that Democrats won’t defend this country. Don’t tell me that Democrats won’t keep us safe’ (Obama 17.0.1). This connects to Moral Nurturance, since the notion of nurturing implies that those in need of nurturing are also secure. In this context, the ones in need of nurturance are the American people at large, and by stating that the Democrats will have no problem securing the safety of America, Obama promises nurturance of the American people.

This nurturance is transferred into Moral Growth further on in the chapter, where Obama in the third paragraph states that: ‘I will rebuild our military to meet future conflicts … [and] I will build new partnerships to defeat the threats of the 21st century … [and] I will restore our moral standing’ (Obama 17.0.3). All these notions are clear goals of the Obama presidency and therefore, they are to be regarded as propositions to make America grow and as Obama mentions in the end, the ultimate goal is to restore America’s moral standing.

In chapter 18, Obama starts to sum up on the hard issues and prepare for the conclusion of the speech. He returns once more to Moral Empathy when he speaks about the differences that are part of the American society. Obama claims that although there are differences in the view on same-sex marriages, surely no one benefits from preventing loved ones visit each other in governmental institutions such as hospitals. He also states on the issue of illegal immigration that: ‘I don’t know anyone who benefits when a mother is separated from her
infant child’ (Obama 18.0.2). This connects to the Absolute Empathy of Moral Empathy, since there is no solutions or propositions suggested, but rather the idea is to paint a picture and make the audience feel with the people suffering from the differences in politics. Obama further connects this to Moral Fair Distribution when he states that America is: ‘the promise of a democracy where we can find the strength and grace to bridge divides and unite in common effort’ (Obama 18.0.2). This implies that since there is a need to come together, there is not yet equality between people, and according to Moral Fair Distribution, that is immoral since all people are to have equal opportunities.

Central to Obama’s campaign was the notion of ‘change’, and the traces of that can be seen in chapter 19, when he states that: ‘Change happens because the American people demand it – because they rise up and insist on new ideas and new leadership, a new politics for a new time’ (Obama 19.0.4). This connects to Moral Growth, since what Obama speaks of is the rising of America to something new; that America is growing and evolving to a new era.

The final section of Obama’s speech that is worth mentioning is chapter 20, when on the subject of the new America rising, Obama states that:

I’ve seen it in the workers who would rather cut their hours back a day than see their friends lose their jobs, in the soldiers who re-enlist after losing a limb, in the good neighbors who take a stranger in when a hurricane strikes and the floodwaters rise (Obama 20.0.2).

This connects, as often before in the speech, to Moral Nurturance, since it deals with people sacrificing something for the nurturing of others. The workers sacrifice some of their hours and in addition then, some of their income so that others can keep their jobs. Just in the same way, soldiers who has already sacrificed a part of their body, re-enlists to nurture the freedom of America and people open up their homes to strangers, who in their time of need when they have lost everything, is in need of nurturing from their fellow human beings.

7. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The two speeches by George W. Bush and Barack Obama each contain numerous references to the ideological base to which their respective party is connected. Although not being a part of this analysis, language relating to the ‘wrong’ metaphor of either Strict Father or Nurturant Parent was present in each speech. When speaking of the persons accompanying him in the campaign and the vice presidential candidate, Obama made references to the moral fiber and
character these people display, connecting to Moral Strength and Moral Essence in the Strict Father Morality. In the same manner, Bush made remarks about nurturing and caring for people exposed to various hardships. Although the Strict Father would claim these people lack self-discipline, it is presumable that Bush understands that the social welfare programs have a role to play in American politics and therefore made the connection to Moral Empathy and Moral Nurturance in the Nurturant Parent Morality.

The Nation-as-Family theory deals with displaying how language is being used in American politics and how this relates to liberal and conservative ideology. Liberal ideology for this analysis was identified as welfare liberalism which is the main strand connected to the Democratic Party today. Central to welfare liberalism is the individual freedom to pursue one's goals as long as this does not interfere with someone else’s freedom and, also important, is that government secures that opportunities to thrive in society are handed out equally to everyone.

The speech by Barack Obama contained numerous examples of Nurturant Parent moralities with a majority relating to Moral Nurturance. Since welfare liberalism deals with the equal distribution of assets and that everyone should have the guaranteed right to pursue one's individual desires, it can be concluded that Barack Obama connects strongly to the ideological base of liberalism and that the Nurturant Parent Morality is relevant as a tool in examining moral in American liberal ideology.

Conservative ideology for this analysis was identified as connected to the American tradition of neo-classical liberalism to which the Republican Party adhere. This ideology portrays central aspects of the notion of self-interest which is accessible through self-reliance and self-discipline in a free, competitive market where the government does not impose freedom by establishing programs that diminish self-discipline.

The speech by George W. Bush contained numerous examples of Strict Father moralities with a majority relating to Moral Strength. Since conservatism deals with self-discipline in a competitive market and the preservation of innate systems of governance, it can be concluded that George W. Bush connects strongly to the ideological base of conservatism and that the Strict Father Morality is relevant as a tool in examining moral in American conservative ideology.

A further study of this kind would gain from including all moralities of both Strict Father and Nurturant Parent in analyzing both speeches and also develop the range of the study to include more speeches, e.g. the acceptance speeches from the second time Bush and Obama were nominated in 2004 and 2012. It would also be interesting to include the speeches
by the vice-presidential candidates, since the choosing of vice-presidential candidates often occur in order to in some ways complement the presidency.

To further develop the study, the inclusion of the Moral Foundations Theory as a second analytic framework would generate another basis to which the results of the analysis could be contrasted. Since both Moral Foundations Theory and Nation-as-Family identify similar keywords connected to each ideology, the two models should be able to complete each other, making the study comprise of both a qualitative and a quantitative part.

Connecting to the research questions, when regarding the ideal types of Strict Father and Nurturant Parent as bearers of the respective ideology, it can be concluded that the results from the analysis show that George W. Bush give numerous examples of connecting to conservative ideology and Barack Obama to liberal ideology. Therefore, it can also be concluded that George Lakoff’s (2002) theory of the Nation-as-Family is highly valid in analyzing ideology in American politics.

The notion of credibility as established by Lincoln & Guba (1981) is well-established since the data’s origin, authors and time it was produced can be determined with accuracy. Also, since The American Presidency Project database is a well-established platform for issues of American presidential politics, and the founders of it (John Woolley and Gerhard Peters) are acknowledged Professors of political science at the University of California Santa Barbara and Citrus Community College, the source from where the speeches were collected can be assigned high credibility.

On the issue of validity, the major focus lies on achieving satisfying intrasubjectivity. Intrasubjectivity implies that similar results would emerge using the same method and frame of analysis applied on similar data, although that data may be produced at different times. In the present case, critique may be directed at the results of the analysis, since it is based on my interpretation of the language used connected to the moralities of the Nation-as-Family theory. Therefore, the results in this essay are to be regarded as my argument for how to analyze the data from the perspective of the selected moralities of Strict Father and Nurturant Parent.
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APPENDIX

George W. Bush
August 3, 2000
Republican National Convention
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

1.0.1 Mr. Chairman, delegates, and my fellow citizens ... I accept your nomination. Thank you for this honor. Together, we will renew America's purpose.

1.0.2 Our founders first defined that purpose here in Philadelphia... Ben Franklin was here. Thomas Jefferson. And, of course, George Washington -- or, as his friends called him, "George W."

1.0.3 I am proud to have Dick Cheney at my side. He is a man of integrity and sound judgment, who has proven that public service can be noble service. America will be proud to have a leader of such character to succeed Al Gore as Vice President of the United States.

1.0.4 I am grateful for John McCain and the other candidates who sought this nomination. Their convictions strengthen our party. I am especially grateful tonight to my family.

1.0.5 No matter what else I do in life, asking Laura to marry me was the best decision I ever made.

1.0.6 To our daughters, Barbara and Jenna, we love you, we're proud of you, and as you head off to college this fall ... Don't stay out too late, and e-mail your old dad once in a while, will you?

1.0.7 And mother, everyone loves you and so do I.

1.0.8 Growing up, she gave me love and lots of advice. I gave her white hair. And I want to thank my father -- the most decent man I have ever known. All my life I have been amazed that a gentle soul could be so strong. And Dad, I want you to know how proud I am to be your son.

2.0.1 My father was the last president of a great generation. A generation of Americans who stormed beaches, liberated concentration camps and delivered us from evil.

2.0.2 Some never came home.

2.0.3 Those who did put their medals in drawers, went to work, and built on a heroic scale ... highways and universities, suburbs and factories, great cities and grand alliances -- the strong foundations of an American Century.

---

9 Philadelphia was the city where the Declaration of Independence was signed.
2.0.4 Now the question comes to the sons and daughters of this achievement...

2.0.5 What is asked of us?

3.0.1 This is a remarkable moment in the life of our nation. Never has the promise of prosperity been so vivid. But times of plenty, like times of crisis, are tests of American character.

3.0.2 Prosperity can be a tool in our hands -- used to build and better our country. Or it can be a drug in our system -- dulling our sense of urgency, of empathy, of duty.

3.0.3 Our opportunities are too great, our lives too short, to waste this moment.

3.0.4 So tonight we vow to our nation ...

3.0.5 We will seize this moment of American promise.

3.0.6 We will use these good times for great goals.

3.0.7 We will confront the hard issues -- threats to our national security, threats to our health and retirement security -- before the challenges of our time become crises for our children.

3.0.8 And we will extend the promise of prosperity to every forgotten corner of this country.

3.0.9 To every man and woman, a chance to succeed. To every child, a chance to learn. To every family, a chance to live with dignity and hope.

4.0.1 For eight years, the Clinton/Gore administration has coasted through prosperity.

4.0.2 And the path of least resistance is always downhill.

4.0.3 But America’s way is the rising road.

4.0.4 This nation is daring and decent and ready for change.

4.0.5 Our current president embodied the potential of a generation. So many talents. So much charm. Such great skill. But, in the end, to what end? So much promise, to no great purpose.

5.0.1 Little more than a decade ago, the Cold War thawed and, with the leadership of Presidents Reagan and Bush,10 that wall came down.

5.0.2 But instead of seizing this moment, the Clinton/Gore administration has squandered it. We have seen a steady erosion of American power and an unsteady exercise of American influence.

---

10 Referes to George W. Bush’s father; George Bush, Sr.
Our military is low on parts, pay and morale.

If called on by the commander-in-chief\(^\text{11}\) today, two entire divisions of the Army would have to report ... Not ready for duty, sir.

This administration had its moment.

They had their chance. They have not led. We will.

This generation was given the gift of the best education in American history. Yet we do not share that gift with everyone. Seven of ten fourth-graders in our highest poverty schools cannot read a simple children's book.

And still this administration continues on the same old path with the same old programs -- while millions are trapped in schools where violence is common and learning is rare.

This administration had its chance. They have not led. We will.

America has a strong economy and a surplus. We have the public resources and the public will -- even the bipartisan opportunities -- to strengthen Social Security\(^\text{12}\) and repair Medicare.\(^\text{13}\)

But this administration -- during eight years of increasing need -- did nothing.

They had their moment. They have not led. We will.

Our generation has a chance to reclaim some essential values -- to show we have grown up before we grow old.

But when the moment for leadership came, this administration did not teach our children, it disillusioned them.

They had their chance. They have not led. We will.

And now they come asking for another chance, another shot.

Our answer?

Not this time.

Not this year.

This is not a time for third chances, it is a time for new beginnings. The rising generations of this country have our own appointment with greatness.

---

\(^\text{11}\) Commander-in-chief is the President’s military title as supreme commander of the United States armed forces.

\(^\text{12}\) Spelled out as The Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance. Social welfare for seniors and disabled citizens.

\(^\text{13}\) Governmental insurance program for citizens older than 65 or young people with disabilities or anyone with severe diseases at a late stage.
5.4.6 It does not rise or fall with the stock market. It cannot be bought with our wealth.

5.4.7 Greatness is found when American character and American courage overcome American challenges.

6.0.1 When Lewis Morris\textsuperscript{14} of New York was about to sign the Declaration of Independence,\textsuperscript{15} his brother advised against it, warning he would lose all his property.

6.0.2 Morris, a plain-spoken Founder,\textsuperscript{16} responded ... "Damn the consequences, give me the pen." That is the eloquence of American action.

6.0.3 We heard it during World War II, when General Eisenhower told paratroopers on D-Day morning not to worry -- and one replied, "We're not worried, General ... It's Hitler's turn to worry now."

6.0.4 We heard it in the civil rights movement, when brave men and women did not say ... "We shall cope," or "We shall see." They said ... "We shall overcome."

6.0.5 An American president must call upon that character.

6.0.6 Tonight, in this hall, we resolve to be, not the party of repose, but the party of reform.

6.0.7 We will write, not footnotes, but chapters in the American story.

6.0.8 We will add the work of our hands to the inheritance of our fathers and mothers -- and leave this nation greater than we found it.

6.0.9 We know the tests of leadership. The issues are joined.

6.0.10 We will strengthen Social Security and Medicare for the greatest generation, and for generations to come.

6.0.11 Medicare does more than meet the needs of our elderly, it reflects the values of our society.

6.0.12 We will set it on firm financial ground, and make prescription drugs available and affordable for every senior who needs them.

7.0.1 Social Security has been called the "third rail of American politics" -- the one you're not supposed to touch because it shocks you.

7.0.2 But, if you don't touch it, you can't fix it. And I intend to fix it.

\textsuperscript{14} One of the persons that signed the Declaration of Independece as a member off the Continental Congress from New York.

\textsuperscript{15} The document proclaiming that the United States was no longer subject to the British Empire.

\textsuperscript{16} Short for Founding Father, i.e. the men that fought in the revolutionary war, signed the Declaration of Independence and/or established the United States Constitution.
To seniors in this country ... You earned your benefits, you made your plans, and President George W. Bush will keep the promise of Social Security ... no changes, no reductions, no way.

Our opponents will say otherwise. This is their last, parting ploy, and don't believe a word of it.

Now is the time for Republicans and Democrats to end the politics of fear and save Social Security, together.

For younger workers, we will give you the option -- your choice -- to put a part of your payroll taxes into sound, responsible investments.

This will mean a higher return on your money, and, over 30 or 40 years, a nest egg to help your retirement, or pass along to your children.

When this money is in your name, in your account, it's not just a program, it's your property.

Now is the time to give American workers security and independence that no politician can ever take away.

On education ... Too many American children are segregated into schools without standards, shuffled from grade-to-grade because of their age, regardless of their knowledge.

This is discrimination, pure and simple -- the soft bigotry of low expectations.

And our nation should treat it like other forms of discrimination ... We should end it.

One size does not fit all when it comes to educating our children, so local people should control local schools.

And those who spend your tax dollars must be held accountable.

When a school district receives federal funds to teach poor children, we expect them to learn. And if they don't, parents should get the money to make a different choice.

Now is the time to make Head Start\(^{17} \) an early learning program, teach all our children to read, and renew the promise of America's public schools. Another test of leadership is tax relief.

The last time taxes were this high as a percentage of our economy, there was a good reason ... We were fighting World War II.

\(^{17}\) A governmental program to provide education and nutrition to children of low-income families.
Today, our high taxes fund a surplus. Some say that growing federal surplus means Washington has more money to spend.

But they've got it backwards.

The surplus is not the government's money. The surplus is the people's money.

I will use this moment of opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to the tax code.

And I will act on principle.

On principle ... every family, every farmer and small businessperson, should be free to pass on their life's work to those they love.

So we will abolish the death tax.

On principle ... no one in America should have to pay more than a third of their income to the federal government.

So we will reduce tax rates for everyone, in every bracket.

On principle ... those in the greatest need should receive the greatest help.

So we will lower the bottom rate from 15 percent to 10 percent and double the child tax credit.

Now is the time to reform the tax code and share some of the surplus with the people who pay the bills.

The world needs America's strength and leadership, and America's armed forces need better equipment, better training, and better pay.

We will give our military the means to keep the peace, and we will give it one thing more ... a commander-in-chief who respects our men and women in uniform, and a commander-in-chief who earns their respect.

A generation shaped by Vietnam\(^ {18} \) must remember the lessons of Vietnam.

When America uses force in the world, the cause must be just, the goal must be clear, and the victory must be overwhelming.

I will work to reduce nuclear weapons and nuclear tension in the world -- to turn these years of influence into decades of peace.

And, at the earliest possible date, my administration will deploy missile defenses to guard against attack and blackmail.

9.0.7 Now is the time, not to defend outdated treaties, but to defend the American people.

10.0.1 A time of prosperity is a test of vision. And our nation today needs vision. That is a fact ... or as my opponent might call it, a "risky truth scheme." Every one of the proposals I've talked about tonight, he has called a "risky scheme," over and over again.

10.0.2 It is the sum of his message -- the politics of the roadblock, the philosophy of the stop sign.

10.0.3 If my opponent had been there at the moon launch, it would have been a "risky rocket scheme."

10.0.4 If he'd been there when Edison was testing the light bulb, it would have been a "risky anti-candle scheme."

10.0.5 And if he'd been there when the Internet was invented well ... I understand he actually was there for that.

10.0.6 He now leads the party of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. But the only thing he has to offer is fear itself.

10.0.7 That outlook is typical of many in Washington -- always seeing the tunnel at the end of the light.

11.0.1 But I come from a different place, and it has made me a different leader. In Midland, Texas, where I grew up, the town motto was "the sky is the limit" ... and we believed it.

11.0.2 There was a restless energy, a basic conviction that, with hard work, anybody could succeed, and everybody deserved a chance.

11.0.3 Our sense of community was just as strong as that sense of promise.

11.0.4 Neighbors helped each other. There were dry wells and sandstorms to keep you humble, and lifelong friends to take your side, and churches to remind us that every soul is equal in value and equal in need.

11.0.5 This background leaves more than an accent, it leaves an outlook.

11.0.6 Optimistic. Impatient with pretense. Confident that people can chart their own course.

11.1.1 That background may lack the polish of Washington. Then again, I don't have a lot of things that come with Washington.

11.1.2 I don't have enemies to fight. And I have no stake in the bitter arguments of the last few years. I want to change the tone of Washington to one of civility and respect.
11.1.3 The largest lesson I learned in Midland still guides me as governor ... Everyone, from immigrant to entrepreneur, has an equal claim on this country's promise.

12.0.1 So we improved our schools, dramatically, for children of every accent, of every background.

12.0.2 We moved people from welfare to work.

12.0.3 We strengthened our juvenile justice laws.

12.0.4 Our budgets have been balanced, with surpluses, and we cut taxes not only once, but twice.

12.0.5 We accomplished a lot.

12.1.1 I don't deserve all the credit, and don't attempt to take it. I worked with Republicans and Democrats to get things done.

12.1.2 A bittersweet part of tonight is that someone is missing, the late Lt. Governor of Texas Bob Bullock.¹⁹

12.1.3 Bob was a Democrat, a crusty veteran of Texas politics, and my great friend.

12.1.4 He worked by my side, endorsed my re-election, and I know he is with me in spirit in saying to those who would malign our state for political gain... Don't mess with Texas.

13.0.1 As governor, I've made difficult decisions, and stood by them under pressure. I've been where the buck stops -- in business and in government. I've been a chief executive who sets an agenda, sets big goals, and rallies people to believe and achieve them.

13.0.2 I am proud of this record, and I'm prepared for the work ahead.

13.0.3 If you give me your trust, I will honor it ... Grant me a mandate, and I will use it... Give me the opportunity to lead this nation, and I will lead ...

13.0.4 And we need a leader to seize the opportunities of this new century -- the new cures of medicine, the amazing technologies that will drive our economy and keep the peace.

13.0.5 But our new economy must never forget the old, unfinished struggle for human dignity.

13.0.6 And here we face a challenge to the very heart and founding premise of our nation.

¹⁹ Democratic vice-governor of Texas 1991-1999. Had a fruitful cooperation as Vice-Governor to Governor George W. Bush 1995-1999, although they represented two different parties.
A couple of years ago, I visited a juvenile jail in Marlin, Texas, and talked with a group of young inmates. They were angry, wary kids. All had committed grownup crimes.

Yet when I looked in their eyes, I realized some of them were still little boys.

Toward the end of conversation, one young man, about 15, raised his hand and asked a haunting question... "What do you think of me?"

He seemed to be asking, like many Americans who struggle ... "Is there hope for me? Do I have a chance?" And, frankly ... "Do you, a white man in a suit, really care what happens to me?"

A small voice, but it speaks for so many. Single moms struggling to feed the kids and pay the rent. Immigrants starting a hard life in a new world. Children without fathers in neighborhoods where gangs seem like friendship, where drugs promise peace, and where sex, sadly, seems like the closest thing to belonging. We are their country, too.

And each of us must share in its promise, or that promise is diminished for all.

If that boy in Marlin believes he is trapped and worthless and hopeless -- if he believes his life has no value, then other lives have no value to him -- and we are ALL diminished.

When these problems aren't confronted, it builds a wall within our nation. On one side are wealth and technology, education and ambition.

On the other side of the wall are poverty and prison, addiction and despair.

And, my fellow Americans, we must tear down that wall.

Big government is not the answer. But the alternative to bureaucracy is not indifference.

It is to put conservative values and conservative ideas into the thick of the fight for justice and opportunity.

This is what I mean by compassionate conservatism. And on this ground we will govern our nation.

We will give low-income Americans tax credits to buy the private health insurance they need and deserve.

We will transform today's housing rental program to help hundreds of thousands of low-income families find stability and dignity in a home of their own.

And, in the next bold step of welfare reform, we will support the heroic work of homeless shelters and hospices, food pantries and crisis pregnancy centers -- people reclaiming their communities block-by-block and heart-by-heart.
15.1.1 I think of Mary Jo Copeland, whose ministry called "Sharing and Caring Hands" serves 1,000 meals a week in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Each day, Mary Jo washes the feet of the homeless, then sends them off with new socks and shoes.

15.1.2 "Look after your feet," she tells them ...... "They must carry you a long way in this world, and then all the way to God."

15.1.3 Government cannot do this work. It can feed the body, but it cannot reach the soul. Yet government can take the side of these groups, helping the helper, encouraging the inspired.

16.0.1 My administration will give taxpayers new incentives to donate to charity, encourage after-school programs that build character, and support mentoring groups that shape and save young lives.

16.0.2 We must give our children a spirit of moral courage, because their character is our destiny.

16.0.3 We must tell them, with clarity and confidence, that drugs and alcohol can destroy you, and bigotry disfigures the heart.

16.0.4 Our schools must support the ideals of parents, elevating character and abstinence from afterthoughts to urgent goals.

16.0.5 We must help protect our children, in our schools and streets, by finally and strictly enforcing our nation's gun laws.

16.0.6 Most of all, we must teach our children the values that defeat violence. I will lead our nation toward a culture that values life -- the life of the elderly and the sick, the life of the young, and the life of the unborn. I know good people disagree on this issue, but surely we can agree on ways to value life by promoting adoption and parental notification, and when Congress sends me a bill against partial-birth abortion, I will sign it into law.

17.0.1 Behind every goal I have talked about tonight is a great hope for our country.

17.0.2 A hundred years from now, this must not be remembered as an age rich in possessions and poor in ideals.

17.0.3 Instead, we must usher in an era of responsibility.

17.0.4 My generation tested limits -- and our country, in some ways, is better for it.

17.0.5 Women are now treated more equally. Racial progress has been steady, if still too slow. We are learning to protect the natural world around us. We will continue this progress, and we will not turn back.

17.0.6 At times, we lost our way. But we are coming home.

17.0.7 So many of us held our first child, and saw a better self reflected in her eyes.
And in that family love, many have found the sign and symbol of an even greater love, and have been touched by faith.

We have discovered that who we are is more important than what we have. And we know we must renew our values to restore our country.

This is the vision of America's founders.

They never saw our nation's greatness in rising wealth or advancing armies, but in small, unnumbered acts of caring and courage and self-denial.

Their highest hope, as Robert Frost described it, was "to occupy the land with character."

And that, 13 generations later, is still our goal ... to occupy the land with character.

In a responsibility era, each of us has important tasks -- work that only we can do.

Each of us is responsible ... to love and guide our children, and help a neighbor in need.

Synagogues, churches and mosques are responsible ... not only to worship but to serve.

Corporations are responsible ... to treat their workers fairly, and leave the air and waters clean.

Our nation's leaders are responsible ... to confront problems, not pass them on to others.

And to lead this nation to a responsibility era, a president himself must be responsible.

And so, when I put my hand on the Bible, I will swear to not only uphold the laws of our land, I will swear to uphold the honor and dignity of the office to which I have been elected, so help me God.

I believe the presidency -- the final point of decision in the American government -- was made for great purposes.

It is the office of Lincoln's conscience and Teddy Roosevelt's energy and Harry Truman's integrity and Ronald Reagan's optimism.

For me, gaining this office is not the ambition of a lifetime, but it IS the opportunity of a lifetime.

And I will make the most of it. I believe great decisions are made with care, made with conviction, not made with polls.
19.1.3 I do not need to take your pulse before I know my own mind. I do not reinvent myself at every turn. I am not running in borrowed clothes. When I act, you will know my reasons ... When I speak, you will know my heart.

19.2.1 I believe in tolerance, not in spite of my faith, but because of it.

19.2.2 I believe in a God who calls us, not to judge our neighbors, but to love them.

19.2.3 I believe in grace, because I have seen it ... In peace, because I have felt it ... In forgiveness, because I have needed it.

19.2.4 I believe true leadership is a process of addition, not an act of division. I will not attack a part of this country, because I want to lead the whole of it.

19.2.5 And I believe this will be a tough race, down to the wire.

20.0.1 Their war room is up and running ... but we are ready. Their attacks will be relentless ... but they will be answered. We are facing something familiar, but they are facing something new.

20.0.2 We are now the party of ideas and innovation ... The party of idealism and inclusion.

20.0.3 The party of a simple and powerful hope ...

20.0.4 My fellow citizens, we can begin again. After all of the shouting, and all of the scandal. After all of the bitterness and broken faith. We can begin again.

20.0.5 The wait has been long, but it won't be long now.

21.0.1 A prosperous nation is ready to renew its purpose and unite behind great goals ... and it won't be long now.

21.0.2 Our nation must renew the hopes of that boy I talked with in jail, and so many like him... and it won't be long now.

21.0.3 Our country is ready for high standards and new leaders ... and it won't be long now.

21.0.4 An era of tarnished ideals is giving way to a responsibility era ... and it won't be long now.

21.0.5 I know how serious the task is before me.

21.0.6 I know the presidency is an office that turns pride into prayer.

21.0.7 But I am eager to start on the work ahead.

21.0.8 And I believe America is ready for a new beginning.
My friend, the artist Tom Lea of El Paso, captured the way I feel about our great land.

He and his wife, he said, "live on the east side of the mountain ..."

It is the sunrise side, not the sunset side.

It is the side to see the day that is coming ... not the side to see the day that is gone."

Americans live on the sunrise side of mountain.

The night is passing.

And we are ready for the day to come.

Thank you. And God bless you.

Barack Obama
August 28, 2008
Democratic National Convention
Denver, Colorado

To Chairman Dean and my great friend Dick Durbin; and to all my fellow citizens of this great nation;

With profound gratitude and great humility, I accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States.

Let me express my thanks to the historic slate of candidates who accompanied me on this journey, and especially the one who traveled the farthest – a champion for working Americans and an inspiration to my daughters and to yours -- Hillary Rodham Clinton. To President Clinton, who last night made the case for change as only he can make it; to Ted Kennedy, who embodies the spirit of service; and to the next Vice President of the United States, Joe Biden, I thank you. I am grateful to finish this journey with one of the finest statesmen of our time, a man at ease with everyone from world leaders to the conductors on the Amtrak train he still takes home every night.

To the love of my life, our next First Lady, Michelle Obama, and to Sasha and Malia – I love you so much, and I'm so proud of all of you.

---

20 Thomas Calloway Lea III. American musician, painter and writer from Texas whom incorporated his home state in his works.


22 Senior US Senator from Illinois since 1997. Has been the Senate Majority whip since 2007 which is the second highest position in the Democratic Party leadership in the Senate.
3.0.1 Four years ago, I stood before you and told you my story – of the brief union between a young man from Kenya23 and a young woman from Kansas24 who weren't well-off or well-known, but shared a belief that in America, their son25 could achieve whatever he put his mind to.

3.0.2 It is that promise that has always set this country apart – that through hard work and sacrifice, each of us can pursue our individual dreams but still come together as one American family, to ensure that the next generation can pursue their dreams as well.

3.0.3 That's why I stand here tonight. Because for two hundred and thirty two years, at each moment when that promise was in jeopardy, ordinary men and women – students and soldiers, farmers and teachers, nurses and janitors -- found the courage to keep it alive.

4.0.1 We meet at one of those defining moments – a moment when our nation is at war, our economy is in turmoil, and the American promise has been threatened once more.

4.0.2 Tonight, more Americans are out of work and more are working harder for less. More of you have lost your homes and even more are watching your home values plummet. More of you have cars you can't afford to drive, credit card bills you can't afford to pay, and tuition that's beyond your reach.

4.0.3 These challenges are not all of government's making. But the failure to respond is a direct result of a broken politics in Washington and the failed policies of George W. Bush.

4.0.4 America, we are better than these last eight years. We are a better country than this.

4.0.5 This country is more decent than one where a woman in Ohio, on the brink of retirement, finds herself one illness away from disaster after a lifetime of hard work.

4.0.6 This country is more generous than one where a man in Indiana has to pack up the equipment he's worked on for twenty years and watch it shipped off to China, and then chokes up as he explains how he felt like a failure when he went home to tell his family the news.

4.0.7 We are more compassionate than a government that lets veterans sleep on our streets and families slide into poverty; that sits on its hands while a major American city drowns before our eyes.

5.0.1 Tonight, I say to the American people, to Democrats and Republicans and Independents across this great land – enough! This moment – this election – is our chance to keep, in the 21st century, the American promise alive. Because

---

23 Barack Obama’s father
24 Barack Obama’s mother
25 Barack Obama
next week, in Minnesota, the same party that brought you two terms of George Bush and Dick Cheney will ask this country for a third. And we are here because we love this country too much to let the next four years look like the last eight. On November 4th, we must stand up and say: "Eight is enough."

Now let there be no doubt. The Republican nominee, John McCain, has worn the uniform of our country with bravery and distinction, and for that we owe him our gratitude and respect. And next week, we'll also hear about those occasions when he's broken with his party as evidence that he can deliver the change that we need.

But the record's clear: John McCain has voted with George Bush ninety percent of the time. Senator McCain likes to talk about judgment, but really, what does it say about your judgment when you think George Bush has been right more than ninety percent of the time? I don't know about you, but I'm not ready to take a ten percent chance on change.

The truth is, on issue after issue that would make a difference in your lives – on health care and education and the economy – Senator McCain has been anything but independent. He said that our economy has made "great progress" under this President. He said that the fundamentals of the economy are strong. And when one of his chief advisors – the man who wrote his economic plan – was talking about the anxiety Americans are feeling, he said that we were just suffering from a "mental recession," and that we've become, and I quote, "a nation of whiners."

A nation of whiners? Tell that to the proud auto workers at a Michigan plant who, after they found out it was closing, kept showing up every day and working as hard as ever, because they knew there were people who counted on the brakes that they made. Tell that to the military families who shoulder their burdens silently as they watch their loved ones leave for their third or fourth or fifth tour of duty. These are not whiners. They work hard and give back and keep going without complaint. These are the Americans that I know.

Now, I don't believe that Senator McCain doesn't care what's going on in the lives of Americans. I just think he doesn't know. Why else would he define middle-class as someone making under five million dollars a year? How else could he propose hundreds of billions in tax breaks for big corporations and oil companies but not one penny of tax relief to more than one hundred million Americans? How else could he offer a health care plan that would actually tax people's benefits, or an education plan that would do nothing to help families pay for college, or a plan that would privatize Social Security and gamble your retirement?

It's not because John McCain doesn't care. It's because John McCain doesn't get it.

26 The date for the 56th quadrennial US Presidential election in 2008 (which Barack Obama subsequently won against John McCain).
For over two decades, he's subscribed to that old, discredited Republican philosophy – give more and more to those with the most and hope that prosperity trickles down to everyone else. In Washington, they call this the Ownership Society, but what it really means is – you're on your own. Out of work? Tough luck. No health care? The market will fix it. Born into poverty? Pull yourself up by your own bootstraps – even if you don't have boots. You're on your own.

Well it's time for them to own their failure. It's time for us to change America.

You see, we Democrats have a very different measure of what constitutes progress in this country.

We measure progress by how many people can find a job that pays the mortgage; whether you can put a little extra money away at the end of each month so you can someday watch your child receive her college diploma. We measure progress in the 23 million new jobs that were created when Bill Clinton was President – when the average American family saw its income go up $7,500 instead of down $2,000 like it has under George Bush.

We measure the strength of our economy not by the number of billionaires we have or the profits of the Fortune 500, but by whether someone with a good idea can take a risk and start a new business, or whether the waitress who lives on tips can take a day off to look after a sick kid without losing her job – an economy that honors the dignity of work.

The fundamentals we use to measure economic strength are whether we are living up to that fundamental promise that has made this country great – a promise that is the only reason I am standing here tonight.

Because in the faces of those young veterans who come back from Iraq and Afghanistan, I see my grandfather, who signed up after Pearl Harbor, marched in Patton's Army, and was rewarded by a grateful nation with the chance to go to college on the GI Bill.

In the face of that young student who sleeps just three hours before working the night shift, I think about my mom, who raised my sister and me on her own while she worked and earned her degree; who once turned to food stamps but was still able to send us to the best schools in the country with the help of student loans and scholarships.

When I listen to another worker tell me that his factory has shut down, I remember all those men and women on the South Side of Chicago who I stood by and fought for two decades ago after the local steel plant closed.

---

27 A societal model promoted by George W. Bush, proclaiming responsibility, economic liberty and the owning of property.
28 An annual list compiled by Fortune Magazine, covering the top 500 US corporations seen to gross revenue.
29 Spelled out as: The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 which included benefits for soldiers returning from WWII.
And when I hear a woman talk about the difficulties of starting her own business, I think about my grandmother, who worked her way up from the secretarial pool to middle-management, despite years of being passed over for promotions because she was a woman. She's the one who taught me about hard work. She's the one who put off buying a new car or a new dress for herself so that I could have a better life. She poured everything she had into me. And although she can no longer travel, I know that she's watching tonight, and that tonight is her night as well.

I don't know what kind of lives John McCain thinks that celebrities lead, but this has been mine. These are my heroes. Theirs are the stories that shaped me. And it is on their behalf that I intend to win this election and keep our promise alive as President of the United States.

What is that promise?

It's a promise that says each of us has the freedom to make of our own lives what we will, but that we also have the obligation to treat each other with dignity and respect.

It's a promise that says the market should reward drive and innovation and generate growth, but that businesses should live up to their responsibilities to create American jobs, look out for American workers, and play by the rules of the road.

Ours is a promise that says government cannot solve all our problems, but what it should do is that which we cannot do for ourselves – protect us from harm and provide every child a decent education; keep our water clean and our toys safe; invest in new schools and new roads and new science and technology.

Our government should work for us, not against us. It should help us, not hurt us. It should ensure opportunity not just for those with the most money and influence, but for every American who's willing to work.

That's the promise of America – the idea that we are responsible for ourselves, but that we also rise or fall as one nation; the fundamental belief that I am my brother's keeper; I am my sister's keeper.

That's the promise we need to keep. That's the change we need right now. So let me spell out exactly what that change would mean if I am President.

Change means a tax code that doesn't reward the lobbyists who wrote it, but the American workers and small businesses who deserve it.

Unlike John McCain, I will stop giving tax breaks to corporations that ship jobs overseas, and I will start giving them to companies that create good jobs right here in America.

I will eliminate capital gains taxes for the small businesses and the start-ups that will create the high-wage, high-tech jobs of tomorrow.
I will cut taxes – cut taxes – for 95% of all working families. Because in an economy like this, the last thing we should do is raise taxes on the middle-class.

And for the sake of our economy, our security, and the future of our planet, I will set a clear goal as President: in ten years, we will finally end our dependence on oil from the Middle East.

Washington's been talking about our oil addiction for the last thirty years, and John McCain has been there for twenty-six of them. In that time, he's said no to higher fuel-efficiency standards for cars, no to investments in renewable energy, no to renewable fuels. And today, we import triple the amount of oil as the day that Senator McCain took office.

Now is the time to end this addiction, and to understand that drilling is a stop-gap measure, not a long-term solution. Not even close.

As President, I will tap our natural gas reserves, invest in clean coal technology, and find ways to safely harness nuclear power. I'll help our auto companies re-tool, so that the fuel-efficient cars of the future are built right here in America. I'll make it easier for the American people to afford these new cars. And I'll invest 150 billion dollars over the next decade in affordable, renewable sources of energy – wind power and solar power and the next generation of biofuels; an investment that will lead to new industries and five million new jobs that pay well and can't ever be outsourced.

America, now is not the time for small plans.

Now is the time to finally meet our moral obligation to provide every child a world-class education, because it will take nothing less to compete in the global economy. Michelle and I are only here tonight because we were given a chance at an education. And I will not settle for an America where some kids don't have that chance. I'll invest in early childhood education. I'll recruit an army of new teachers, and pay them higher salaries and give them more support. And in exchange, I'll ask for higher standards and more accountability. And we will keep our promise to every young American – if you commit to serving your community or your country, we will make sure you can afford a college education.

Now is the time to finally keep the promise of affordable, accessible health care for every single American. If you have health care, my plan will lower your premiums. If you don't, you'll be able to get the same kind of coverage that members of Congress give themselves. And as someone who watched my mother argue with insurance companies while she lay in bed dying of cancer, I will make certain those companies stop discriminating against those who are sick and need care the most.

Now is the time to help families with paid sick days and better family leave, because nobody in America should have to choose between keeping their jobs and caring for a sick child or ailing parent.
14.0.2 Now is the time to change our bankruptcy laws, so that your pensions are protected ahead of CEO’s bonuses; and the time to protect Social Security for future generations.

14.0.3 And now is the time to keep the promise of equal pay for an equal day's work, because I want my daughters to have exactly the same opportunities as your sons.

14.0.4 Now, many of these plans will cost money, which is why I’ve laid out how I'll pay for every dime – by closing corporate loopholes and tax havens that don't help America grow. But I will also go through the federal budget, line by line, eliminating programs that no longer work and making the ones we do need work better and cost less – because we cannot meet twenty-first century challenges with a twentieth century bureaucracy.

15.0.1 And Democrats, we must also admit that fulfilling America's promise will require more than just money. It will require a renewed sense of responsibility from each of us to recover what John F. Kennedy called our "intellectual and moral strength." Yes, government must lead on energy independence, but each of us must do our part to make our homes and businesses more efficient. Yes, we must provide more ladders to success for young men who fall into lives of crime and despair. But we must also admit that programs alone can't replace parents; that government can't turn off the television and make a child do her homework; that fathers must take more responsibility for providing the love and guidance their children need.

15.0.2 Individual responsibility and mutual responsibility – that's the essence of America's promise.

16.0.1 And just as we keep our promise to the next generation here at home, so must we keep America's promise abroad. If John McCain wants to have a debate about who has the temperament, and judgment, to serve as the next Commander-in-Chief, that's a debate I'm ready to have.

16.0.2 For while Senator McCain was turning his sights to Iraq just days after 9/11, I stood up and opposed this war, knowing that it would distract us from the real threats we face. When John McCain said we could just "muddle through" in Afghanistan, I argued for more resources and more troops to finish the fight against the terrorists who actually attacked us on 9/11, and made clear that we must take out Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants if we have them in our sights. John McCain likes to say that he'll follow bin Laden to the Gates of Hell – but he won't even go to the cave where he lives.

16.0.3 And today, as my call for a time frame to remove our troops from Iraq has been echoed by the Iraqi government and even the Bush Administration, even after we learned that Iraq has a $79 billion surplus while we're wallowing in deficits, John McCain stands alone in his stubborn refusal to end a misguided war.

30 Spelled out as: Chief Executive Officer, which is the highest ranking person in a corporation or an organization.
16.0.4 That's not the judgment we need. That won't keep America safe. We need a President who can face the threats of the future, not keep grasping at the ideas of the past.

16.0.5 You don't defeat a terrorist network that operates in eighty countries by occupying Iraq. You don't protect Israel and deter Iran just by talking tough in Washington. You can't truly stand up for Georgia when you've strained our oldest alliances. If John McCain wants to follow George Bush with more tough talk and bad strategy, that is his choice – but it is not the change we need.

17.0.1 We are the party of Roosevelt. We are the party of Kennedy. So don't tell me that Democrats won't defend this country. Don't tell me that Democrats won't keep us safe. The Bush-McCain foreign policy has squandered the legacy that generations of Americans -- Democrats and Republicans -- have built, and we are here to restore that legacy.

17.0.2 As Commander-in-Chief, I will never hesitate to defend this nation, but I will only send our troops into harm's way with a clear mission and a sacred commitment to give them the equipment they need in battle and the care and benefits they deserve when they come home.

17.0.3 I will end this war in Iraq responsibly, and finish the fight against al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. I will rebuild our military to meet future conflicts. But I will also renew the tough, direct diplomacy that can prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons and curb Russian aggression. I will build new partnerships to defeat the threats of the 21st century: terrorism and nuclear proliferation; poverty and genocide; climate change and disease. And I will restore our moral standing, so that America is once again that last, best hope for all who are called to the cause of freedom, who long for lives of peace, and who yearn for a better future.

17.0.4 These are the policies I will pursue. And in the weeks ahead, I look forward to debating them with John McCain.

17.0.5 But what I will not do is suggest that the Senator takes his positions for political purposes. Because one of the things that we have to change in our politics is the idea that people cannot disagree without challenging each other's character and patriotism.

17.1.1 The times are too serious, the stakes are too high for this same partisan playbook. So let us agree that patriotism has no party. I love this country, and so do you, and so does John McCain. The men and women who serve in our battlefields may be Democrats and Republicans and Independents, but they have fought together and bled together and some died together under the same proud flag. They have not served a Red America or a Blue America – they have served the United States of America.

17.1.2 So I've got news for you, John McCain. We all put our country first.
America, our work will not be easy. The challenges we face require tough choices, and Democrats as well as Republicans will need to cast off the worn-out ideas and politics of the past. For part of what has been lost these past eight years can't just be measured by lost wages or bigger trade deficits. What has also been lost is our sense of common purpose – our sense of higher purpose. And that's what we have to restore.

We may not agree on abortion, but surely we can agree on reducing the number of unwanted pregnancies in this country. The reality of gun ownership may be different for hunters in rural Ohio than for those plagued by gang-violence in Cleveland, but don't tell me we can't uphold the Second Amendment while keeping AK-47s out of the hands of criminals. I know there are differences on same-sex marriage, but surely we can agree that our gay and lesbian brothers and sisters deserve to visit the person they love in the hospital and to live lives free of discrimination. Passions fly on immigration, but I don't know anyone who benefits when a mother is separated from her infant child or an employer undercuts American wages by hiring illegal workers. This too is part of America's promise – the promise of a democracy where we can find the strength and grace to bridge divides and unite in common effort.

I know there are those who dismiss such beliefs as happy talk. They claim that our insistence on something larger, something firmer and more honest in our public life is just a Trojan Horse for higher taxes and the abandonment of traditional values. And that's to be expected. Because if you don't have any fresh ideas, then you use stale tactics to scare the voters. If you don't have a record to run on, then you paint your opponent as someone people should run from.

You make a big election about small things.

And you know what – it's worked before. Because it feeds into the cynicism we all have about government. When Washington doesn't work, all its promises seem empty. If your hopes have been dashed again and again, then it's best to stop hoping, and settle for what you already know.

I get it. I realize that I am not the likeliest candidate for this office. I don't fit the typical pedigree, and I haven't spent my career in the halls of Washington.

But I stand before you tonight because all across America something is stirring. What the nay-sayers don't understand is that this election has never been about me. It's been about you.

For eighteen long months, you have stood up, one by one, and said enough to the politics of the past. You understand that in this election, the greatest risk we can take is to try the same old politics with the same old players and expect a different result. You have shown what history teaches us – that at defining moments like this one, the change we need doesn't come from Washington. Change comes to Washington. Change happens because the American people demand it – because they rise up and insist on new ideas and new leadership, a new politics for a new time.
America, this is one of those moments.

I believe that as hard as it will be, the change we need is coming. Because I've seen it. Because I've lived it. I've seen it in Illinois, when we provided health care to more children and moved more families from welfare to work. I've seen it in Washington, when we worked across party lines to open up government and hold lobbyists more accountable, to give better care for our veterans and keep nuclear weapons out of terrorist hands.

And I've seen it in this campaign. In the young people who voted for the first time, and in those who got involved again after a very long time. In the Republicans who never thought they'd pick up a Democratic ballot, but did. I've seen it in the workers who would rather cut their hours back a day than see their friends lose their jobs, in the soldiers who re-enlist after losing a limb, in the good neighbors who take a stranger in when a hurricane strikes and the floodwaters rise.

This country of ours has more wealth than any nation, but that's not what makes us rich. We have the most powerful military on Earth, but that's not what makes us strong. Our universities and our culture are the envy of the world, but that's not what keeps the world coming to our shores.

Instead, it is that American spirit – that American promise – that pushes us forward even when the path is uncertain; that binds us together in spite of our differences; that makes us fix our eye not on what is seen, but what is unseen, that better place around the bend.

That promise is our greatest inheritance. It's a promise I make to my daughters when I tuck them in at night, and a promise that you make to yours – a promise that has led immigrants to cross oceans and pioneers to travel west; a promise that led workers to picket lines, and women to reach for the ballot.

And it is that promise that forty five years ago today, brought Americans from every corner of this land to stand together on a Mall in Washington, before Lincoln's Memorial, and hear a young preacher from Georgia speak of his dream.

The men and women who gathered there could've heard many things. They could've heard words of anger and discord. They could've been told to succumb to the fear and frustration of so many dreams deferred.

But what the people heard instead – people of every creed and color, from every walk of life – is that in America, our destiny is inextricably linked. That together, our dreams can be one.

"We cannot walk alone," the preacher cried. "And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back."

---

31 Martín Luther King, Jr.
America, we cannot turn back. Not with so much work to be done. Not with so many children to educate, and so many veterans to care for. Not with an economy to fix and cities to rebuild and farms to save. Not with so many families to protect and so many lives to mend. America, we cannot turn back. We cannot walk alone. At this moment, in this election, we must pledge once more to march into the future. Let us keep that promise – that American promise – and in the words of Scripture hold firmly, without wavering, to the hope that we confess.

Thank you, God Bless you, and God Bless the United States of America.