1. Introduction
This thesis is a discourse analytic investigation of the two videogames CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE and CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2. As the titles suggest, these videogames have war in modern times as their main theme, and the focal point of the discourse analysis presented in
this thesis will be the study of the *Discourse of War* that is presented in these games. In doing so this thesis will devote quite a lot of attention to metaphors and cognitive metaphor theory based on Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and metaphor criticism as presented by Lakoff (1991) and Charteris-Black (2005). Metaphors are powerful rhetoric strategies as they tap into shared cultural knowledge and beliefs. Lakoff and Charteris-Black both study the use of metaphors in the political discourse of Western heads-of-state in wartimes, but as this thesis will show metaphors are just as prevalent in the videogames studied in this thesis and seem to serve the same purpose: to create and maintain views of the world that on a larger scale support or contest political power and perceptions of reality.

The *Discourse of War* will be presented as a discourse that is highly prevalent in Western culture, and easily recognizable through the metaphors it makes use of. It is a discourse that is first and foremost associated with political rhetoric, but this thesis will show that the *Discourse of War* is also found in videogames. Here it takes a shape similar to well-known political speeches delivered by some of the most influential Western heads-of-state, US presidents such as Bush Jr. and Sr. and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and this thesis presents the conclusion that this is due to the power of metaphors. Metaphors tap into shared cultural beliefs and knowledge systems, and activate connotations of right and wrong and good and evil in the mind of the audience. Western videogames and political rhetoric share the same cultural background, and draw on some of the same world views, myths and history perceptions. The *Call of Duty* videogames additionally deal with many of the same themes as political discourse in wartimes: war, terrorism, duty, allies and enemies and moral obligations to fight. These themes are all highly value laden, and metaphors are a very efficient way of presenting them in a manner that engages the audience and wins their sympathy, as metaphors allow the presenter to align himself with right and good, and the enemy with wrong and evil. This discourse will be presented as a *Discourse of Empire* in this thesis, drawing on the analysis by Dyer-Witherford & Peuter (2009), in which the US is presented as an empire maintaining status and power by presenting its citizens with a world view necessitating war and presenting itself as a hero and crusader for justice.

Following the Introduction in Chapter 1, Chapter 2 presents a definition of videogames and an overview of major research areas in game studies. This overview is followed by a brief introduction to Discourse Analysis, the link between the language of videogames and linguistics in this thesis as Discourse Analysis is the linguistic method employed to investigate videogames, a media not often studied in linguistics. The emphasis in the introduction is on the
view of the study of discourse as the study of society and reality, and on videogames as sites of discursive practices creating and maintaining power structures and social perceptions. Finally the chapter introduces the games studied in this thesis, CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE and CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2. An overview of the storyline in the two games can be found in Appendix B: Call of Duty.

Chapter 3 describes cognitive metaphor theory as it is presented in Lakoff and Johnson (1980). The aim of this chapter is to give an introduction to the concept of metaphor as well as to cognitive metaphor theory, and the importance this branch of linguistics places on the links between metaphor and cognition. It also introduces Charteris-Black’s study of presidential rhetoric focusing on metaphor use, showing how discourse analysis can benefit from including metaphor theory in the study of political language.

Chapter 4 presents studies of presidential discourse in times of war, with special emphasis on the rhetoric of George W. Bush, US president at the time when the CALL OF DUTY videogames were made. The emphasis here is on metaphors and how they are used to present certain values and worldviews desirable for the speaker to instill in the audience. This chapter serves as the theoretical foundation for the analysis of the discourses in CALL OF DUTY as presented in chapter 5.

Chapter 5 contains the analysis of the five main sub discourses found in the CALL OF DUTY videogames, with special attention to the use of metaphors. The aim of this chapter is to show how Discourse Analysis, a linguistic discipline traditionally used to study more conventional media types such as newspaper articles, speeches and political debates on TV, can be used to study videogames. Furthermore this chapter shows how videogames make use of rhetorical strategies similar to those found in political speeches, supporting Lakoff and Johnson’s claim that metaphors are so prevalent and ingrained in human thinking that they appear everywhere as a natural choice for writers seeking to present a certain world view or represent a specific reality.

Chapter 6 concludes this thesis, giving a brief overview of the content and key conclusions drawn.

2. Preliminaries
“Language matters, because it can determine how we think and act” (Lakoff & Frisch 2006). Five years after the attacks on US ground in 2001, an event that has passed into history under the name 9/11, Lakoff and Frisch begin an article on metaphorical presidential rhetoric in HuffPost Politics
with these words. Now, in 2011, 10 years later, the international political scene is still shaped by the forces that were set in motion in the days and months following September 11th, 2001, and one of the ways in which these forces manifest themselves is through language. Language, of course, only matters if it has an impact, if it manages to reach out enough to actually have a chance of influencing any sort of thinking and acting, and one method of maximising the potential impact of a political discourse, such as the Discourse of War that is the object of study of this thesis, is by enhancing it through the use of metaphors. In the wake of 9/11 a powerful discourse emerged in US political rhetoric, the war discourse based on the war on terror metaphor. Based on Lakoff’s work on metaphor criticism, this thesis aims to examine the Discourse of War in modern media. Traditional rhetorical studies typically focus on media types as newspapers, TV or internet texts, but the aim in this thesis is to make a different media type, the videogame, the field of study.

Videogames are most often thought of as a visual media, and the number of studies focusing on the visual aspects of videogames is countless. Linguistic studies, on the other hand, are rare. The starting point for this thesis, however, is that although videogames are primarily visual, they are also objects worthy of linguistic study, because language plays a big part in constructing the game universes. There are exceptions of course, a game like Tetris for instance, that consists of a very minimal game play of fitting falling blocks of different shapes into a box, seems to have no linguistic elements at all, but the majority of videogames today make use of several linguistic strategies to reinforce the visual statements made, and in some cases the linguistic elements of videogames even carry meanings that are not unfolded in the visual representations. One example of this is the use of accents in CALL OF DUTY described in chapter 5.3. This is, however, not to say that the linguistic practices work independently of the visual aspects, but rather to emphasise that videogames are not merely a visual phenomena. Language is a part of the videogame universe, and a part of the whole videogame experience for the gamers. "As stated in the title of Smith (2002), “computer games have words, too”, and these 'words' (or rather: the discourse used in computer games) can be analyzed, just like any other instance of actual language use, from a discourse analytical perspective."

Apart from introducing videogames as a linguistic subject matter, this thesis also addresses another gap in most of the existing videogame research: the fact that almost all existing videogame studies are conducted by avid gamers. There is nothing wrong with studying something the researcher has experience with, but there is also nothing wrong with examining something with a certain scientific distance to the subject, and this thesis belongs to the latter category as I
am by no means a gamer myself, but simply interested in videogames as a type of modern media just like newspapers, TV, internet texts, etc, with the big difference that videogames have received far less attention from discourse analysis. Simons (2007:3) writes that “Readers, film buffs, art lovers, and passionate game players tend to confuse the experience of their beloved objects with a theory thereof”. Whether this is true or not is another debate, but this thesis at least does not have to deal with that pitfall. It also seems to be the only study of its kind combining discourse analysis, metaphor theory and videogame study, and I hope that it will prove a valuable contribution to all three areas of research.

In the world of discourse analysis language use is seen as a conscious or subconscious choice, inevitably revealing an individual or group’s beliefs, norms and ideals. This is also the approach taken to the language of videogames in this thesis, and the goal of the analysis is to highlight some of the social practices that underlie the language used. In this thesis the language of videogames is regarded as a part of a discourse, a social construction capable of influencing speakers’ perception of reality and an assumption of language as a medium that “embodies “sediments” of social practices which serve to justify and perpetuate inequalities of power and opportunity in society” (Wooffitt 2006:54). The aim of this thesis is not so much to investigate the language of videogames in itself, but rather a study of the social realities that are constructed and contested in these games through the use of language. It is an attempt at studying how social practices find their way into videogames, using the medium as platforms for ideological representations, and how real life events are reflected in the videogame discourse.

The working hypothesis for this thesis is that the metaphorical presidential rhetoric described by Lakoff is part of a discourse found not only in presidential speeches and media traditionally considered political such as newspapers, political speeches and TV debates, but also in the popular culture phenomena of videogames such as the CALL OF DUTY franchise. This discourse is one that represents hegemonic US core values, mirroring a Discourse of War that has been a part of the US national identity for decades, though it is in particular associated with the discourse of former President George W. Bush and his White House administration after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The Discourse of War in the CALL OF DUTY videogames is a discourse drawing on the use of metaphor as the prime linguistic strategy. Charteris-Black, who examines the rhetoric of US and British heads-of-state, argues that “linguistic analysis provides a very clear insight into the nature of how power is gained and maintained in democracies” (Charteris-Black 2005:xi). This thesis takes this assumption as its starting point and applies it to videogames instead,
to examine how the rhetorical means known from the world of politics are used in videogames to create and maintain political power there as well. Furthermore a big part of the *Discourse of War* found in the CALL OF DUTY videogames closely resembles President George W. Bush’s post 9/11 speeches, reinforcing the US foreign policies in the days and years after the attack. The rhetoric found in the CALL OF DUTY videogames is placed within a discourse I will label a *Discourse of Empire* and it is my hope that this thesis will show that discourse analysis has its place anywhere discourses are found, and can be applied to any type of media, even the more unconventional ones such as videogames.

### 2.1 Studying videogames

This chapter focuses on research on videogames, referencing major schools of thought in game studies so far, and relating videogames to linguistics. Chapter 2.1.1 deals with terminology, describing the differences between the related terms videogame, computer game and console game as they are presented in Travinor (2009). Chapter 2.1.2 summarises three main approaches to describing the nature of videogames, the narratological, the ludological and the interactive fiction approach. Chapter 2.1.3 introduces discourse analysis as the link between videogames and linguistics, showing how videogames can be read as discursive sites where ideologies are upheld, contested and created. Finally chapter 2.1.4 gives an introduction to the videogames studied in this thesis, CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE and CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2.

#### 2.1.1 Game terminology

The term “videogame” is not entirely unproblematic, as it is not the only term used to describe the media this thesis examines. “Videogames”, “computer games” and “console games” are all used to describe electronic games, and all three terms are sometimes, quite confusingly, used interchangeably, but “computer games” and “console games” in particular usually denote two related but different phenomena. Travinor (2009:17) explains that:

*computer game* is sometimes taken to refer to games on a personal computer, but is also used as the generic term [...] while *videogame*, as well as being a generic term, is sometimes used to refer exclusively to console games such as those on the X-Box 360 or Playstation 3.

Travinor settles on using “videogame” as the generic term for all types of games, and this practice is followed here in this thesis. It should be noted that the spelling “video game” is used as well
in both game studies and colloquially, a practice that does make sense as both “computer game” and “console game” are written out in two words. In this thesis however, “videogame” is the chosen spelling, and the term refers to any kind of digital game played on either PC, X-Box 360 or Playstation 3.

2.1.2 The Nature of Videogames
Games Studies: “an interdisciplinary research field drawing mostly from the humanities, social sciences, psychology, and computer science” (Travinor 2009:10), is a relatively new scientific area that focuses on videogames, examining them from various scientific stances. One of the areas of Game Studies that has received a lot of attention in recent years is the question of the nature of videogames, a task that, according to Travinor (2009:15), is often “taken to ask which of the previous non-videogaming forms of culture videogaming most resembles”. These typically fall into one of three main approaches to the study of videogames, narratological, ludological and interactive fiction.

The narratological approach sees videogames as “new forms of narratives or texts” (Travinor 2009:15) and draw on methods and theories from “the old forms”, films and novels, when analyzing videogames. The starting point for the narratological approach is that videogames are narratives, and that they can be analyzed as such. It is a belief expressed in quotes such as the following “Narratives and games, along with many other existing and yet to be invented forms and formats, are all part of the same game” (Simons 2007:11).

The ludological approach considers videogames “as being principally games though in a new digital medium” (Travinor 2009:15) It is often presented as a counter theory to the narratological approach, and the focus here is on the traits videogames share with non-digital games such as board games and sports, namely being based on formal rules. One ludologist presenting this view on videogames is Eskelinen (2001:1-2) who states that “computer games are remediated games” and that “games are systems of ends and means” with “specific procedural rules of how to manipulate the equipment (pieces or tokens or whatever)”

Finally the interactive fiction theory acts as a counterpart to both the narratological and the ludological approach, focusing on the interaction between the player and the game rather than the narrative elements or formal rule based properties of videogames. One of the proponents of the interactive fiction theory is Juul (2003:5) who borrows from the ludological approach in stressing the formal properties of videogames and rejecting the notion of them as narratives, while
at the same time emphasizing the player’s role, as seen in the following statement:

A game is a rule based formal system with a variable and quantifiable outcome, where different outcomes are assigned different values, the player exerts effort in order to influence the outcome, the player feels attached to the outcome, and the consequences of the activity are optional and negotional.

Travinor rejects all three approaches on the grounds that the basic premise in all of them fails to prove itself as a “necessary condition of videogaming” (Travinor 2009:24). Some videogames rely heavily on narratives, some seem to be designed around rules and others highlight the player/game interaction, but none of these parameters are, according to Travinor (2009:26), essential for all videogames. Instead he offers up his own, disjunctive definition as follows:

X is a videogame if it is an artifact in a visual digital medium, is intended as an object of entertainment, and is intended to provide such entertainment through the employment of one or both of the following modes of engagement: rule and objective gameplay or interactive fiction.

Travinor’s definition has merits over the other approaches, because it attempts to encompass several different characteristics of videogames rather than just focus on one thing. By attempting to find a definition of the nature of all videogames, however, he does run into the same problem as the definitions he is trying to distance himself from. Defining the nature of videogames is an admirable task that will undoubtedly require rough generalizations ignoring individual differences, but, taken the vastness of his topic into consideration, it seems impossible to want to define all videogames as one. Tetris is obviously different from many other kinds of games, and trying to fit a definition more thorough than “videogames” to all the vast and diverse examples of videogames out there is about as fruitful as trying to define all kinds of, say, music or movies as one. Generic terms with a general definition are of course not characteristic for each and every single instance of subcategory elements in a genre, but it is often a necessary starting point for a further, more detailed analysis of a single genre within the overarching concept. A scientist would not study music, a scientist would study specific subcategories of music defined by how they differ from other types of music belonging to the same generic class music, but to do so he would first have to have a general definition of music in place before being able to single out differences between various musical subgenres. The debate on definitions of videogames seem to be a matter of researchers defining different subgenres of videogames, emphasizing different inherent properties to the individual subcategories of their choice, rather than focusing on the shared traits of the overall phenomenon. Videogames, it could be argued, display what Wittgenstein termed family resemblance, they have similarities but no one common feature defining them all.
2.1.3 Videogames and Linguistics

Why even study videogames in a linguistic thesis? Videogames are first and foremost fictional phenomena designed with entertainment in mind. They are, however, also discourses where power relations are contested and constructed, and the language used in videogames imitates that used in “the real world”, allowing the researcher to gain insight into dominant language practices found outside of the gaming sphere, in the modern, everyday world everyone, gamers or not, inhabit. The belief that videogames are influenced by reality, and can in turn influence, if not reality, then at least the gamers playing them, is quite pervasive in game studies, with quotes as the following being used to explain the interest and relevancy of game studies “the experience and enjoyment of videogames are affected in part by social reality and, in turn, social reality is being affected by the experience and enjoyment of videogames” (Reyes & Adams, 2010:149).

What does all this have to do with linguistics? Quite a lot in fact, as the thesis will show in the chapters to come, because the study of videogames in this thesis is discourse analytic. The link between social reality and (linguistic) representations is a main component of Discourse Analysis, a major linguistic discipline. As mentioned in the introduction, this paper is based on the view of discourse as more than “just” language, seeing it instead as “a constructive and constitutive medium” that “brings the world into being” (Wooffitt 2006:97). The key reason to study linguistic phenomena in videogames is thus not to analyze language in itself, but rather to examine what the language used reveals about the society it belongs to. This is done by studying ideologies, defined as “organized sets of beliefs which mobilize practices and viewpoints which sustain inequalities across society” (ibid: 140). Discourse Analysis thus studies people’s perceptions of the world and the mindsets behind social constructions and orderings of societies.

Another key concept here is inequality, as Discourse Analysis focuses on disparity, seeking to reveal and, to a lesser or greater extent depending on the researcher, change existing hierarchical structures perceived as unfair. Power thus becomes a crucial element in Discourse Analysis, and language is believed to reflect power in various ways as detailed in the following quote “the ways in which we talk and write about the world reflect wider ideological pressures and, ultimately, particular constellations of power relations” (ibid:140) Language is seen as a gateway to understanding the power relations that shape not only the world, but also public and personal perceptions of the world, with the main premise being that those in power use that power to create and sustain a world order ensuring that they stay in power. “Discourses shape and constitute our
identities, and legitimate certain kinds of relationships between those identities, thus locking people into particular kinds of social arrangements” (ibid:151) Language is not only considered a means of communication, but instead a powerful force regulating and influencing human interactions and social constructions. These constructions of realities take place everywhere language is used, also in videogames, and the areas of interest in the videogame world mirror those found in other settings, as “games employ and deploy racial, gendered, and national meaning, often reinforcing dominant ideas and the status quo” (Quellette 2008:2).

Violence and gender issues in videogames are two discourses that have been studied often in the late 20th and early 21st century. Violence is an inherent part of many videogames, and a source of great concern for many parents and educators worrying about the possible corrupting effects of videogame violence on impressionable youth. This has lead to a number of studies attempting to establish whether or not videogames can be linked to violence in real world encounters. One recent study addressing videogame violence is Doğan (2006), concluding that videogame violence not only promotes violence among youngsters, but also leads to impaired brain development and in some cases is the direct reason behind teen assaults and killings.

Many video games feature female game characters, either as avatars representing the player, or as Non-player characters, NPCs. The representation of these characters is, along with the possible harmful effects of video game violence, among the most contested topics of controversy related to gaming. Concerns regarding gender stereotyping in video games range from the visual representation of female characters to the roles and courses of action the characters are subjected to. The former can be seen in Nakamura & Wirman (2005:4) stating that “Girls are also disturbed by representations of stereotypical females that follow masculine fantasies”. Yao et al. (2010) study the latter, examining games with decidedly sexual content where female game characters are portrayed as object of sexual pursuit for male game characters controlled by the player. This is, according to the authors of the article, an even greater problem than objectification of women in other types of popular media such as movies, because of the level on involvement invested in video games. The researchers conclude that “Unlike viewers of television programs who simply watch other characters performing sexually-related behaviors, players of video games actually step into the role of the characters by virtually practicing these acts” (Yao et al. 2010:82). According to the researchers playing a video game with sexual content makes male players more likely to sexually-harass based on lexical decision tasks and self-reports in questionnaires.

Gender issues in particular have been studied quite intensely in linguistic Discourse
Analysis, and a linguistic investigation of gender could also be an interesting addition to the study of videogames, as most, if not all, of the existing literature focuses on visual representations rather than linguistic content. In CALL OF DUTY however, there is no sexual content, and the only possibly dubious representation of female characters is the non-representation as there is not a single female character in the game. What the videogames do have, however, is a quite interesting discourse concerning masculinity, an area of gender studies that hasn’t received nearly as much attention in discourse analysis. The discourse of masculinity, which will be described in detail in chapter 5.6.1 is one that combines gendered and national meaning, drawing on a heroic myth that has been a part of US values from the dawn of the nation.

CALL OF DUTY also has an obvious link to presidential rhetoric relying heavily on metaphorical content to establish and maintain a desired representation of the world and the war efforts connected to the war on terror in Western societies. As this thesis will show, metaphor criticism, the discourse analytic study of political language, is directly applicable to the language used in the CALL OF DUTY videogames. Entertainment or not, the rhetoric used in CALL OF DUTY is not just fiction but a mirror of prominent social realities with widespread consequences. The war on terror is real to the thousands of people directly involved in the conflict, and to the millions and billions living in a world shaped by war and terror and international politics. Discourse Analysis aims to examine prominent discourses that influence societies and worlds, and this is where linguistics and videogames meet in this thesis. Linguistics, represented here by Discourse Analysis and metaphor theory, offers a method to gain insight into the mechanics behind the discourses present in videogames, and the social realities feeding these discourses.

2.1.4 CALL OF DUTY

CALL OF DUTY is the shared title of a range of First Person Shooter or FPS videogames for both the PC and consoles containing both single- and multiplayer levels. In August 2011 the CALL OF DUTY series covers seven titles with an eight installment, CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 3, scheduled to be released November 8th. The first four games are all set in World War II environments, while the fifth, CALL OF DUTY: BLACK OPS takes place in Cold War and Vietnam War settings. The sixth and seventh game, CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE and CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2, both take place in modern times in post 9/11 settings, and it is these two games that I have chosen to focus on. CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE was released in November 2007 and is set in 2011, when a civil war breaks out in Russia. The game was hugely popular after its release, being the
top selling game worldwide in 2007 and winning several videogame awards including IGN’s Best Xbox 360 Game. CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2 was released November 2009, and takes place in modern times, some 5 years after the incidents in the prequel, when terrorist actions by Russian terrorists framing the US for their misdeeds, incites Russia to invade the US.

I have chosen to work with these two videogames because the work on metaphor analysis that I am interested in focuses on modern politics and presidential rhetoric after 9/11, and I wanted my data to reflect this day and age. Many modern military shooters are set in World War II settings or deal with other historical conflicts such as the Vietnam War or the Cold War, but the two CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE videogames are examples of popular war games set in modern times. Furthermore I have chosen these two games as my main data, and the whole franchise as reference, because they represent a type of videogame that I believe to be particularly interesting for a discourse analytic analysis, namely that of the realistic, military FPS. FPS videogames are characterized by their perspective, presenting the game world as it would look like if the gamers were actually there in person. In Höglund (2008), the author examines the military shooter represented by the games CLOSE COMBAT, AMERICA’S ARMY: SPECIAL FORCES, KUMA/WAR and FULL SPECTRUM WARRIOR, games that share the common characteristic of rendering “a game space before the gamer that is reminiscent of an actual, modern battlefield” (Höglund 2008:4). It is perhaps questionable whether or not the average gamer has any sort of knowledge of what an actual, modern battlefield looks like, and a more precise description of these games would perhaps be that they render a game space that is reminiscent of what the average gamer, through the influence of other media forms such as movies and TV news, thinks is an actual, modern battlefield. The power of suggestion lies not in successfully mimicking an actual battlefield, but in mirroring popular beliefs of what a battlefield should look like.

Another important characteristic in the military shooters is their representations of realism, and the potential blurring of lines between realistic and real. Höglund summarizes the difference between the two as realistic meaning “that the game environment and its physics appear authentic before the gamers eyes”, while real means that “the narrative that the gamer becomes part of is historically and ideologically accurate” (ibid:4). It is, as one may already at this point suspect, the latter meaning that is problematic in most military shooters, as the representation of a narrative can always be contested historically and ideologically, and who is to determine what is accurate or not? It is this very issue that first turned my attention towards the military shooter as a site where discursive practice attempting to define the historically and
ideologically accurate are played out. Höglund writes that “videogames – more so than schools, religion, or other forms of popular culture – are teaching Americans about race, gender, sexuality, class, and national identity” (ibid:3). The military shooter, and all other types of videogames of course, are not just restricted to the American sphere though, but influences gamers all over the world, spreading dominant Discourse of War. Höglund suggest that it is necessary to “study computer games as a vehicle that disseminate the ideologies of hegemonies” (ibid:3), and that is what I wish to do with this thesis. CALL OF DUTY seems an ideal subject for such a study as it is not only filled with teaching of national identity, but also because many of these are played out linguistically rather than visually. Some videogames have next to nothing to analyze in terms linguistic interest, but the CALL OF DUTY videogames offer quite a lot of linguistic data in the shape of game dialogue and monologue. These are presented auditory as speech and visually onscreen as subtitles, and it is the latter representation that I will be using in this thesis, where data from the game is presented as it appears in the onscreen subtitles.

For my analysis I followed Charteris-Black’s (2005) approach. The data selection simply consisted of going through the game dialogues and monologues, selecting any instances of metaphorical language for further analysis. These instances of metaphorical language were then analyzed using Lakoff’s and Johnson’s (1980) framework for metaphorical analysis, and the later metaphor criticism works of Lakoff (1991) and Charteris-Black (2005), comparing the existing work on metaphors in presidential speeches with the metaphorical language used in the CALL OF DUTY videogames.

Both CALL OF DUTY videogames consist of both single player and multiplayer parts. In this thesis the focus is on the single player parts only, as there is precious little dialogue in the multiplayer parts of both games. This is not to say that the multiplayer parts of CALL OF DUTY are not sites of discursive negotiations, but simply that the practices taking place there lie beyond the linguistic scope, as they are visual rather than linguistic in nature.

It is impossible to measure how influential videogames are, but one hint is in the sales numbers as they do tell us something about the scope of games. CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2 had sold 20 million copies worldwide in 2010, and was the best selling game of all time in UK and the second best selling game in the US. In January 2011 CALL OF DUTY: BLACK OPS was the second most selling game in Denmark only topped by Little Big Planet 2, and CALL OF DUTY ticked in at number 19 on the list (GFK Chart Track 2011), and CALL OF DUTY: BLACK OPS was the seventh most sold game worldwide on Jan 15th, having sold more than 10
million copies (vgechartz 2011), and the other installments in the series have similar sales numbers to boost. Influence is of course not a matter of copies sold only, but with statistics like that there should be no doubt that the potential influence of the CALL OF DUTY series is massive. If only a fraction of the gamers who have bought a CALL OF DUTY videogame are influenced by the game discourse, that is a potential of thousands or even millions of people affected. Different sources disagree on the exact numbers, but there is no doubt that videogames are among the most influential modern entertainment genres, rivaling and perhaps even surpassing other popular media forms such as movies and music, and they are by far more widespread than traditional opinion formers such as newspapers and TV broadcasts of political speeches. It is time to turn from the more traditional media types and genres studied in Discourse Analysis, and take a look at something so far considered pure entertainment, to examine the discursive practices unfolding in modern videogames.

Chapter 2.1 has introduced the study of videogames starting with the terminology of the term “videogame” itself, followed by a summary of the three main approaches to the study of the nature of videogames as they are presented in Travinor (2009), the narratological, the ludological and the interactive fiction approach. Discourse Analysis, the linguistic theoretical foundation for this thesis, was then introduced to show how videogames can be read as discursive sites, and finally the videogames studied in this thesis, CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE and CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2 were introduced.

3. Cognitive metaphor theory
This chapter introduces cognitive metaphor theory as it is presented in Lakoff & Johnson (1980), summarizing the major components of their then groundbreaking theories on the link between metaphors and cognition. Chapter 3.1 describes the difference between conceptual metaphor and metaphorical, linguistic expression and how the two are connected. Chapter 3.2 presents the three types of metaphor Lakoff and Johnson work with, the structural, the ontological and the orientational metaphor. Chapter 3.3 describes highlighting and hiding in metaphor, the fact that a metaphor does not transfer all aspect of meaning of a source but only highlight some while hiding others. Chapter 3.4 explains metaphorical systems, groups of conceptual metaphors described in terms of the most specific conceptual metaphor. Chapter 3.6 deals with metaphorically conditioned examples of iconicity, and chapter 3.7 summarizes how Lakoff and Johnson see metaphors as important components of political discourse, presented to the public by those in power to create or
maintain a certain world view. This leads into chapter 3.7.1 which summarizes how Charteris-Black (2005) has applied cognitive metaphor theory to the political discourse of Western heads-of-state. This study forms the inspiration for the discourse analytic investigation of political discourses in CALL OF DUTY which will be presented in Chapter 5.

Metaphors play a very important role in the discursive practices unfolding in the CALL OF DUTY videogames, and it is therefore only reasonable to take a closer look at what has come to be known as cognitive metaphor theory. Cognitive metaphor theory is first and foremost associated with the works of Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Here the two authors presented the main thesis “Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:3) or, put differently “Trying to understand metaphor, then, means attempting to understand a vital part of who we are and what kind of world we live in” (Kövecses 2002:xi). This view on metaphor as a conceptual phenomenon rather than simply a literary or linguistic device, became the cornerstone of cognitive metaphor theory, and also forms the basis of the views on metaphors presented in this thesis. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980:5) “The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another”. A metaphor is a way of thinking, a means of accessing one event, situation, concept etc. in terms of structures and patterns typically associated with another, more precisely, as “understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain” (Kövecses 2002:4). The conceptual domain that is understood through the metaphor is called the target domain, and the domain that is used is called the source domain. The target is usually abstract in nature, while the source usually comes from the concrete or physical domain. Metaphor is then often an attempt at understanding an abstract concept by explaining it through a concrete or physical thing, a way of taking something intangible and making it more accessible through the use of phenomena from “the real world” that people recognize and understand, or, as Kövecses (2002:6) puts it “Our experiences with the physical world serve as a natural and logical foundation for the comprehension of more abstract domains”. One way this manifests itself, is through the use of the human body as a source domain. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:25) write that “our experiences with physical objects (especially our own bodies) provide the basis for an extraordinarily wide variety of ontological metaphors” and “MORE IS UP seems always to have the highest priority since it has the clearest physical basis” (ibid:23). Cognitive metaphor theory links metaphor and cognition based on the belief that thinking in itself is metaphorical, as we view and understand the world in metaphorical terms. Physical orientation is one of the first learned and most primary understandings
of human thinking, and it is through this that we understand more abstract and complex constructions. The body is the foundation of the human experience of the world, and metaphors are the basis of human understanding of the world.

3.1 Conceptual metaphor and Metaphorical Linguistic Expression
In dealing with metaphors Lakoff and Johnson distinguish between conceptual metaphor and metaphorical linguistic expression. The metaphorical linguistic expression is the linguistic construction most people would think of as “metaphor”, sayings like “I’ve never won an argument with him” and “He shot down all my arguments” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:4). The conceptual metaphor is the idea that governs possible metaphorical expressions. It is in other words a kind of super metaphor, an overarching understanding of a concept and is denoted in capitals to distinguish it from metaphorical linguistic expressions, like ARGUMENT IS WAR (ibid:3). A single conceptual metaphor can have an unlimited number of metaphorical linguistic expressions attached to it. Examples of metaphorical linguistic expressions belonging to the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR, are, apart from the two metaphors mentioned above, expressions such as “Your claims are indefensible”, “He attacked every weak point in my argument, “His criticisms were right on target” and “I demolished his argument” (ibid:4). In all of these expressions, the concept of argument is described in terms belonging to the realm of war. “Indefensible”, “weak points of attack”, “targets” and “demolishing” are all sayings from warfare with quite bloody literal meanings that, when translated into metaphors, can be used to describe and access a completely different concept. The conceptual metaphor is the framework wherein literal instances of metaphorical expressions belong. “Your claims are indefensible”, “He attacked every weak point in my argument, “His criticisms were right on target” and “I demolished his argument” are literal metaphors, ARGUMENT IS WAR is the conceptual understanding of what arguments are and how they work, that enables speakers to make use of and understand the literal metaphors tapping into the idea of arguments having warlike structures. Conceptual metaphor reveals patterns of human cognition, showing typical culturally determined understandings of a concept, while metaphorical linguistic expressions are ways in which these understandings are expressed linguistically.

3.2 Categorizing metaphors
Lakoff and Johnson organize metaphors in three categories, structural, ontological and orientational metaphors. The structural metaphors “enable speakers to understand target A by means of
the structure of source B”, the ontological metaphors “give an ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts” while the orientational metaphors “make a set of target concepts coherent in our conceptual system” (Kövecses 2002:33-35) and “give a concept a spatial orientation” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:14).

Structural metaphors “are grounded in systematic correlations within our experience” and “allow us […] to use one highly structured and clearly delineated concept to structure another” (ibid:61). One example of a structural metaphor is RATIONAL ARGUMENT IS WAR. Here target A, rational argument, is understood by means of source B, war. This is an example of the previously mentioned way something abstract is made readily available by means of something concrete.

Ontological metaphors are used “to comprehend events, actions, activities, and states” (ibid: 30). Events and actions are understood as objects, activities are seen as substances, and states are viewed as containers. As with the structural metaphor the ontological metaphor allows people to access abstract or complex constructions via something recognizable and simple. Objects, substances and containers are tangible and thus easily accessible, and they are also entities we recognize from our physical experiences of the world, allowing them to act as cognitive bridges to the more abstract events, actions, activities and states. Another kind of ontological metaphor are linguistic metaphorical expressions like “His theory explained to me the behavior of chickens raised in factories”, “This fact argues against the standard theories” and “Life has cheated me” (ibid:33). Here abstract constructions are personified, allowing people to “make sense of phenomena in the world in human terms – terms that we can understand on the basis of our own motivations, goals, actions and characteristics” (ibid:34).

Orientational metaphors are metaphors relating to spatial orientation, such as HAPPY IS UP; SAD IS DOWN (ibid:15). Examples of linguistic expression of such metaphors are “I’m feeling up”, “My spirits rose” and “He’s really low these days”. The authors speculate that these metaphors have come in to being based on physical experiences such as people having a drooping posture when they are sad, and reversely an erect posture when being happy. Here the body is once again viewed as the starting point of all human experience of the world and believed to form the basis of human understanding of less accessible concepts such as feelings and states of mind.

3.3 Highlighting and hiding
Highlighting and hiding are related aspects of metaphors, addressing the fact that “When a source
domain is applied to a target, only some (but not all) aspects of the target are brought into focus” (Kövecses 2002:79). Metaphor is a process of mapping meaning from the source to the target domain, and in this process it is only the aspects that are relevant for the understanding of the target that are carried over, or highlighted. One example of this is the conceptual metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS. This conceptual metaphor has numerous linguistic expressions such as “Is that the foundation for your theory?” The theory needs more support” and “The argument is shaky” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:46). These examples focus on the foundation element of buildings and the importance of a solid foundation for a functioning building. It is, however, not all aspects of buildings that can be used to access theories. Examples such as “His theory has thousands of little rooms and long, winding, corridors”, “His theories are Bauhaus in their pseudofunctional simplicity” and “He prefers massive Gothic theories covered with gargoyles” (ibid:53) are examples of elements of buildings that are not used to form metaphors of theories. Lakoff and Johnson call this the “unused part” of the THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS metaphor, whereas the recognizable linguistic expressions belong to the “used part” (ibid:51).

Theories then, are understood as having foundations just like buildings, but they are not understood as having rooms or belonging to distinct architectural genres or periods. If all parts of the target were carried over, metaphors would lose their meaning as they are in fact constructions describing one entity, which is usually abstract or complex, in terms of another, complete different usually concrete entity. Theories and buildings are not the same in our understanding of the world, which means that the THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS metaphor depends on partial mapping. We can understand theories through buildings because we only use one or a few aspects of the concept “buildings”, a full use of all aspects of buildings would only work to describe one thing – buildings.

3.4 Metaphorical systems
Metaphorical linguistic expressions belong to conceptual metaphors, and these can in turn go together to form systems. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:9) give the example of TIME IS MONEY, a conceptual metaphor that belongs in a system with TIME IS A RESOURCE and TIME IS A LIMITED COMMODITY. All three conceptual metaphors rely on an understanding of time as a limited and desirable resource, an understanding that Lakoff and Johnson underline is culturally determined as not all cultures view time this way. TIME IS MONEY is not a natural, congenital way for human beings to understand time, it is simply a product of Western societies. Metaphorical
systems are characterized by using the most specific conceptual metaphor to describe the entire system. In the case of time the most specific of the conceptual metaphors is TIME IS MONEY, making TIME IS A RESOURCE and TIME IS A LIMITED COMMODITY sub categorizations of the overall conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY. As previously mentioned different metaphorical linguistic expressions belonging to the same conceptual metaphor can highlight different aspects of the source domain. This means that metaphors may not always be consistent, but they are, according to Lakoff and Johnson, always coherent and “part of whole metaphorical systems that together serve the complex purpose of characterizing the concept of an argument in all its aspects” (ibid:105).

3.5 Metonymy
When working with metaphor it is also relevant to mention metonymy, a related, yet different construction. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:39) write that “metonymic concepts are grounded in our experience” and “Experience with physical objects provides the basis for metonymy” (ibid:59). Examples of metonymy are expressions like “I’m reading Shakespeare”, “America doesn’t want another Pearl Harbor” and “We need a better glove at third base” (Kövecses 2002:143). In all these examples one entity or thing is being used to provide access to another, Shakespeare for Shakespeare’s works, Pearl Harbor for defeat in war and glove for baseball player. At first glance this may seem just like metaphor, but an important difference between the two is that metonymy is based on contiguity while metaphor is based on similarity. This can, according to Kövecses, be tested with the “is like” test, where a metaphorical expression based on similarity will make sense with the insertion of is like between the two entities compared, a metonymy will not. He gives the examples “The creampie was knocked out in the first round of the fight”, a metaphor that makes sense when put to the “is like” test yielding the sentence “The boxer is like a creampie”, whereas the metonymy “We need a new glove to play third base” doesn’t make sense when converted into the sentence “*The third baseman is like a glove” (ibid:146). Metonymy works by association, metaphor by transfer of certain features.

Another way of viewing the difference between metonymy and metaphor could be by saying that metonymy is more literal while metaphor is more figurative. Metonymy extends the meaning of one related entity or thing to another, while metaphor takes one or more aspects of a concrete concept and applies that to an abstract concept that isn’t necessarily logically related. In an example such as “I’m reading Shakespeare” it is easy to see how the writer Shakespeare comes to
stand in for the written pieces he has authored, while a famous literary metaphor like “Juliet is the sun”, is far more figurative. Here aspects of the sun that, when understood literally, have no logical connection to a woman, are used as an expression of love. The sun is ascribed characteristics such as radiant and beautiful, and these, not strictly logical aspects, are then transferred to the object of Romeo’s affection, Juliet. The same can be said of the creampuff and glove examples, it is relatively easy to see how the glove, the instrument of the baseman, can be extended to describing his function in the game, while it is less obvious how a pastry comes to characterize a boxer.

3.6 Iconicity
Metaphorical thinking is, according to Lakoff and Johnson, not confined to metaphorical linguistic expressions such as the ones discussed so far. Conceptual metaphors also influence languages grammatically and phonetically. Iteration such as “He ran and ran and ran and ran” and “He is very very very tall” are examples of MORE OF FORM IS MORE OF CONTENT (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:127), a metaphor that shapes sentence construction on a grammatical level rather than just by appearing as metaphorical linguistic expressions. Another example of metaphorical content influencing sentence production is rising intonation in questions, a practice the authors see as evidence of the UNKNOWN IS UP metaphor in play (ibid:137). In this thesis the focus is on metaphorical linguistic expression though, and more precisely on examining how metaphorical linguistic expressions can be used to examine political discourse. This question is, as the next chapter will show, also one Lakoff and Johnson consider.

3.7 Metaphor, Reality and Power
Lakoff and Johnson explain that “The most fundamental values in a culture will be coherent with the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts in the culture” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:22) and “our values are not independent but must form a coherent system with the metaphorical concepts we live by”. Metaphors are then not just expressions used to paint picturesque descriptions; they also reveal a given culture’s values and, perhaps even more importantly, they also “play a central role in the construction of social and political reality” (ibid:159). The authors also state that “Most of our metaphors have evolved in our culture over a long period, but many are imposed upon us by people in power” (ibid:160). The question of who holds the power in a given society is of course a political and/or philosophical debate, but if the starting point that politicians and world leaders are in positions of power is accepted, that means
that political rhetoric is a good place to examine metaphors. The latter position is clearly one that Lakoff and Johnson (1980:236) accept, stating that “Political and economic ideologies are framed in metaphorical terms”. They do not advocate the view that metaphors alone shape reality or hold the key to political power, but do none the less emphasize the importance of studying metaphors when examining political rhetoric using the following words “It is reasonable enough to assume that words alone don’t change reality. But changes in our conceptual system do change what is real for us and affect how we perceive the world and act upon those perceptions” (ibid:146). It is this view on the link between metaphor and (political) reality that forms the basis of this thesis, and the area of investigation that will be laid out in the following pages.

3.7.1 Applying Metaphor Theory to Political Discourse

One study that investigates the role of metaphor in political rhetoric based on Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is Charteris-Black (2005). Here “the persuasive power of metaphor” is examined in the speeches of British and US heads-of-state and noticeable public speakers from Winston Churchill and Martin Luther King to Margaret Thatcher, Bill Clinton, Tony Blair and George Bush Sr. and Jr. with the intention of showing “how linguistic analysis provides a very clear insight into the nature of how power is gained and maintained in democracies” (Charteris-Black, 2005:xii). Charteris-Black (ibid:9) identifies persuasion, rhetoric, metaphor, ideology and myth as key concepts in his study, explaining that persuasion and rhetoric are not the same, as “rhetoric refers to the act of communication from the hearer’s perspective while persuasion refers to both speaker intentions and to successful outcomes”. The two are, however, closely linked, as the successful outcome of efficient rhetoric is, in fact, persuasion. The link between metaphor, ideology and myth is that “they share a common discourse function of persuasion and the expressive potential for cognitive and emotional engagement” (ibid:13). This focus on discourse functions and how discourse strategies can influence opinions and emotions clearly shows Charteris-Black’s discourse analytic approach as similar to that described by Wooffitt. The focus is not so much on linguistic structures within a language, as it is on language seen in relation to society. Charteris-Black sees metaphor, ideology and myth as elements of rhetoric that can be used to achieve a successful outcome of persuasion, and his interest in persuasions lies in examining how political persuasion is used to shape, create and maintain perceptions of reality. In doing so he is giving the concept of power that is crucial in Discourse Analysis a prominent place in his study, although he never uses that term. Another prominent term from Discourse Analysis that Charteris-Black
(2005:21) uses in his analysis is ideology, defining it as “a belief system through which a particular social group creates the meanings that justify its existence to itself”. Compare this to Wooffitt’s (2006:140) definition of ideology as “organized sets of beliefs which mobilize practices and viewpoints which sustain inequalities across society” and it becomes quite clear that Charteris-Black’s study of rhetoric has a lot of common ground with Discourse Analysis. In this light it makes good sense to use his studies of political rhetoric as basic for a discourse analytic examination of the Discourse of War in the CALL OF DUTY videogames, and this is what this thesis does. Rhetoric, metaphor theory and Discourse Analysis can be combined to examine and explain the dominant discourses in CALL OF DUTY, and, probably in other modern videogames as well.

Myth is another key term in Charteris-Black’s study, and one that is also relevant for Discourse Analysis. Charteris-Black (2005:22) defines myth as “a story that provides an explanation of all things for which explanations are felt to be necessary”. This definition seems to parallel the definition found in McCutcheon (2000), where it is emphasizes that myth is not simply to be understood as a kind of story as the word is often used. A myth is not something fictive or false or something belonging solely to the religious or literary sphere, but a method of constructing meaning, a technique or strategy to construct, authorize or contest social identity. I will build on this definition of myth later on in this thesis when examining a pervasive discourse in the CALL OF DUTY universe, namely the discourse of The All American Hero, suggesting that the ideals of masculinity this discourse entails can be read as a myth that is necessary to many males seeking to understand or build a gendered identity in modern Western society. Gender is in fact, according to Charteris-Black (2005:22), one of the typical topics of myths, as myths often deal with “the origins of the universe, the causes of good and evil, the origin of the elements, of male and female or anything else that is believed to be mysterious”.

Another characteristic example of a myth is the political myth. The word “myth” is here seen as an opposite to “truth”, as the political myth is a biased representation of the world and political events, staged to promote a certain viewpoint or build a positive image of a politician or political action. As Lakoff and Johnson, Charteris-Black (2005:14) views metaphor from a cognitive perspective, stating that “The discourse role of metaphor is to legitimate policies by accessing the underlying social and cultural value system”. He also sees the relationship between metaphor and cognition as a two-way influence, underlining that the study of metaphor is the study of construction of meaning, and believes that metaphors have the power to influence political reality, writing that “metaphor is caused by, and may cause, a shift in the conceptual system”
(ibid:15). The analysis of metaphor is then also the analysis of how politicians can influence a public’s beliefs and truths, which in turn constitutes political power. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980:185) “truth is always relative to a conceptual system”, and there is therefore “no fully objective, unconditional or absolute truth”. Instead there are political myths, and metaphor analysis “enables us to identify which metaphors are chosen and to explain why these metaphors are chosen by illustrating how they create political myths” (Charteris-Black 2005:28). Political myths are crucial to Charteris-Black’s analysis of political discourse, and he identifies three political myths widely employed by the British and US political leaders he investigates. The three political myths presented in Charteris-Black (2005:25) are:

1. The myth of the Conspiratorial Enemy (a hostile out-group is plotting to commit some harmful acts against an in-group)
2. The Valiant Leader myth (the political leader is benevolent and is effective in saving people from danger)
3. The United We Stand myth (a belief that a group can achieve victory by obeying and making sacrifices)

The CALL OF DUTY videogames makes use of all of these strategies in its Discourse on War, and as the later analysis will show that this discourse is similar to political discourse found in the speeches of US and British politicians. The myth of the Conspiratorial Enemy can be found in the CALL OF DUTY Discourse of Orientalism and Othering, The Valiant Leader myth can be found in The Discourse of the All American Hero and The United We Stand myth is especially frequent in the CALL OF DUTY videogames and can be found in The Discourse of Freedom and Friendship, The Discourse of the Defense of Democracy and Freedom and The Discourse of the Writing of History.

With a starting point in discourse analytic investigations of political rhetoric found in speeches in prominent Western political speakers such as Winston Churchill, Ronald Reagan, George Bush Sr. and George Bush Jr., this thesis studies the rhetoric in the CALL OF DUTY videogames with special emphasis on the way the videogames make use of metaphors to present hegemonic US values.

This chapter has introduced cognitive metaphor theory, summarizing the main elements of Lakoff and Johnson’s work on metaphors and cognition and basing metaphorical of nature, and showed how Charteris-Black (2005) has used cognitive metaphor theory to perform a discourse analytic investigation of political discourse in the speeches of Western heads of state.
4. The Discourse of War
Chapter 4 introduces discourse analytic studies of presidential rhetoric in wartimes and chapter 4.1 emphasizes on the political metaphors found in the discourse of former US president George Bush Jr. as it is presented in Charteris-Black (2005). The aim of chapter 4 is to show that political discourse can be studied using cognitive metaphor theory, as metaphors play a big role in successful political persuasion.

The greatest war of the 21st century Western world to date is without a doubt the war against terror that was launched after the terrorist attacks on September 11th, a date that has already written itself into the history of modern politics. An event of such magnitude will naturally influence the media in the influenced areas, and this thesis investigates a media that, as Quellette (2008:1) puts it, “comprises a largely unexamined form” in the study of how the terrorist attacks have influenced subsequent media. The events that took place that day, and the destruction of the Twin Towers in particular, received such a massive media attention and subsequent worldwide mention, that I believe it justified to give a very brief summary only. On the purely factual level, 9/11 was a terrorist attack on US buildings of key symbolic value. On the metaphorical level the term 9/11 has been established as a discourse encompassing nothing less than the clash of the Western and the Middle Eastern world, and an attack on Western values such as freedom, liberty and democracy. 9/11 is in fact established so firmly as a concept that the term is even used in Europe where the format of dates is reversed, as September 11th in European would be written 11/9. Furthermore the expression 9/11 is used in countries where the date of the attack, due to the time differences around the globe, was in actual September 10th or 12th. A testimony to the massive symbolic value the term has gained, and perhaps also just as much a testimony to the US significance in the international community. The 9/11 incident is embodied in the presidential rhetoric of George Bush in his presidential period from 2001-2009, especially in his many speeches concerning the US military engagement in Iraq and Afghanistan. I will go into details with Bush’ rhetoric and the parallels to the discourse of war in the CALL OF DUTY videogames, but first I will give a brief summary of studies of presidential rhetoric to show how metaphors can be used in Discourse Analysis.

Though not dealing with videogames, Campos (2007:32) offers an overview of the rhetoric of presidents and media during the offices of Nixon, Carter, Reagan, Bush Sr., Clinton and Bush Jr., stating that “each president strategically framed US responses to terrorism
within a highly specialized national security discourse”. This national security discourse is, according to Campos, one that presents terrorism as threat that necessitates reprisal and preemptive measures and “produces and legitimizes power relations that act as a field of statecraft in which security becomes a commodity within the control of the state” (ibid:2). In the wake of terrorist attacks security becomes highly sought after and desired, thus allowing states to “use terrorism to strengthen their identity and legitimacy” (ibid:90). In the case of the US, this identity is one that is bound on the US hegemony, a construction that “is colored by, and advances through, the conflation of terrorism and ideology” (ibid:83). This construction of the US hegemony is evident in both Bush’s rhetoric in statements like “the world’s most influential nation” (Bush, Nov 6, 2003) and in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2 “the most powerful military force in the history of man.” The discourse that surrounds this hegemony “frames an idealized, highly rhetorical, and ideological visualization of how Americans should view terror” (Campos 2007:5). One, quite poignant example of such a rhetoric is found in Widding (2004) where the author examines the link between Hollywood and presidential rhetoric, quoting Ronald Reagan’s “They can run, but they can’t hide” as a response to Arab terrorists hijacking a luxury liner. Widding sees Reagan’s rhetoric as a direct inspiration for George W. Bush’s post 9/11 speeches, and Campos also links modern presidential rhetoric to Reagan’s Cold War discourse, stating that “responses to terrorism initiates by President George W. Bush are a re-energizing and amplifying of past foreign policies practices” (Campos 2007:32) One of these practices, and one that is also evident in Bush’s speeches as well as in the CALL OF DUTY videogames, is that of demonization and derogation, evident in the following:

Based on President Reagan’s description of terrorists, terrorists became classified as “cowards,” “barbarians,” “insane lunatics,” and “monsters”. This vein of description did not stop with just terrorists but moved to include sponsors of terrorists as the “strangest collection of misfits, loony tunes, and squalid criminals.”
(Campos 2007:65)

Another example is the Gulf War that Widding (2004:11) characterizes as being rhetorically “short and sharp”, with a clear narrative outline, with heroic heroes and a “mustachioed villain, Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein, and evil mastermind right out of the hoariest anti-Nazi propaganda”. A similar rhetoric is found in Bush’s addresses on the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and not least in the references to the September 11 terror attacks on US ground. Reagan is, however, not the first political leader to make use of such a discourse. Winston Churchill, who, according to Charteris-Black, was a great source of inspiration for US president George W. Bush, made use of a similar rhetoric in his speeches that made him a role model for many future public speakers and
political leaders.

According to Charteris-Black (2005:34) “Churchill’s primary rhetorical objective was the creation of a heroic myth in which the actions of Hitler and Germany are represented as forces of evil” and “A hallmark of Churchill’s use of metaphor is that nation-states are conceptualized as human participants in terms of their status as heroes, villains or victims”. In other words Churchill relied heavily on personification in constructing a myth of the allies, the British and not least himself as heroic protectors and defenders against the evil Other of Hitler and Germany. The parallels found in Bush’s rhetoric are obvious, here one of the most prominent examples of personification is that of THE USA IS THE MORAL LEADER (ibid:28) and way the enemy is portrayed as an evil, soulless, terrorist Other. Charteris-Black groups Churchill’s positive personification metaphors in the following categories after their targets: Country/Political grouping (“France”, “nations”, “countries” “British nation”), Abstract concept (“destiny”, “freedom”, “justice”, “progress”, “history”), Social grouping (“we/us”, “mankind”, “motherland”), Military grouping (“British army”, “French army”, “navy”) and Ideology “Western democracies”. The same general categories can be found in Bush’s speeches where the focus is on the Western allies in the war against terror and on Western ideals of “freedom” and “democracy. It is themes like these that a Discourse Analysis paying special attention to metaphors can shed light over, and the aim of this thesis is to show that a similar approach to videogames will yield similar results as the discourses found there make use of the same metaphors as the political speeches.

4.1 Political Metaphors in The Discourse of War of Bush Jr. and Sr.
Charteris-Black (2005:71) identifies five main conceptual metaphors in George W. Bush’s rhetoric: WELL-BEING AS WEALTH, THE NATION IS A PERSON, THE NATION IS THE LEADER, THE USA IS A MORAL LEADER, HISTORY IS A PERSON and places these metaphors in a Finance and Crime and Punishment framework. Finance metaphors are defined as metaphors that “are indicated by non-literal uses of words such as price, cost, debt etc: but also include those that draw on the domain of betting”, while crime and punishment metaphors “evoke images from the Wild West in which outlaws and bandits are brought under the control of a governing authority” and “are indicated by the use of words such as “lawless”, “outlaws”, “wrongdoer” and “punish” (ibid:189). The same metaphors can be found in Bush Sr.’s speeches, though they appear more frequently in Bush Jr’s. The motivation for these metaphors is, according to Charteris-Black
(ibid:71) “the importance of commercial interests and the need to punish a “rogue” nation”.

Personifications are, as previously mentioned, frequent in Bush Jr.’s rhetoric as well as in Churchill’s, and Charteris-Black (2005:174) suggests that “we may suppose that the intensity of emotions evoked by war scenarios encourage the use of this metaphor type”. The finance and crime and punishment metaphors may be motivated by a similar concern, wars are expensive and thus necessitate a focus on commercial interests, and at the same time a war with an invisible enemy is a war that is difficult to receive support for funding too. Providing an enemy, be it a rogue nation or terrorist leader or organization, gives the enemy a face making it easier to explain the need for further funding. Charteris-Black (2005:196) suggests that this discourse is one that “is deeply rooted in American cultural values and can be drawn on when political conditions create fertile ground for such myths to flourish”. By drawing on the Wild West myth Bush’s rhetoric makes use of a historical narrative of justice and righteousness to “establish the ethical legitimacy of America’s foreign policy” (ibid:190).

This analysis of Bush Jr.’s rhetoric goes well in hand with an analysis of Bush Sr.’s Gulf War rhetoric by George Lakoff (1991) where Lakoff describes the key elements of Bush Sr.’s war rhetoric as The State-as-Person System, The Fairy Tale of the Just War, The Ruler-for-State Metonymy and The Casual Commerce System.

The State-as-Person system entails the use of metaphors that serve to conceptualize the state “as a person, engaging in social relations within a world community. Its land-mass is its home. It lives in a neighborhood, and has neighbors, friends and enemies” (Lakoff 1991:3) The well-being is wealth metaphor is employed here as well, as a state’s health is measured in terms of its economical situation. A threat to a state’s economy is thus a threat to its survival, necessitating war if a lifeline, such as an oil supply, is at jeopardy. Military strength makes up a state’s strength, and “Since it is in the interest of every person to be as strong and healthy as possible, a rational state seeks to maximize wealth and military might” (ibid:3).

The Fairy Tale of the Just War is a Western discourse used to justify war efforts between personified nations. It features a villain, a victim and a hero, and the two latter may be one and the same. The discourse follows a classical fairy tale narrative with the villain committing some sort of crime against the innocent victim, prompting the hero to action. The hero either gathers helpers or goes into combat alone, setting out on an epic journey overcoming adversity before defeating the villain in glorious and righteous combat. Lakoff (1991:4) stresses that this fairy tale
myth has “an asymmetry built into it”. The hero is moral, courageous and rational, whereas the villain is amoral, vicious and cannot be reasoned with, leaving the hero with no other choice but combat. As a result of this “The enemy-as-demon metaphor arises as a consequence of the fact that we understand what a just war is in terms of this fairy tale” (ibid:4). The construction of the enemy Other as inhuman that is evident in both Bush Jr. and Sr. and Churchill’s rhetoric is then, according to Lakoff, a result of the use of The Fairy Tale of the Just War.

The Ruler-for-State Metonymy combines The State-as-Person metaphor with a LEADER FOR STATE metonymy, extending a state leader to represent the state itself, as in “We have to get Saddam out of Kuwait” (ibid:5) Lakoff notes that this only applies to leaders perceived as “illegitimate rulers”, stating that a metonymic expression as “George Bush marched into Kuwait” would not be likely.

Lakoff (1991:5) describes The Casual Commerce System as “a way to comprehend actions intended to achieve positive effects, but which may also have negative effect”. It consists of three metaphors, Casual Transfer, The Exchange Metaphor for Value and Well-being is Wealth. Casual transfer “turns purposeful actions into transfers of objects”, like sanctions “giving” Iraq economic difficulties, The Exchange Metaphor for Value is “The value of something is what you are willing to exchange for it” (ibid:5) and the Well-being is Wealth is “Things of value constitute wealth” (ibid:6). The result of the use of The Casual Commerce System is that war efforts are seen as “commercial transactions with costs and gains”. (ibid:9). This in turn leads to a International Politics is Business metaphorical view on the world, which open up for the acceptance of a War is Politics, pursued by other means metaphor, a metaphor that, according to Lakoff, was defining for the whole public Gulf War discourse.

The discourses of prominent Western politicians, then, have a lot of common traits. War is presented metaphorically in an attempt to constitute a discourse that presents the wars as well as the political leaders in charge as good and just, while the enemy is demonized and dehumanized. The motivation for doing so is obvious, to win support among the population and be able to continue in office a political leader needs to appear as “the good guy” doing “the right thing”, and it is a lot easier to gain support for a war that basically means the taking of enemy lives, if that enemy is considered evil and inhuman. Metaphors provide a powerful means of painting such pictures, presenting recognizable myths and tales as truths.

Chapter 4 has presented discourse analytic studies of presidential rhetoric in
wartimes and described the political metaphors found in the discourse of former US president George Bush Jr. as it is presented in Charteris-Black (2005), showing that Bush Jr.’s rhetoric is a discourse influenced by rhetoric drawn from both Churchill and Bush Sr., and that metaphors play an important part of political persuasion. Political persuasion is, however, not just played out in political speeches. It is all around in daily discourses, and this thesis now turns to videogames to show that the rhetorical strategies described above can also be found in the CALL OF DUTY discourses.

5. The Discourse of War in CALL OF DUTY
This chapter presents a discourse analytic study of the Discourse of War found in CALL OF DUTY. Chapter 5.1 introduces the concept of a Discourse of Empire, a discourse designed to persuade the public to support the war efforts that help the empire uphold its power on the international political stage. Chapters 5.2-5.6 describe each of the 5 main sub discourses of the Discourse of War in CALL OF DUTY, showing how metaphors play a crucial role in these discourses.

The Discourse of War in CALL OF DUTY is remarkably similar to that of former US president George W. Bush as presented in his speeches after 9/11. The videogames not only make use of the same discourse features such as metaphor, ideology and myth, but also make use of the same features in the same way to an extend where the language seems to mirror that of Bush’ so precisely it could have been copied. For political leaders, speeches are the vehicle delivering their discourse, but in the videogames the channel of communication that gives the most data for Discourse Analysis is the cut scenes. The cut scenes in the videogames are introductions to missions in the game, and serve the narrative function of presenting the game story to the player in manageable portions. They are presented as briefings with a map zooming in on the target location for the coming mission, and are narrated by key game characters presenting or discussing the mission. Gish (2010:170) describes cut scenes in the CALL OF DUTY videogames as scenes that “simultaneously provide the player with a spatio-temporal localization for the coming military encounter, and a personalization of the conflict’s stakes and meanings”.

Some briefings feature short snippets of dialogue between two or more characters, but the main part, and the most interesting in examining political rhetorical strategies, are monologues delivered by the game character Shepherd, and these monologues bear a striking resemblance to the rhetoric found in Bush’ political discourse. The table below shows a number of instances where speech from CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2, delivered by the character Shepherd, seems to
come straight out of one of Bush’s speeches during his first terms as president.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Shepherd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“the world’s most influential nation” (Nov 6, 2003)</td>
<td>“the most powerful military force in the history of man”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“some of the attackers […] fight in the shadows” (Sep 7, 2003)</td>
<td>“there’s an evil man hiding in these shadows”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the true monuments of Saddam Hussein’s rule have been brought to light” (Jul 1, 2003)</td>
<td>“we’re gonna bring him into the light”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“coalition forces will make every effort to spare innocent civilians from harm” (Mar 19, 2003)</td>
<td>“we don’t kill civilians. We use precision”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“we will pass through this time of peril” (Mar 19, 2003) “we will not be distracted, and we will prevail” (Jul 1, 2003)</td>
<td>“it’s been a tough week gentlemen. We’ve lost more than we ever dreamed. But we will recover”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“war has no certainty, except the certainty of sacrifice” (Mar 17, 2003)</td>
<td>“there will be casualties”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“evil men plot chemical biological and nuclear terror” (Mar 17, 2003)</td>
<td>“there’s an evil man”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the war on terror would be a lengthy way, a different kind of war fought on many fronts in many places” (Sep 7. 2003) and “in this new kind of war, civilians find themselves suddenly on the front lines” (Mar 19, 2004) “These enemies view the entire world as a battlefield, and we must pursue them wherever they are” (Sep 11, 2002)</td>
<td>“yesterday you were a soldier on the front lines. But today front lines are history. Uniforms are relics, The war rages everywhere”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“this is a massive and difficult undertaking -- it is worth our effort, it is worth our sacrifice, because we know the stakes” (Nov 6 2003)</td>
<td>“It will cost you a piece of yourself. It will cost nothing compared to everything you’ll save”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why these similarities? It is of course possible that the creators of the CALL OF DUTY videogames have studied Bush’ speeches and decided to mimic these in an attempt to create a recognizable discourse, but it is more likely that the likenesses shown above stem from the power of metaphors. Charteris-Black (2005:xi) writes that “Metaphor is a highly effective rhetorical strategy for
combining our understanding of familiar experiences in everyday life with deep-rooted cultural values that evoke powerful emotional responses”. This is most likely the link between political speeches and videogames, the desire to touch the feelings of the audience by drawing on shared cultural values. In the case of politicians the potential gain of a successful attempt to prompt an emotional investment is votes that will secure the politician another period of office, in the case of videogames an emotional investment is most of all a matter of the level of immersion the player can be expected to achieve. In the CALL OF DUTY videogames the metaphorical expressions listed above come together to form a Discourse of Empire consisting of five main discourses. Chapter 5.1 explains the term Discourse of Empire, and chapters 5.1-5.6 treat each of the five main discourses in detail.

5.1 The Discourse of Empire
The Discourse of War found in the CALL OF DUTY videogames as well as in the political speeches of former US president George Bush Jr. is part of a discourse that I, inspired by Dyer-Witherford and Peuter (2009), would like to label the Discourse of Empire. The empire in question is the hegemonic US super power. Höglund (2008:2) writes that “claims have been made both by the critical left and by the approving, neoconservative right that America, in fact, constitutes an empire”, and it is this belief that forms the basis of my classification of the language in CALL OF DUTY as a discourse of empire. Dyer-Witherford and Peuter (2009:116) state that “Maintaining an imperial populace’s will to fight is as important as battlefield dominance”, and the spread of a Discourse of Empire is one way of achieving this goal. If the empire can manage to instill its citizens and allies with a sense of duty obliging them to continue the war efforts, it can maintain its status and power. This is done by glorifying the ongoing war and presenting the world with an image of the empire as the just and right defender of key values shared by citizens and allies.

In CALL OF DUTY this is done through the use of metaphors and discourses drawing on Charteris-Black’s three political myths to present the US war efforts in the war against terror as right and just and in the interest of all free and democratic nations. The Discourse of Empire prevalent in the CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WAREFARE videogames, is one of US hegemonic core values that are also found in the post 9/11 US presidential rhetoric as it was presented by President George W. Bush in the months and years after the terrorist attacks on September 11th, 2001. In both CALL OF DUTY videogames the Discourse of Empire is constructed through the use of the following five sub discourses:
The Discourse of Freedom and Friendship
The Discourse of Orientalism and Othering
The Discourse of Defense of Democracy and Civilization
The Discourse of the Writing of History
The Discourse of the All American Hero

I will look at each of these discourses as they are played out in both the post 9/11 presidential rhetoric and the CALL OF DUTY videogames, with extra attention to metaphors as all of these discourses are expressed metaphorically.

5.2 The Discourse of Friendship and Freedom
One key figure of speech that runs through the discourse of both the CALL OF DUTY videogames and Bush’s rhetoric throughout his presidential career is that of metaphors of friendship. One example of this the “We take care of our friends” from CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE. It is voiced by the game character Captain Price, who later reemerges as one of the characters involved in the narrative in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2, and as the principal speaker in the cut scenes after Shepherd. The term friend(s) is also used very liberally in Bush’s speeches, sometimes alone, sometimes along with the term allies as the examples below show.

“I recognize that not all of our friends agreed with our decision to enforce the Security Council before committing troops to Iraq” (Sep 7, 2003)“We will hunt them by day and by night in every corner of the world until they are no longer a threat to America and our friends” (Jul 1, 2003)“I want to thank our friends from Poland” (Jun 5, 2003)“I want to thank the Amir of Qatar, with whom I just met, for his hospitality and for his friendship to the United States of America” (Jun 5, 2003)“Qatar, the host of CENTCOM, a great friend to the United States” (Jun 5, 2003)“Our friends in Bahrain and the UAE” (Jun 5, 2003)“The United States and our friends and allies will first take care of the Iraqi citizens” (Jun 5, 2003)“Because of you, America and our friends and allies, those of us who love freedom are now more secure” (Jun 5, 2003)“The people of the United States and our friends and allies” (Mar 19, 2003)“The regime […] has a deep hatred for America and our friends” (Mar 17, 2003)“America is a friend to the people of Iraq” (Oct 7, 2002)“Together with our friends and allies from Europe to Asia, and Africa to Latin America” (Jan 29, 2002)“America has no truer friend than Great Britain […] Thank you for coming, friend” (Sep 20, 2001)“The enemy of America is not our many Muslim friends; it is not our many Arab friends” (Sep 20, 2001)“There have been disagreements in this matter, among old and valued friends” (Mar 19, 2004)

The use of the term friend(s) is metaphorical in the sense that it is a term describing relations between humans, transferred to describe relations between nations and organizations. An example of this is the Bush, Mar 17, 2003 speech, where Bush says “The regime […] has a deep hatred for
America and our friends”. Here we find that “America” is personified by virtue of the transfer of meaning. The coordinating conjunction “and” equals “America” and “friends”, attributing layers of meaning from “friends” to “America”. A similar juxtaposition is invoked by the contradistinction between “The regime” and “America” where “The Regime”, by virtue of agency, is linked to the negative emotion of hatred, while “America” is linked to the positive connotations of the words “friends” and “friendship”. These metaphors serve both as a personification fitting the United We Stand political myth and the Appeal for uniting legitimization strategy as well as emphasizing the social grouping that is also found in Churchill’s speeches, establishing an “us” of the US and its European allies, a rhetorical device Charteris-Black describes as journey metaphors.

Journey metaphors are frequent in Charteris-Black’s (2005:49) Churchill speech corpus. He theorizes that they “show evidence of an underlying concept BRITAIN AND THE USA ARE TRAVELLING COMPANIONS” to encourage and commit the US to enter the war in order to rescue its “travelling companion”. Whether this is the case or not is of course up to debate, but it is worth considering the fact that Bush’s speeches are filled with the same type of metaphors. One might suspect that the US president, finding himself in a situation mirroring that of the British state leader during the Second World War, chooses a similar rhetorical strategy to achieve the same goal. In the days following the 9/11 incident it was the US that suddenly found itself at war, seeking the help of the UK as one of, if not the most, powerful European ally whose support in the war efforts was vital to the US.

The freedom to choose to fight, is a recurrent theme in Bush’s speeches as well, seen for instance in his Mar 17, 2003 address “This is the future we chose”, and it can be found in CALL OF DUTY as well. In one of the last cut scenes of CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2, Price has quite a long monologue about the hopelessness of the player’s mission to track and kill Shepherd. Price states that knowing that the mission is a suicide mission is “a luxury, not a curse”, and “a kind of freedom”, and continues in an almost poetical soliloquy, saying that:

the sand and rocks here, stained with thousands of year of warfare… They will remember us. For this.
Because out of all our vast arrays of nightmares, this is the one we choose for ourselves.

This freedom of choice metaphors taps into a larger freedom metaphor that is tied up to the construction of national identity of the US as the land of the brave and the free, a construction that Bush relies on quite heavily in his post 9/11 speeches. One of them, his September 20th 2001 speech, is particularly interesting in this respect. It was given only a little over a week after the terrorist attacks on US ground, and in this speech Bush states that the reason for the attacks was in
fact the US freedom. “They hate our freedoms – our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other” (20 Sep, 2001) Bush declared, thus framing the terrorist attack as one born of jealousy as well as presenting freedom as a fundamental US virtue.

The Discourse of Friendship and Freedom draws on what Charteris-Black as previously mentioned calls The United We Stand Myth. It is a construction of a discourse where the good and righteous, by virtue of their very nature, chose to ally and face the enemy Other.

5.3 The Discourse of Orientalism and Othering
One way of constructing a discourse of an enemy Other or building a myth of a “Conspiratorial Enemy” as Charteris-Black labels it, is through Orientalism. The term Orientalism is in this context to be understood as a practice where the media in Western cultures paints an image of “the developed West and the underdeveloped East” (Mora 2009: 423). This postcolonial discourse is left uncontested, and given life to breed and spread throughout the Western media and mindset. “Television, films, and all facilities of the media force the information to shape into molds which are increasingly becoming uniform” (Ibid:423)

One interesting example of Orientalism in videogames can be found in the strategy game Civilisation 4. The game frames the West as progressive, democratic and desirable using a simple scheme of association, where concepts fitting the western ideals are attributed to the western game characters, while eastern characters are associated with ideals westerners “know” from orientalist images of the east as exotic, uncivilized and mystic. The figure below shows an overview of the traits associated with selected nation leaders, namely the American, Arabian and Chinese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civilization</th>
<th>Unique Unit</th>
<th>Unique Building</th>
<th>Starting Techs</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Original Traits</th>
<th>Favorite Civic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>Navy SEAL</td>
<td>Mall</td>
<td>Fishing Agriculture</td>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>Expansive Charismatic</td>
<td>Financial Organized</td>
<td>Free Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt</td>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>Arabia</td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrious Organized</td>
<td>Philosophical Charismatic</td>
<td>Camel Archer</td>
<td>Cho-Ku-Nu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Madrassa</td>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercantilism</td>
<td>Emancipation</td>
<td>Mysticism</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Wheel</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saladin</td>
<td>Mao Zedong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expansive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theocracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice how the US leaders are Expansive, Charismatic, Industrious, Organized and Philosophical, and associated with Free Speech, Mercantilism and Emancipation, key ideals in the present US society and foreign and domestic politics, while the Chinese leaders are Expansive, Protective and Industrious, and associated with State Property and Bureaucracy. The American unique unit is the Navy SEAL, the Arabic equivalent is a Camel Archer. Though both personnel types are historic, their connotations are quite different. The Navy SEAL only date back to the 60s and thus have no association with the American presidents portrayed in the game, and they still exist today as a highly specialized, highly idolized military unit. The Camel Archers are associated with the crusades and Saladin, the 11th century Islamic military commander, and the difference in framing between the two is quite apparent. The American unit conceptualizes progress, modern
warfare and skilled individuals, while the Arabian unit taps into an orientalist discourse set a thousand years back, as if no significant changes have occurred in the Arabic countries since the crusades.

Closer even to the CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE videogames, is, perhaps, Höglund’s (2008) study of Orientalism in the military shooter. This study examines “how a set of military computer games set in the Middle East construct this location within its game space” (Höglund 2008:1). According to Höglund the military videogames rely heavily on misrepresentations of the Middle East, rendering the population a terrorist enemy Other, and “the gamer involved in a military shooter set in the Middle East is forever performing this strategic containment of the Other” (ibid:9) A possible reason for doing this, is explored by Quellette who states that in times of crisis culture is often aggressively deployed to differentiate the nation from its rivals; “us” from “them” (Quellette 2008:9)

In the CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE videogames, one notable element of Orientalism is in the use of accents signaling language proficiency, and, on a deeper level, intelligence as heavy accents invoke conceptions of capability and skill. The Russian helpers Nikolaj and Kamarov speak English with a heavy Russian accent, whereas the Western soldiers seem to speak Russian fluently. This taps into a common popular media (mis)representation of foreigners who are often depicted with accents, whereas the Western, often American characters have native-like proficiency in foreign languages. It is possible to argue that the use of Russian accent is really a tribute to linguistic diversity and a way of positively signaling nationality, representing more than just standard English language varieties, but on the other hand the most obvious way of showing that the Russians are Russian would be to simple let them speak Russian and add subtitles instead.

The use of accents is, however, a small detail compared to another, even more prevalent and efficient form of Othering taking place in this post 9/11 discourse, namely that of framing the terrorists as inhuman, moving from an Orientalism focusing on the national and racial to a postmodern construction emphasizing the humane and ideological instead. The enemy of the modern day West is not contained to a single nationality, but instead a diffuse Other who can be found in any country in the world, and although the political rhetoric in many Western media focus heavily on Islam when portraying the war on terror, an outright singling out of Muslims as the Other would be too dangerous, leaving the terror discourse with little choice but to accept a new nameless, faceless enemy distinguished instead by a lack of humanity rather than by a specific
ethnic or religious affiliation.

Bush’s speeches and the discourse in the CALL OF DUTY videogames share linguistic representations of the terrorist enemy. Mral (2006) examines the rhetorical strategies used in the war on terror, looking at the image of the enemy portrayed. According to her, the post 9/11 discourse on the war of terror marks a shift in enemy rhetoric “from depicting an entire people as cruel and inferior to describing the leaders in satanic terms” (Mral 2006:49). Similarly Campos analyses the American Cold War presidential discourse as “an international system through which politics were constituted as a clear binary of “us” versus “them” – process that created the Soviet Union as a demonized other” (Campos 2007:14), and states that “in order to protect the state, terrorists and their actions must be relegated to the status of the barbaric and uncivilized” (ibid:39).

Bush’s speeches are also ripe with examples of this rhetoric. Saddam Hussein in particularly is demonized, but also Al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden and terrorist leaders in general are portrayed as pure evil as the following list shows.

“Saudi authorities have also uncovered terrorist operations in the holy city of Mecca, demonstrating once again that the terrorists hold nothing sacred and have no home in any religion” (Jul 1, 2003) “In this conflict, America faces an enemy who has no regard for conventions of war or rules of morality” (Mar 19, 2003) “The lawless men who rule your country” (Mar 17, 2003) “We will not be intimidated by thugs and killers” (Mar 19, 2003) “Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction are controlled by a murderous tyrant” (Oct 7, 2002) “Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator who is addicted to weapon of mass destruction” (Oct 7, 2002) “We value every life, our enemies value none” (Sep 11, 2002) “There are still violent thugs and murderers in Iraq, and we’re dealing with them” (Mar 19, 2004)

In CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2, the demonization of the main antagonist, Makarov, a Soviet terrorist, is just as prevalent. In one of the briefings designed to give the gamers a chance to prepare for the upcoming gameplay as well as to treating them to a bit of storytelling, Shepherd describes Makarov with demonizing terms of lawlessness and lack of honor similar to that found in Bush’s speeches.

Shepherd: This man Makarov is fighting his own war and he has no rules. No boundaries. He doesn’t flinch at torture, human trafficking or genocide. He’s not loyal to a flag or a country or any set of ideals. He trades blood for money.

Makarov is in short an evil man, a discursive framing that is mirrored in Bush’s rhetoric concerning terrorists. In a March 2003 address, Bush speaks of “evil men plot chemical biological and nuclear terror” (Mar 17, 2003), a practice that Campos (2007:99) describes with the words “The prospect of terrorists as “inhumane” individuals has been magnified in the way the actor, the terrorist, is
portrayed through US presidential rhetoric”. Makarov is similarly described with the words “there’s an evil man”, a plain and clear-cut Othering and paralleling to real life terrorists and enemies such as the “axis of evil” regimes North Korea, Iran and Iraq, all linked together “by that vague but alarming word “evil”’” (Mral 2006:48) This rhetorical strategy, termed “the “evil” theme” by Mral, is a form of demonization rendering the enemy satanic, a powerful strategy in a country where Christianity plays a great role in the population’s everyday life. This representation of terrorists and terrorist leaders in particular, is, according to Mral (2006:50), a part of a discursive practice justifying the war on terror, as the depiction of terrorists “as existentially evil”, creates a space where “it becomes fully legitimate to destroy the enemy using all available means”. The emphasis on religious discourse comes into play again here, and as described in the chapter on Churchill’s use of light and dark metaphors this can be seen as justifying war efforts and establishing a Valiant Leader myth. Another notable exchange concerning Makarov takes place in one of the game’s first missions with the words:

PFC Allen: So Makarov is the prize.
Shepherd: Makarov’s no prize. He’s a whore. A mad-dog killer for the highest bidder.

In Shepherds short reply he managed to frame a whole load of negative impressions of Makarov. First of all we are told that Makarov is a hired crook, a villain who works for money rather than ideals. This is about as low as you can get on the villain scale, and the starkest possible contrast to the US values of fighting and dying for freedom and democracy. Makarov is a mad-dog and a whore, two extremely derogative terms, and even the concept of him being “a prize” is too positive. Interestingly the term mad-dog is also found in Reagan’s presidential rhetoric. In a speech in 1986 President Reagan labels Libya’s Mu’ammar Gaddafi “this mad dog of the Middle East” (Campos 2007:59) Denoting Makarov as “the price” further dehumanizes him, drawing on metaphors of trophy winning and hunting. Metaphors of hunting are, according to Mral, another strategy employed to demonize the enemy as well as justify the war against terror. She writes that

In war, the hunting metaphor is a worthwhile one in order to degrade and dehumanize the opponent.
But hunting is also an accepted pastime, perhaps even a necessity in order to limit damage to land and property.
(Mral 2006:58)

The use of the hunting metaphor is thus not only an instrument of dehumanization, it also serves as a justification of the ongoing US war efforts, providing a framing that necessitates the war on terror as a means of defending the homeland, a discourse that permeates the post 9/11 discourse to such an extent that there is little surprising in the fact that it has reached all the way into the videogame
world as well.

This Othering of the enemy is an example of what Charteris-Black calls the myth of the Conspiratorial Enemy, and as chapter 4 has already shown this type of discourse is very common in the Discourse of War. The more an enemy is dehumanized the less a political leader or war faring nation has to worry about its public turning against it as the US experienced during the Vietnam war were the civilian casualties became too much for the US population to bear. Othering minimizes the risk of this happening, and helps to further legitimize a Discourse of Empire representing the war as a necessity and itself as the last defense against an enemy that must be stopped at all costs.

5.4 The Discourse of Defense of Democracy and Civilisation

One of the metaphors found in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2 is the following

Shepherd: It will cost you a piece of yourself. It will cost nothing compared to everything you’ll save.

This is particularly interesting because of its fragmented nature. What exactly is it that the player will save? An obvious guess as this is a game of conflict and terrorism would be human lives, but if that is the case a far more appropriate expression would be “compared to everyone you’ll save”. It is possible that the sentence is just a result of a rhetorical device of reference. As “a piece of yourself” is a thing, rather than a person, it is possible that the writers have chosen “everything” to keep a direct link to the previous statement. It is, however, also possible, that the implications of this sentence reaches beyond human lives that may be lost, borrowing a deeper meaning that is unfolded in several of Bush’s speeches. In his speech on Sep 20, 2001, Bush, addressing the 9/11 incidents, says “This is not, however, just America’s fight. And what is at stake is not just America’s freedom. This is the world’s fight. This is civilizations’ fight”. Bush is thus implying that the attack on America is an attack on democracy and civilization itself, a theme that keeps recurring in his many speeches in the years to come following the attack. The war on terror is cast as a defense of civilization, democracy and freedom rather than a personal vengeance the victim of an assault that came as a complete surprise. The metaphor found in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2 can also be seen as an instance of the United We Stand myth, emphasizing the necessity of sacrificing in order to achieve victory. One of Churchill’s most famous, albeit often misquoted statements, is the lines “Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few” (Churchill 1940). Shepherd’s “It will cost you a piece of yourself” can be seen as a parallel to these famous lines, establishing the player as one of the new few the Western world will owe it’s
peace and wellbeing to, and framing the entire discourse of CALL OF DUTY as a discourse of the righteous allied defenders of democracy and civilization by invoking memories of the allied British and US forces teaming up against the evil Nazis through the use of the United We Stand myth and the parallel to Churchill’s speech.

The discourse of defending civilization also touches on the previously mentioned discourse of national security, emphasizing the necessity for action and the threat to homeland security and the civilian, US citizen, thus working as a tool in the grander scheme of legitimizing the US war efforts. Bush’s post 9/11 speeches contain statements as “the war on terror would be a lengthy way, a different kind of war fought on many fronts in many places” (Sep 7, 2003), “These enemies view the entire world as a battlefield, and we must pursue them wherever they are” (Sep 11, 2002) and “in this new kind of war, civilians find themselves suddenly on the front lines” (Mar 19, 2004). These quotes are centered on establishing the war on terror as a new form of war independent of previous wars’ clearly established front lines and battle zones, one of the key arguments for entering Iraq in 2003. A similar rhetoric can be found in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2, in the statement “yesterday you were a soldier on the front lines. But today front lines are history. Uniforms are relics, the war rages everywhere”. Here, as in Bush’s speeches, the emphasis is on the novelty of terrorist warfare and the need to bring the war to all corners of the world.

Along with the discourse of bringing the war to the terrorist in order to defend civilization, comes a perhaps even touchier subject, the discourse of killing. Wars have victims, and in the case of the war against terror this has proved a problem as some of these victims have been civilians, leading to allegations of the US army being irresponsible, reckless and even bloodthirsty. Civilian casualties are a sore spot in modern warfare. In the “wikileaks cases” from 2010, where classified documents from the Afghan and Iraq war were disclosed to the public, the number of civilian casualties in both wars was one of the key issues and criticisms, and in the case of the Vietnam war the media coverage of civilian casualties by US hands is widely considered one of the main reasons the US public opposition against the war efforts grew so strong the US military involvement was ended. Bush took up the subject of civilian casualties in a March 2003 speech, ensuring the American population and voters as well as the international community and allies, that “coalition forces will make every effort to spare innocent civilians from harm” (Mar 19, 2003). It is worth to take extra note of the term “innocent civilians” here, as it is a somewhat unusual construction. In traditional warfare this would be a pleonasm as civilians are already considered
innocent and outside of any justified military course of action. This was, however, a problematic construction in many of the conflicts that took place as a direct result of the war on terror, as the US army more than once found itself with civilian casualties on its hands due to technical or human imprecision or quite simple the impossibility of distinguishing between friend and foe when fighting a war where “uniforms are relics”. The term “innocent civilians” coins a new perception of reality where any civilian is a potential terrorist enemy, and only the innocent, non-terrorist civilians are regrettable loses.

In CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2, the gamer is ensured that “we don’t kill civilians. We use precision”. In-game this statement is a comment to the terrorist enemy who has launched several attacks with civilian loses as a result, and serves to further frame the gamer, who has taken the role of an anti-terrorist squad soldier, as a hero and crusader of justice and democracy. The difference in rhetoric between Bush’s speeches and CALL OF DUTY here is perhaps a question of perspective. Bush speaks on behalf of a war faring nation and the entire coalition forces, whereas Sheperd speaks as the leader of a small team in a game played from a first person perspective. Missiles and bombers may miss a terrorist hideout and hit a nearby school or hospital, but in CALL OF DUTY the lines between civilian and terrorist are clear cut and easy to navigate, further promoting the ideal of the Western hero soldier killing all the bad guys while saving all the good guys who wisely keep their distance and never get in the way of the gunfire.

Another, perhaps more subtle framing of acceptable loses in warfare is the fact that several of the playable characters in both CALL OF DUTY videogames die. In the first installment the player controlled characters Yasir Al-Fulani and Sergeant Paul Jackson are both killed, and in the second the player controls three characters who die, Private Allen, Satl and Roach. It should be noted that these character deaths are unavoidable, they are not a part of the gameplay depending on the gamers' skill level, but a scripted part of the game, and the characters will thus die regardless of the gamers’ actions in the game. As the CALL OF DUTY videogames are First Person Shooters this means that the gamers literally see their virtual selves die on the screen, and it is possible that this is a part of a larger discourse designed to ready the population for both civilian and military casualties as a result of the war on terror, and perhaps also to tap into the fear of death and terrorist attacks that became a part of everyday, civilian lives for many westerners in the days and years following the 9/11 events.

5.5 The Discourse of the Writing of History
The writing of history is another prominent discourse in CALL OF DUTY. In one of the first missions in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2, Shepherd declares that “History is written by the victors”. Later, when the player is closing in on Makarov, the terrorist leader, Shepherd is giving a blank check to capture Makarov with any means necessary, and briefs the team with the following pep talk:

  Shepherd: There’s an evil man hiding in these shadows and we’re gonna bring him into the light. Once his face is revealed, we will write history, gentlemen.

Shepherd is later revealed to be a traitor, and from then on the briefings are voiced by the game characters Price and MacTavish. Price, echoing Shepherd in a briefing as the player sets out to kill the traitor, says:

  Price: This is for the record. History is written by the victor. History is filled with liars. If he lives and we die, his truth becomes written and ours is lost.

The underlying metaphor in this statement, that history is not a mere recording of events that have taken place, but a sight for contesting truths, is also present in a very prominent speech from Bush, namely his Address to the Nation on September 20\(^{th}\), 2001, less than two weeks after the 9/11 incident. In this speech Bush names al Qaeda as the perpetrators of the terrorist attack 11 days earlier, stating that they hate America for being a free country, standing in the way of their plans to spread their fundamentalist regimes worldwide, saying:

  We are not deceived by their pretenses to piety. We have seen their kind before. They are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20\(^{th}\) century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions -- by abandoning every value except the will to power -- they follow in the path of fascism, and Nazism, and totalitarianism. And they will follow that path all the way, to where it ends: in history’s unmarked grave of discarded lies

  The enemy attempts at writing a history of the West as offenders is thus brushed aside, freeing up the scene for staging the US history writing as the truth. One way this is done is by drawing on already established history writings of the US as the defenders and crusaders of liberty, democracy and justice.

  In Bush’s Address at the 20\(^{th}\) Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy November 6\(^{th}\), 2003, Bush mentions a speech Reagan gave at Westminster Palace in 1982.

  The roots of our democracy can be traced to England, and to its Parliament -- and so can the roots of this organization. In June of 1982, President Ronald Reagan spoke at Westminster Palace and declared, the turning point had arrived in history. He argued that Soviet communism had failed, precisely because it did not respect its own people -- their creativity, their genius and their rights. President Reagan said that the day of Soviet tyranny was passing, that freedom had a momentum which would not be
halted. He gave this organization its mandate: to add to the momentum of freedom across the world. Your mandate was important 20 years ago; it is equally important today. A number of critics were dismissive of that speech by the President. According to one editorial of the time, “it seems hard to be a sophisticated European and also an admirer of Ronald Reagan.” Some observers on both sides of the Atlantic pronounced the speech simplistic and naïve, and even dangerous. In fact, Ronald Reagan’s words were courageous and optimistic and entirely correct. As the 20th century ended, there were around 120 democracies in the world -- and I can assure you more are on the way. Ronald Reagan would be pleased, and he would not be surprised.

The main themes in this extract are freedom and democracy, themes that are pivotal throughout Bush’s speeches. What is especially interesting here is the way Bush makes an indirect comparison between himself and Reagan, thus mirroring the connecting Widdings makes between the two presidents. As Reagan, Bush has been accused of being simplistic, naïve and dangerous in his rhetoric, and as Reagan Bush’s critics span both sides of the Atlantic. By drawing attention to these similarities, Bush attempts to establish a very powerful ethos, linking himself to Reagan, and Reagan to the spread of democracy. The latter is done through references to history, a quite ironic strategy as the history Bush refers to is indeed one written by the winners. Bush declares that:

The sacrifices of Americans have not always been recognized or appreciated, yet they have been worthwhile. Because we and our allies were steadfast, Germany and Japan are democratic nations that no longer threaten the world. A global nuclear standoff with the Soviet Union ended peacefully -- as did the Soviet Union.

In this short statement Bush frames two of the greatest military conflicts in modern, Western history, the Second World War and the Cold War, invoking existing schematics of the US as the heroes and victors and saviors of the West and the world. The history of these two wars is a history of the US as proponents of democracy and freedom, and as a safeguard against oppressing isms. This rhetoric strategy of framing the US as the good guys in a history repeating itself, is also apparent in Bush’s speech on Sep 7, 2003, where he states that: “Since America put out the fires of September the 11th, and mourned our dead, and went to war, history has taken a different turn.” The US is portrayed as an active force capable of creating history, writing the current war efforts into a desirable historic truth. Bush bends this in neon in his Oct 7, 2002 speech, in saying “this nation, in world war and in Cold War, has never permitted the brutal and the lawless to set history’s course.”

Another interesting aspect of history is its use as authentification in videogames, forming a cycle where videogames are authenticated by westerly biased history while acting as proponents of a discourse that writes current history with a Western bias. Gish (2010:169) states that “The Call of Duty franchise emphatically proclaims the historical fidelity of its individual
titles by referencing consultations with veterans and historians during the games’ closing credit sequences.” This practice can be interpreted as a mode of persuasion, a rhetorical device designed to appeal to the audience. The modes of persuasion date back to Aristotle’s Ars Rhetorica, and have survived the test of time, still appearing today in both educational as well as business settings. One present day area where the modes of persuasion are still used on a daily basis is in advertisement, and it seems doubly fitting to refer to this here when examining videogames that not only employ methods from advertising, but also function as advertisement themselves. The classic modes of persuasion are Logos, Ethos and Pathos (Hansen et al. 2001)

*Logos* is persuasion by means of appealing to reason and sense. Use of facts, data and numbers are ways to utilize logos to add weight to one’s arguments. This does not, however, mean that logos advertisements are always reasonable and sensible, or even that they are in any way true. In advertisement logos is independent of truth, an advertisement claiming that a product has 90% more users and is 3 times more efficient than a competing product is using logos regardless of whether or not the numbers are actually true.

*Ethos* is persuasion by means of a person’s credibility and reputation. In advertising the concept ”person” covers not only people but also companies and organizations, and a classical example of ethos advertisement is a commercial in which a famous person endorses a product. Ethos is then not only dependent on credibility, but also very much on recognizability, as just about any celebrity can endorse a product, adding ethos value to an advertisement simply by virtue of being know.

*Pathos* is persuasion by appealing to the emotions. It includes all emotional appeals, and ranges from the grandest highlights in life to mundane, everyday situations.

The practice of “referencing consultations with veterans and historians during the games’ closing credit sequences” (Gish, 2010:169) can be seen as an example of ethos advertisement, as the consultants lend credibility to the franchise by virtue of their professions. Though they are not famous, their status as veterans and historians establish them as knowledgeable in regards to the real war efforts, lending credibility to the fictional game war efforts, marketing the game as one that has been developed in cooperation with experts on the field. It is also worth noting that CALL OF DUTY makes use of a logos argumentation supporting the current war efforts in the war against terror throughout the game universe, establishing war as something that has “always” been a part of democracy and western ideals. On the surface it may seem that previous wars have little or nothing to do with recent military engagements, but at a
closer look it seems that the Second World War and Cold War scenarios that appear in post 9/11 military games are in fact part of a Discourse of Empire legitimizing the current war against terror. The use of historical wars, further authenticated by experts such as veterans and historians remind the gamers of established Second World War and Cold War discourses staging the West as saviors and heroes, drawing on ideologies of “the good guys” during these conflicts. The link between past and present helps promote a discourse of “the third world war”, the global war against terror, as a direct parallel with the West as the defenders of justice and virtue once more. In doing so the Discourse of the Writing of History draws on The United We Stand myth, emphasizing the necessity and honorability of the war efforts while subtly preparing the way for the discourse of killing as well, reminding the audience that wars have casualties and victory comes at the costs of sacrifices.

Gish describes one example of this in one of the other CALL OF DUTY videogames, CALL OF DUTY: WORLD AT WAR, where character Sergeant Roebuck played by Kiefer Sutherland intones that “the capturing of the airbase on the island of Makin Atol may allow us to win this war”. According to Gish (2010:170) this is a declaration that “exemplifies the nationalist bent evident in the franchise”. The CALL OF DUTY videogames represent a history of war through a US viewpoint, aligning the player, regardless of nationality, with Western and US hegemonic values. The player is a part of an inclusive “us” containing the US and the West, and his mission is to win the war for the allies. Another thing worth nothing about this example is that the actor Kiefer Sutherland stars as Jack Bauer in the US TV show 24 where he portrays a federal agent fighting terrorist threats against US targets using controversial methods. 24 has received quite a lot of attention because of this, with critics claiming that the use of torture and other illegal or morally questionable forms of pressure employed in the series justifies episodes such as the infamous Abu Ghraib prison abuse by US soldiers in Iraq. Gish (2010:173) describes wartime history in the CALL OF DUTY franchise as simplified, stating that violent interaction is portrayed as a necessary means of winning the war, giving the videogames a practice of “foregrounding singular acts of violence as the sole catalyst of military victory and the impetus for historical progression.” Sacrifices are necessary and deaths are perhaps regrettable but as long as the West unites in the war against terror good and right will prevail.

5.6 The Discourse of the All American Hero
Bush’s historical reference to Reagan also holds significance, namely the fact that the war rhetoric
framing the US as “the good guy” fighting “the bad guys”, is indeed not new, but a part of US identity dating back to the very founding of the nation. Campos (2007:30) writes “it could be argued that the terrorist attacks on September 11th tapped into an American imagination of xenophobia and isolationism that had historical credence and viability within the story of the American state” and states that Bush draws on tales of the “Wild West”, comparing terrorism to the wild and “uncivilized” west that was tamed only through the power of “the gun-wielding sheriff”, employing a “historical imaginaries of an enforcer – specifically the American West where good/law triumphed over evil/lawlessness – and religion’s virtue – specifically the Christian world set against the Muslim world to mobilize the citizenry and solidify the state” (ibid:21). Religion’s virtue is also evident in the use of light and darkness metaphors in Bush’ speeches and it is characteristic of Churchill’s rhetoric as well. According to Charteris-Black (2005:51) these metaphors should be seen as religiously motivated, as “Light and darkness metaphors are very common in Christian religious discourse and link light, faith, goodness and Jesus”. Bush also makes frequent use of light and darkness metaphors, and this is unsurprising when taking the social and cultural value system of the current day US into consideration. The US is known to be religious, especially by European standards. Furthermore the US Bush was speaking to after 9/11 was a US that found itself in a war seen by many as a religious war between the Christian, Western democratic US and the Muslim, dictatorial Middle East. It makes good sense to draw on religious discourse in a situation like that, as a reminder to the public of the two opposing fronts and the values associated with both. Tradition may play a part too, according to Charteris-Black (2005:136) “Religious belief has always been an acceptable pretext for political action in American politics” and “the rhetorical objective of choosing words from the domain of religion is to enhance the ethos of the speaker because they imply that political decisions are made on the basis of high principle rather than crude self-interest”. The latter may very well have been important for Bush, as many both domestic and foreign critics dismissed his appeals for action in the Middle East as a personal crusade, accusing him of wanting to finish his father’s Gulf War. By using light and darkness metaphors to evoke religious discourse, Bush may have attempted to counter this critique, working instead to construct a myth of himself as a principled leader working for a greater good. It is the Valiant Leader myth played out, a strategy that, if successful, will portray Bush as a president who put aside all personal motivation and gain to stand up for the good and right in a time of crisis.

Another purpose of religious metaphors is also, according to Charteris-Black (2005:137), “to create a myth of a political leadership as equivalent to spiritual guidance”. Bush
already has an enemy image of unhealthy, fanatical religious suppression in the terrorist Other embodied by Bin Laden, and the construction of himself as an enlightened leader would make for a very persuasive opposite to this. Charteris-Black’s Conspiratorial Enemy and Valiant Leader are direct opposites, and it is no surprise that such discourses are desirable to political leaders in times of war. If the public can convinced that they are supporting “the good guy” fighting against “the bad guy” they can be at peace with their nation’s involvement in military conflict even if it comes at the costs of not just dehumanized Others but also their own troops.

Campos’ “gun-wielding sheriff” mentioned earlier can also be seen as a hero myth fundamental to a Western world view that favors tales of a Western, roguish champion coming to the rescue in times of need. One of the main protagonists in both CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE videogames, is Captain Price, member of the British Special Air Service, and this character seems to embody the hero myth that Campos describes perfectly. In the CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE videogames, the hero myth is one that is adapted to support the ideologies of the state, reinforcing the Discourse of Empire by adding to it a tale of heroics much as the one found in narratives and fiction of triumph in adversity known from novels and movies. In CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2 Price is subordinate to Shepherd, not only due to the military hierarchy where Shepherd holds the higher rank of Lieutenant General compared to Price’s status as Captain, but also on a less tangible level as Shepherd has organized the mission leading to Price’s rescue from a Russian gulag. With this in mind the following exchange between the two shows that Price has more than just a hint of stubborn rebellion to him. The situation prior to the exchange is that Shepherd suggests a rather spectacular plan of attack against the advice of Shepherd who is in fact, by virtue of his rank, the one in charge.

Shepherd: Price, you been locked away too long. Better get your mind right, son.
Captain Price: Shepherd, are you willing to do what is necessary to win?
Shepherd: Always.

Price’s one comment here, “are you willing to do what is necessary to win” is quintessential for the US hero needed in the modern war against terror social reality America was and is facing. Despite the overwhelming sympathy that flooded the US in the days immediately following 9/11, the superpower also met quite a lot of resistance to its foreign policies and decision to enter Afghanistan. On a side note Price’s nationality as British may in fact be a direct reference to the Afghanistan war as the US and Great Britain where the frontrunners in this conflict. More importantly, however, is the emphasis on the willingness to do the necessary
embodied in the representation of Price who is both resourceful and radical when conventional methods fail, thus mirroring the US foreign policy of taking military action despite the reservation of the “conservative” Europe. This is the modern hero the US needed in the days after the terrorist attacks on The World Trade Center, and the kind of hero the US needed citizens at home as well as in potentially allied countries to identify with. The CALL OF DUTY videogames offer, under guise of being mere entertainment, a platform for establishing just this discourse, and it is remarkable how long a little goes in this respect. Notice also Price’s address to Shepherd in the above exchange. A correct formal address would be to either “Lieutenant Shepherd, including Shepherd’s rank, or “sir”. Both of these highlight the hierarchy in the military and thus Price’s lower rank, and both of these have a depersonalizing effect. Addressing Shepherd simply with his name is a gesture more common on civilian life, and a far more personal form of address than “sir” which leaves out a person’s name altogether, presenting him as nothing more than an authority figure. Price’s way of addressing Shepherd is both bold and cocky as he disregards military conventions, and human and clever because he speaks to Shepherd’s human side, trying to persuade him to go against standard procedure by appealing to his emotions.

Another exchange, this one from CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE, establishes Price’s rogue hero status using just a minimal, yet very efficient linguistic cue. Price is commanding a somewhat strained cooperative mission with Russian allies lead by the Russian sergeant Kamarov, and the groups is meeting far more resistance than anticipated, causing friction between the Russian and the US troops, leading to the following exchange between Price and one of his subordinates, Gaz.

Gaz: We should just beat it out of him Sir
Price: Not yet

This short piece of dialogue, is in fact loaded with discursive practices aimed at establishing Price as a modern hero. The urgency of the mission for one, is the rescue of an informant, Nikolai, who has been captured by the enemy, the Russian ultranationalists. Price’s insistence on saving Nikolai draws on a discourse of loyalty and honor prevalent in the US armed forces and embodied in the slogan leave no man behind. This sentiment is mirrored in a mission in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE, where a helicopter crashes in an urban area leaving one survivor surrounded by hostile forces, in a scenario more or less identical to that of the 2001 movie Black Hawk Down. The player controlled character Sergeant Paul Jackson is part of the crew in an accompanying helicopter, and after having attained permission to land and engage in a rescue mission, the crew leader, Lieutenant
Vasquez, gives the following briefing:

Lt. Vasquez: We got 90 seconds Jackson! Get the pilot! No One gets left behind!

Another, more humorous version of the same message is found later on in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE, after a successful rescue mission where Price and his team rescue the captured Staff Sergeant Griggs and have the following exchange:

SSgt. Griggs: Bout damn time… I was starting to think you guys were gonna leave me behind.
Captain Price: That was my first thought, but your arse had all the C4.
Captain Price: You all right?
SSgt. Griggs: Yeah I’m good to go.

The humor here relies on a shared knowledge between the two men as well as between the game and the gamer who are all in on the joke as the US army and Captain Price of course would never dream of leaving anyone behind.

Price’s exchange with Gaz serves as more than just a framing of him in the same heroic discourse, showing that he has a more dangerous side as well, as he does not outright refuse to use force or reprimand Gaz for his suggestion, tying the game discourse to the debate on the use of torture in and by the US army. Gaz does in fact attack Kamarov seconds later, grabbing him by the neck threatening to throw him down a cliff if he does not give the US troops the exact location of the informant. After a quick struggle Kamarov gives in and reveals the house Nikolai is begin held captured in, and Gaz releases him with the following comment:

Gaz: Well that wasn’t so hard was it? Now go sit in the corner

This exchange can be seen as a part of a discourse that serves to minimize the harmfulness of torture, as Gaz uses an expression typically associated with school and children, “go sit in the corner”, making light of the whole ordeal to establish a discourse that treats physical force, a euphemism coined to further downplay the potential damage of torture, as something necessary and hardly even dangerous. Later on in the game the dark side of Price is played out in full in a torture scene as well, as Price violently beats up an enemy who is tied to a chair before shooting him dead at close range after having attained the desired information from a cell phone call.

Price is at first glance a very unconventional, perhaps even rather unhinged character, but at a closer look he promotes institutionalized, core US values. One example of this is a long monologue late in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2, where Price in a strangely poetic if slightly disturbing, fashion idealizes a personal crusade against a traitor, embodying the mindset of the American statehood in the post 9/11 atmosphere.

MacTavish: We don’t even know if Makarov’s intel’s any good.
Mactavish: Price
Mactavish: …Price?
Price: The healthy human mind doesn’t wake up in the morning thinking this is the last day on earth.
Price: But I think that’s a luxury. Not a curse.
Price: To know you’re close to the end is a kind of freedom.
Price: But the sand and rocks here, stained with thousands of years of warfare…
Price: They will remember us. For this.
Price: Because out of all our vast array of nightmares, this is the one we choose for ourselves.
Price: We go forward like a breath exhaled from the Earth.
Price: With vigor in our hearts and one goal in sight.
Price: We. Will.
Price: Kill him.

Price’s monologue here is quite marked compared to the rest of the game discourse. First of all because it is a monologue, setting it apart from the majority of the other cut scenes that are characterized by being short pieces of dialogue. It is also uncharacteristically prose-like, standing out from the short, straight to the matter exchanges that dominate the discourse of both CALL OF DUTY videogames. It is, in short, extremely noticeable simply by virtue of being different, and it is therefore not unreasonable to assume that the game designers have had a special purpose with this monologue besides filling the gamers in on the storyline. Perhaps the monologue is simply added for entertainment value, offering a break from the dialogues surrounding it, but it is more likely that this piece of discourse embodies core values deemed so vital that they necessitate a break of form to make sure that gamers take note. When looking at the monologue it is striking how similar it is to presidential rhetoric from the days right after the 9/11 attacks, such as Bush’s “great harm has been done to us. We have suffered great loss. And in our grief and anger we have found our mission and our moment” (Bush, Sep 20, 2001). This speech was delivered in the very wake of an event so traumatizing and important that it has been called “the Pearl Harbor” of modern day Americans (Campos 2007:97). The key message in Bush’s speech as well as in Price’s is that of resolve, and of willingness to do the necessary. Both speeches are delivered in pre-combat times by leaders who are about to embark on war, and both speeches have a definitive discourse offering violent retaliation as the only right and necessary course of action.

Campos (2007:94) writes that “As the state reforms the desire and will of its public, the hero is employed as the consummate actor who supports the state’s virtuous role”. Given Price’s rebellious character it may seem a strange claim to see him as an instrument of the
state, but his roguish nature can indeed be seen as very much a trait of a classic, all American hero. The all American hero does what it takes to get the job done, and if this means defying authority figures he will do so. In Price’s case his defiance is even a good thing, the mission he talks Shepherd into accepting turns out to be a success and when Shepherd is revealed to be a traitor Price calmly remarks that he never trusted him, giving him an advantage as he is not caught off guard as the other, more obedient characters. In one of the other CALL OF DUTY videogames, CALL OF DUTY: WORLD AT WAR, the ending credits have a dedication “to the veterans of World War II who sacrificed their lives for the preservation of liberty.” According to Gish (2010:176) “This dedication overtly heralds the heroism of individual soldiers, echoing the game’s narrative construction of warfare as both personal and heroic”. Just as the enemies in the Discourse of War are cast as evil, terrorist Others, the US and allied soldiers are portrayed as strong, resourceful, individualistic heroes. This has to do with another Western discourse, the discourse of masculinity, and this discourse will be examined in the following chapter.

5.6.1 The Discourse of Masculinity
In Edley & Wetherell (1995) masculinity in modern society is examined closer. Though the book is now 15 years old, I believe that the perspectives presented there still apply to masculinity in 2011, and to videogames though the book does not specifically deal with this medium. What it does deal with however, is masculinity as both a dominant and fragile construction. Masculinity is seen as dominant in thread with most feminist theories, because it is regarded as the norm in (Western) society. This norm is part of “cultural ideologies” operating “as taken-for-granted world views which frame events in a particular and often partial way” (Edley & Wetherell, 1995:146) This is significant because “Through ideology, the operations of power can pass virtually unnoticed, because unwittingly, the subordinate groups come to consent to the conditions of their own exploitation” (ibid:147) This consent caused by ideological pressure, can be seen as a heterosexual matrix, a term found in Butler (1990:42). In this work on gender and sexuality, the heterosexual matrix is the prevalent norm of heterosexuality as the only normal sexual behavior, a norm so ingrained in some societies and subcultures, that homosexuality is seen not only as deviant, but as sick or criminal.

The dominance associated with masculinity in Edley & Wetherell, is not as much masculinity in itself, as it is an overall ideal ordering of the world promoting ideals associated with masculinity.Masculinity in itself is, according to Edley and Wetherell, a highly fragile identity
because it has to be maintained and reinforced continuously. “Masculinity defined through the
difference with femininity will always be insecure and in danger of being “lost”, since a “collapse”
into femininity is always possible” (Edley & Wetherell, 1995:53). As a result of this fear of losing
masculinity is that “dependency is such a problem for men because masculine ideology, established
in society and culture, idealises rationality, independence, lack of emotion, hard-headedness
and free self-assertion” (ibid:62) and “masculinity is widely associated with aggressiveness,
indepedence, self-reliance and so on” (ibid:77) Masculinity is thus neither an unproblematic or
uncontested term, and this makes it particularly interesting with respects to the CALL OF DUTY
videogames, as it is my belief that the discourse taking place in these games is one that negotiates
gender as well as political rhetoric. The masculinity presented here is one that must be analyzed
with the military perspective of the game in mind, and I turn therefore, from the more general
studies of masculinity to studies of masculinity and war.

Phillips (2006) studies literary representations of masculinity during World War I and
II, the Vietnam War and the Iraq War. Literary analysis may not be an obvious choice of source
material, and Phillips (2006:5) also addresses the validity of literary studies in her introduction,
 stating that “Literature ferries many socially assumed connections between gender definitions and
war”. Literature may not be reality, but Phillips argues that it does still represent reality, offering
insight into prevalent social constructions. She even suggests that fiction in some cases can be even
better than historical accounts, as “novelists or playwrights or poets do not need to keep to a thesis
or set out consistent arguments” (ibid:6). Fiction can, in other words, according to Phillips, focus
on conveying norms and attitudes as they are perceived and played out without being bound by
academic conventions. The claim that literature can be more precise than history may seem rather
strange, but it does seem that literature and literary analysis can tell us something about the society
it describes. Fiction may not be reality, but it relates to reality in one way or another, and can by
virtue of this alone say something about the times it was created in.

Phillips (2006:2) surveys a number of literary works, arriving at the following
conclusion:

societies which arbitrarily label a number of purely human traits “feminine” possess a tactic useful to
war-making, for men are bound to detect some of these human traits in themselves – and then worry
that they have strayed into a feminine, inferior realm. Placed in a constantly renewed insecurity about
their status, men must scramble to amass “proofs” of masculinity.

Femininity is thus, according to Phillips, an artificial construction that
forces men to go to war to prove their masculinity, as the traits society labels “feminine” are
indeed “human” rather than feminine, and thus will apply to men as well. If society at the same time
convinces men and women that war is manly, men will see the military as an opportunity to prove a
masculinity that is otherwise almost impossible to attain, as it entails denying fundamental human
qualities within. Going to war “proves” manliness through the syllogism “there are no half-men at
the front; I am at the front; therefore, I am not a half-man” (Phillips, 2006:26) Furthermore, Phillips
states that society upholds a chauvinist gender bias as “the taunt “womanly” only works to send
men to war in cultures that strongly polarize the sexes and count women as lesser” (ibid:7). Apart
from forcing men into war to prove their manliness, the juxtaposition of masculinity and the
military also serves another purpose, namely allowing soldiers and societies to dodge unpleasant
moral and ethical issues with the business of war itself. Phillips writes that “opposing sides have a
remarkable capacity not to see war as death and suffering, blocking that view before, during and
after hostilities with a more palatable vision of noble and always defensive manliness” (ibid:1) This
works on both micro and macro level, on the micro level soldiers can focus on self-development
and find fulfillment in the hero role society constructs around the armed forces, which, according to
Phillips, is a widespread strategy as “Instead of asking about bigger purposes, men at the time of
their wars predominantly pursue smaller, more personal aims” (ibid:3) At a macro level societies
are allowed to see themselves as modern crusaders promoting justice, democracy and peace, or as
Phillips puts it “Rather than identifying oneself as an imperialist whose ambitions clashed with the
greed of a rival imperialist, it was easier for Europe and America to draw on pervasive medieval
revivals” (ibid:75).

Joining the army is, however, not enough to maintain masculinity. Once in the army,
men have to sustain their manliness against a homophobic system degrading them with a discourse
presenting homosexuality as feminine, and all soldiers as possible homosexuals, once again forcing
them to prove their masculinity just as they had to outside the military. This is done linguistically
through the use of derogative, homophobic terms of address, such as the use of the words “faggot”
and “queer”, as a means of controlling all men ” (ibid:144). The military hierarchy is constantly
and brutally reinforced, as drill instructors (DIs) systematically instilled fear of womanliness, in
a self-conscious manipulation (ibid:131). In CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE, one of the first
encounters between game characters is that of the newcomer Soap being put to the test by Captain
Price, greeting him with these words

Captain Price: Right. What the hell kind of name is Soap? How’d a muppet like you pass Selection, eh?
Though not homophobic, this address is still derogative, challenging Soap to prove his worth and
his manliness or risk rejection and ridicule.

Another study of masculinity and war in fiction is Selig (1993), in which the author examines Hollywood representations of the Vietnam war, with a critical, feminist view. He sees these movies as part of a discourse that constitutes a war propaganda ideal of masculinity that degrades the female and distorts the historical realities of the conflict. According to Selig (1993:3), Hollywood movies on Vietnam typically promote “the narrative and visual reconstitution of a heroic male subject, a prerequisite for which is the devaluation and abuse of the feminine”. This degradation is largely symbolic as in the use of caves denoting the feminine gender as a *vagina dentata*, a toothed vagina swallowing the white, male, US soldiers, sending them to their deaths in crude traps, or visual casting women as prostitutes or Vietcong or both. It is, however, also a project that takes place on a semantic level, making it of interest for a linguistic analysis. Selig (1993:8) states that “the bonding of trained killers requires semantic degradation of women”, hence opening the floor for a discourse analytical perspective on the construction of gendered language. The is done through the use of misogynist slang such as calling recruits “girls”, “pussies” or “cherries”, with the two latter terms being slang expressions for the female reproductive organ. This practice seems a reasonable explanation for the following exchange.

PFC Allen: So Makarov is the prize.
Shepherd: Makarov’s no prize. He’s a whore. A mad-dog killer for the highest bidder.

The use of the terms “prize” and “whore” may at first seem strange as they are usually associated with derogation of female characters rather than male. With Selig’s article in mind they make a lot more sense for someone with no prior knowledge of military jargon however, as they do indeed seem to be an example of a “semantic degradation of women” occurring in a male discourse to construct and maintain an aggressive masculinity defining the male and right as an opposition to the female. Makarov is established as both anti-male and anti-hero, not only is he an object of male pursuit, a prize, he is also “a whore”, an anti-soldier breaking the moral code of warriors as a “killer for the highest bidder.”

Another interesting exchange when looking into discourses of masculinity, is the following comment:

Shepherd: Boys, I know I’m sending you into the meat grinder on this one…

At first glance it would seem that “boys” is a derogatory term as it denotes non-male in a context where the masculine ideal is very much demanded of the addressed who are about to engage in a highly dangerous mission. The term “boy” was used for black males, denying them equality with
the dominant whites, as described in Edley & Wetherell (1995:150) who state that “The fact that
black men were never really accepted as men was indicated by the tendency of whites to refer to
them as “boys”. A boy is at best a possible male, a liminal being who may yet pass into the realm of
the masculine. The mission could be seen as a trial of manhood, and an opportunity for the player to
prove himself a “real man”. Furthermore Shepherd is at this point of the narrative, still a father
figure for the game characters as well as for the player. It is then possible that the use of the
term “boys” here is a metaphor for this relationship. In a decidedly masculine environment, the use
of a term that suggests feelings and attachment is a potential weakness, a possible collapse into
femininity, rendering Shepherd vulnerable as the addressees are placed in a position where they can
reject his metaphorical family construction. Shepherd knows that he is asking the impossible of his
men, and in exchange offers up a piece of his own masculinity in order to reinforce the bond
between them, emphasizing just how dangerous this mission is. This symbolic token offering of
Shepherd’s masculinity in turn reinforces the masculinity of the addressees, framing them as “the
right stuff” and “the last defense against chaos”, sustaining them as the heroic male who has no
choice but to do the right thing, tying masculinity to the hero myth, sustaining a discourse of real
men being military heroes fighting for freedom, democracy and peace.

Chapter 5 has presented a discourse analytic study of the Discourse of War found in
CALL OF DUTY, placing it in a wider framework of a Discourse of Empire, before moving on to
detail how metaphors serve as a foundation in each of the 5 main sub discourses in the Discourse of
war, presenting the audience with a world view that supports the US hegemony and the war efforts
in the war against terror.

6. Conclusion
This thesis has examined videogames, a new but very prominent entertainment form which seems
to enjoy a rising popularity year after year in the 21st century, through the use of discourse analysis,
a linguistic discipline that typically occupies itself with the more “traditional” media types such
as newspapers and TV. The study of political rhetoric is common in discourse analysis, and this
thesis has shown that political discourses are not only found in traditional places such as televised
election time debates or political speeches, but all around us in modern Western society, even in
the entertainment industry. Here the goal of political discourse is not persuasion as much as it is a
desire to mirror the reality of current affairs to create a realistic environment, but this does not mean
that the discourses found in videogames have no real life application at all. The Discourse of War
presented in the CALL OF DUTY videogames is a discourse that makes use of metaphors known from both political rhetoric in general where it is used by those in power to create and maintain desired ideologies, presenting them to the public as truths, and political wartime discourse in particular, where it establishes a Discourse of Empire presenting Western world view and identities as good and right while demonizing the enemy Other as wrong and evil. The aim of the videogames themselves may not be to support the war on terror or any politicians associated with this particular discourse, but in using the same rhetoric the videogames will inadvertently sustain the world views promoted by those supporting the war on terror. In doing so the videogames place themselves firmly in a Western cultural frame, carrying elements of Western identity recognizable from political rhetoric that are easily analyzed using discourse analysis. Representations of reality, be it political speeches or videogames, rely on discourses, social constructions that are a part of a larger scheme where power is created, maintained and contested by attempts to influence, manipulate or reinforce the audience’s perception of reality and right and wrong.

The discourses in the CALL OF DUTY videogames rely quite heavily on the use of metaphors, and in doing so draws on myths and values that are an integral part of Western culture. Every main theme in the five main discourses found in CALL OF DUTY relies on metaphorical expressions, just as the discourses found in political speeches by Western politicians. One plausible reason for the use of metaphors is that metaphors not only allow a speaker to describe an abstract idea or concept through something concrete and tangible, but also prompt values and ideologies without the speaker having to actually state these. In the case of Othering as a means of demonizing the enemy for instance, a speaker can use light and darkness metaphors to prompt religious values in the hearer, thereby paralleling the enemy with the devil or Satan without ever using these exact words. The very basic foundation of cognitive metaphor theory as it was originally presented by Lakoff and Johnson is that metaphors are so inherent in human thinking that we automatically turn to them when trying to explain and describe complex matters. The discourse analysis of CALL OF DUTY seems to support this claim as the heavy use of metaphors here indicates that metaphorical thinking is indeed so natural a way of thinking about war that it shows up even in videogames. Metaphors tap into shared belief systems, and validate discourses by referring to basic, cognitive patterns that are so embedded in Western culture that people may not even recognize them as metaphors or rhetorical means, but simply accept them as truths. Herein lies a great part of the power of metaphors, and the reason why people use them. Metaphors work, and as long as they do they will appear in public discourses from highly persuasive political speeches to entertainment
venues such as videogames.
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Appendix A: Glossary

**Avatar:** A game character representing the player.

**Console:** A machine used to play videogames on, like a Playstation, Xbox or Nintendo Wii.

**Cut scene:** A movie sequence where the player cannot control the action on the screen. Cutscenes are often used to present the player with background information or fill in the game storyline.

**First Person Shooter (FPS):** Type of videogame where the player sees the screen in first person view, through the eyes of one or more game characters, and where the emphasis is on combat.

**Military shooter:** A type of videogame where the emphasis is on combat in military settings.

**Single player/Multiplayer level:** A single player level is a part of a videogame that is played by one player only. A multiplayer level can be played by anything from two to hundreds of players at the same time.

Appendix B: Call of Duty
CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE takes place in 2011 and the player controls several different British and American characters who work together to stop Imran Zakhaev, a Russian Ultranationalist with an ingrown hatred to Western civilization and access to nuclear weapons. His goal is to seize control of Russia, and to do so he manages to start a civil war in Russia while at the same time supporting a coup in an unnamed Middle Eastern country to draw the attention of the international society away from Russia. The British Special Air Service and the United States Marine Corps join forces in an attempt to capture Zakhaev’s son Victor who can tell them where Zakhaev is hiding, but Victor chooses to commit suicide rather than to be taken alive, and Zakhaev, seeing this as murder, plans to launch nuclear missiles on American soil. The British and American characters manage to stop the launch of the missiles at the very last minute, but not without heavy casualties.

Apart from the villain Zakhaev, the main characters in the videogame are:

- British Special Air Service **Sergeant John "Soap" MacTavish**
- British Special Air Service **Captain/Lieutenant John Price**
- British Special Air Service **Gaz**
- United States Marine Corps **Sergeant Paul Jackson**
- United States Marine Corps **Lieutenant Vasquez**
- United States Marine Corps **Staff Sergeant Griggs**

CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE 2 takes place some five years after the events in CALL OF DUTY: MODERN WARFARE, though no exact date or year is given. Zakhaev, the main antagonist from the first CALL OF DUTY videogame has become a national hero in Russia, and one of his former lieutenants, Vladimir Makarov launches a campaign of terrorist attacks in Europe. After a failed undercover CIA mission featuring Private Allen, Makarov manages to start a war between Russia and America, by making it seem as if the Americans supported a terrorist attack on Russian ground. Russia invades America, and the Task Force 141 Unit under the command of Lieutenant General Sheperd attempts to put an end to the conflict. During one of their missions they break into a Russian gulag to free Makarov’s number one enemy who turns out to be Captain Price from the first CALL OF DUTY game. Price joins the Task Force 141 to help capture Makarov, and serves as MacTavish’ right hand as Sheperd turns out to be a betrayer. Together MacTavish and Price pursue and kill him.

The main characters in the videogame are:
• Multi-national counter-terrorist Task Force 141 Unit Sergeant Gary "Roach" Sanderson
• American Ranger Private First Class Joseph Allen
• American Ranger Private James Ramirez
• Multi-national counter-terrorist Task Force 141 Unit Lieutenant General Shepherd
• Multi-national counter-terrorist Task Force 141 Unit John "Soap" MacTavish
• Captain John Price