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1 Introduction

“Words are not actions,” she said. “And as beautifully presented and passionately felt as they are, they are not action. You know, what we’ve got to do is translate talk into action and feeling into reality.”

“Let’s have a reality check.”

Presidential candidate Senator Hillary Clinton in a debate in New Hampshire 5th Jan, 2008

“And, you know, so, the truth is, actually, words do inspire, words do help people get involved, words do help members of Congress get into power so that they can be part of a coalition to deliver health-care reform, to deliver a bold energy policy.”

“Don’t discount that power.”

Presidential candidate Senator Barack Obama in a debate in New Hampshire 5th Jan, 2008

The Oxford English Dictionary (1989) dates the advent of buy in the meaning of ‘to believe’ as 1926 and considers it as late as 2007 an American, colloquial expression. Older figurative expressions with the stem word buy are, for example, ‘to be bought and sold’ (to bribe, 13th century) or ‘to buy a pig in a poke’ (to accept something without closer inspection, 15th century). Sell metaphors seem to be older and more productive: there are various phrasal expressions. The oldest occurrence is in the Lindisfarne Gospels ca. 950: Cuæð uutedlice iudam · · · des forđon ues sellend hine (John vi:71)\(^1\) (Oxford English Dictionary 1989). Selling one’s soul is from the 16th century, sell someone down the river, sell short and sell out are from the 19th century and they are defined as American. Sell or sell on in the sense of promoting an idea, to be sold on in the sense becoming convinced, and sell oneself as promoting someone are all from the first half of the 20th century. The Oxford English Dictionary marks all these newer expressions as American and colloquial, sell out is specifically defined as “orig. U.S. political, slang.”

In this thesis, I will study the occurrence of buy and sell metaphors in authentic political news discourse. Naturally-occurring language is represented in this study by four text corpora, which all are based on American news media. First, there is an election news corpus (1.6 million words) of news texts in print and online media covering the presidential election campaigns in the United States in 2000, 2004 and 2008. These texts represent either a conservative or liberal political affiliation, and there is one set of texts covering the primaries and another the general election phase in each election period. A

---

\(^1\)In modern English (International Standard Version): For this man, even though he was one of the twelve, was going to betray him. The original text in Vulgata, the expression underlined: dicebat autem Iudam Simonis Scariotis hic enim erat traditus eum cum esset unus ex duodecim set unus ex duodecim
news article or an opinion article was included in the corpus if the theme was a presidential candidate. Thus, the focus is on the person-centered stories. To limit the data, I selected news coverage addressing only three or four candidates in each election, the nominated candidate of the Republican or Democratic party in each election and his main opponent in primaries: George W. Bush (Rep), John McCain (Rep), Al Gore (Dem) and Bill Bradley (Dem) in 2000, George W. Bush (Rep), John Kerry (Dem), Howard Dean (Dem) in 2004, and John McCain (Rep), Rudy Giuliani (Rep), Barack Obama (Dem) and Hillary Clinton (Dem) in 2008.

Then there are three text corpora based on texts and transcripts in The Contemporary Corpus of American English (from hereon: COCA). I will compare the election data with the following data:

- conservative and liberal news and opinion magazines ((3.8 million words),
- conservative and liberal political talk shows in cable TV (4.1 million words)
- conservative and liberal radio news and news commentaries (4.3 million words)

The news magazines corpus is comprised of the following publications: Harper’s Magazine, The Mother Jones and The Washington Monthly for the liberal media, The American Spectator, National Review and U.S. News and World Report and USA Today Magazine for the conservative media. Fox News will represent conservative cable TV news and MSNBC liberal cable TV news. With regard to radio news data, I have chosen Rush Limbaugh data from the COCA to represent conservative radio news, even though the data is really from the short-lived Limbaugh cable TV show in 1992-1996. As there are no other suitable radio data available, and as can be expected that Limbaugh, the most popular political talk radio show host in the United States (Hall Jamieson & Cappella 2008, 46; Rush Limbaugh 2011), based his TV show on his radio show, it has to serve as “mock” radio data. National Public Radio will represent center-left radio news and news commentaries. In some cases I will compare data of this study with the entire COCA (410

2 With respect to the election 2008, I started to collect data in May 2007. So the selection of the candidates then was more a lucky guess of who might be nominated and who might be the main opponent.
3 USA Today Magazine has no connection with the USA Today newspaper.
mill. words) in order to illustrate how metaphorical expressions may be applied in American English in general in the 1990s-2000s.

The objective of this study is to investigate how certain pragmatic and grammatical factors affect the occurrence levels of *buy* and *sell* metaphors. Thus, the approach is principally quantitative, although some qualitative analyses will be carried out on the basis of quantitative findings. The variables explored in this study are:

1) genre/subgenre (political news, election news, written news, spoken news, TV, radio)
2) partisanship (liberal or conservative, liberal for Democratic and conservative for Republican)
3) multiword units based on *buy* or *sell* (for instance, *sell out* or *buy it*)
4) metaphorization level (the proportion of literal and metaphorical occurrences)
5) the evaluative value of the metaphors (in the election data only)
6) timeline (in the election data only: the 2000, 2004 and 2008 presidential elections)
7) the targets of evaluation (the election data only: presidential candidates and the Republican or the Democratic Party)

There should be variation in different news genres, as opinion articles and TV talk shows differ, for example. Political cable TV and radio talk shows have emerged as significant political media in the United States after the 1980s. Opinion columns in periodicals are an old and respected form of political discussion, hence, they may be less open for colloquial expressions—such as *buy* or *sell* metaphors—than the new media. Election news represents in this research design a genre in which competition and partisanship together may induce more aggressive metaphor use.

As conservative and liberal argumentation also differs, there should be variation in the partisan metaphor use. Partisanship could also be called more broadly a political ideology, and as the research corpora are comprised of liberal and conservative news media, they are strictly speaking not partisan, or at least not institutions of the Democratic or the Republican Party. The publications and the broadcasting channels in the conservative corpora, such as *National Review, The Wall Street Journal, Fox News* or
Rush Limbaugh, represent each their respective conservative strand, but they do not adhere to the Republican Party. As for the liberal corpora, MSNBC cable channel and publications such as The Nation or The New Republic follow their idiosyncratic liberal affiliation with no direct ties to the Democratic Party. National Public Radio is an independent non-profit membership news organization, which yet has sometimes been labeled liberal (McCauley 2002, 267). Hence, it represents the moderate, center-left voice in the political arena in this study, in juxtaposition to conservative talk radio (Limbaugh).

I will pay special attention to multiword types of metaphor, since there is some evidence that collocations or phrasal expressions may be significant in metaphorization (Deignan 2005, 145, 160-161, 178-180, 210; Stubbs 1995, 382-386). Moreover, as my topic concerns metaphorical verbs, the objects and subjects of these verbs contribute to the metaphorical sense. In addition, I will explore how metaphorization levels vary: what is the proportion between metaphorical and non-metaphorical occurrence of buy and sell expressions?

Criticism of the opponent party with negative metaphors is to be expected in the election data, but are there other differences in the evaluation? It is also possible that both parties (through partisan media) use the same metaphorical domains, as Charteris-Black (2004, 65-69) found in his study on British Labour and Conservative Party manifestos. Although metaphors arose from the same domains, there was variation in the individual realizations of these domains (ibid). As regards to terms conservative and liberal, I will follow a rather conventional definition of these political affiliations, as already was demonstrated by the choice of the comparison corpora. Conservative means a pro-Republican ideological leaning with an emphasis on issues such as limited government intervention, strong national defense, individual responsibility or conservative cultural values, whereas liberal means a pro-Democrat leaning with an emphasis on issues such as progressive social or economic policies with government intervention, multilateral diplomacy or liberal cultural values.

Metaphors play a role in the framing of political issues and politicians (see e.g. Mio 1997). The evaluative role of buy and sell metaphors in election data will be addressed from the aspect of their targets in the texts, with a focus on presidential candidates and
political parties as targets. The timeline of the three elections in the 2000s is too short for comprehensive diachronic research, but as this period extends from pre-11/9 era to the later phases of the Iraq war and the end of the George W. Bush presidency, the election corpus represents a period of crucial changes in American political life. Thus the diachronic analysis may yet reveal some directions in metaphor use. The immense and far-reaching changes in communication technology have greatly shaken media from the 1990s onwards, the growth and the significance of the Internet as the most important. Because of this, the years 2000, 2004 and 2008 may well represent a phase when online media emerged as an equal competitor of the traditional print media, radio and TV. There is some previous research on the rise of negativity in news (see e.g. Cohen 2008, Dagnes 2010). Negativity is often seen as an outcome of the hectic news cycles and tabloidization in the information age. Therefore this paper addresses specifically negative metaphors and their rise in news.

The comparison corpora will not be used in the diachronic comparisons, as the COCA data chosen for this research design is not suitable for this. The COCA corpora in this study are all from the 2000s, except one, the conservative radio corpus, which is from 1992-1996. It should yet be beneficial to have data from a period when the incumbent president was a Democrat (Bill Clinton), as all other data represent mainly the George W. Bush’s era, the period in 2001-2008.

_Buy_ and _sell_ were chosen as a research topic because in the exploratory phase of this study it seemed that their use varies in partisan election news and that _buy_ metaphors seem to be a relatively new phenomenon at least in written genres. They also seemed to be clearly evaluative. Because the United States is the world’s most influential representative of free-market ideology, it may seem obvious that metaphors such as _buy_ and _sell_ which highlight free choice in transactions have emerged. They are, however, not the most frequent metaphors in political discourse. So far, studies have proved that conflict or contest metaphor occur very frequently in political discourse (see e.g. Howe 1988). There are, however, little studies on less frequently used metaphors in political discourse and their role. Furthermore, quantitative studies on variation or change in the language of American political news are scarce.
To sum it up, the purpose of this study is to find out answers to these research questions:

1) Do buy or sell metaphors occur in greater numbers in any genres of political discourse, are they genre-specific? Are there partisan differences in this respect?

2) Do buy or sell metaphors occur in multiword units and are there partisan or genre differences in the occurrence of these units?

3) Do buy and sell multiword unit metaphors occur more frequently than their literal counterparts? Are there partisan or genre differences in this respect?

4) Do buy or sell metaphors increase or decrease in the timeline of the three elections and does partisanship or a particular election (2000, 2004 or 2008) have any role in these possible changes?

5) How are buy and sell metaphors used in election news as evaluation? How does this evaluation, especially when it is negative, vary with respect to candidates, parties and the timeline of three elections (2000, 2004 and 2008)?

Finally, there is the question of how these differences or changes can be accounted for, even though this may be at best tentative. Explanations of why these metaphors behave as they do can arise from various premises. I will focus in this paper on some well-known phenomena linked with conservative and liberal political thought and practices and some prevailing views on mass media in the 21st century.

My approach is to study metaphors in an empirical setting: how metaphors function in naturally-occurring language and how they work as parts of discourse the purpose of which is to persuade, to evaluate and to form in-group identities (such as partisan identity). To quote a researcher on Russian political discourse, the task is to analyze “discursive metaphors, i.e. the articulation of metaphors and their entailments at the level of the situated spoken or written text” (Macgillchrist 2011, 81). This analysis will be conducted by alternating quantitative and qualitative perspective since both are needed: quantitative analysis to discover the extent of use of different expressions, and qualitative analysis to identify metaphorical expressions and to assess evaluation in discourse, for instance. Charteris-Black (2004) calls this alternating procedure a dialogue, “each raising the questions that may be answered by the other” (32).
As abbreviations for metaphorical expressions based on the stem words buy or sell, I will use terms ‘buy metaphor’ or ‘sell metaphor’, (buy or sell will be written in italics). The lemmas of BUY or SELL will be written in small capitals. I will use terms ‘literal’ and ‘non-metaphorical’ to refer to non-metaphorical use of expressions (in Figures, abbreviation for literal is ‘lit’ and for metaphorical ‘met.’). The term ‘non-negative’ refers to expressions which have a positive evaluation or neutral evaluation. For conservative and liberal, I will use ‘cons’ and ‘lib’ for short in the Figures and Tables. There is a list of abbreviations regarding the corpus data in Appendix A.
2 Studying metaphor in discourse

In this section, I will present how metaphor in discourse has been studied and define some terms and definitions with regard to metaphor identification. I will introduce some ideas of political language and metaphors from the viewpoint of corpus studies, cognitive semantics and political communication research. I will also sum up how genre-specificity and metaphors have been examined in previous studies, with a special interest in quantitative metaphor research. Previous research on metaphorization is also discussed.

The etymological origin of the word ‘metaphor’ is from the Greek meta = with/after and phereini = bear, carry, thus, it is transferring meanings (Charteris-Black 2004, 19). One of the simplest, yet a valid and apt metaphor definition, was made by Burke: “metaphor is a device for seeing something in terms of something else” (Burke 1989, 246). It has also been said that the function of metaphor is to hide and highlight at the same time. A frequently cited quotation in metaphor research literature compares metaphor with a solar eclipse: “it hides the object of study and at the same time reveals some of its most salient characteristics when viewed through the right telescope” (Paivio 1979; cited in Mio 1997, 113).

Metaphor comprises two parts: the explainer and the explained, or the interpreting and the interpreted. Here is an example of a sell metaphor from the election corpus:

(1) In this, Obama's [health care] plan is not dissimilar from Obama himself—filled with obvious talent and undeniable appeal, sold with stunning rhetoric and grand hopes, but never quite delivering on the promises and potential. And so he remains the candidate of almosts. (Klein 2007)

The sense of this passage is that when candidate Obama offers his health care plan to voters, he sells it. Political proposal is interpreted or explained through commercial transaction. The simple lexical unit sold carries the interpretative or explainer function. Health care legislation, a considerably complex political process, is highlighted as a commodity. Naturally, this is not the only way of thinking of a political proposal. This is the hiding aspect of metaphor: the vast options of thinking of ‘something as something’ temporarily retreat (Charteris-Black 2004, 9; Kimmel 2004, 277; Lakoff 1980 10-13, 236-237), because of the interpretation provided by the explainer. Sometimes the
resulting metaphor seems to be more than a sum of its parts, sometimes a metaphor seems just a synonym or one term in a semantic field, for instance simply to offer in example (1). This sell metaphor as an offer is not a free offer but an offer with expectations of something in return (in election news, usually a vote or other form of support).

In this study, I will mostly follow a metaphor definition suggested by a group of researchers in *Metaphor Analysis Project*\(^4\) (2006). “metaphor is a linguistic phenomenon found in discourse which has a potential to be identified as a metaphor”. As this definition is very general, it has to be amended with a notion that some incongruity or semantic tension has to be found in this discourse event (Cameron 2003, 9). Cameron also posits that metaphor may be signaled by an incongruous lexical item, but that metaphorical interpretation can also be created in the discourse context or in the larger co-text (ibid.). Low and Cameron (2002) underscore the complexity of figurative speech in discourse (85-87), and as this study is based on authentic discourse, it is reasonable to approach metaphors as discourse events potentially metaphorical at many levels.

In example (1), the lexical item sold is incongruous with the context, a health care plan cannot really be ‘sold’ as a commodity. In the co-text, an additional contrast is created with comparing Obama’s health care plan with the candidate Obama himself: the phrases sold with stunning rhetoric and never quite delivering refer to the plan and to candidate Obama at the same time. The signal, not dissimilar, shows that there is a comparison at the utterance level. This example illustrates how multifaceted metaphors may be in authentic discourse.

From the viewpoint of rhetoric, a linguistic metaphor is a trope: it is a figure of speech, like hyperbole or irony (Cameron 2003, 2). From the viewpoint of semantics, a linguistic metaphor may be seen as an anomaly. It has sometimes been called ‘loose speech’ inducing use of Grice’s co-operative principle: the listener/receiver must create or conclude the meaning (Partington 1998, 110). From the viewpoint of philosophy, a linguistic metaphor creates a breach of logic; it seems to “state an untruth that has some

\(^4\) *Metaphor Analysis Project and MetNet*, Lynne Cameron led this research project. Other members included e.g. Graham Low, Elena Semino, Zazie Todd and Paul Rayson.
truth” (Cameron 2003, 2). The Conceptual Metaphor Theory suggests that linguistic metaphors are instantiations of conceptual processing, whereby a source domain and a target domain form mappings in mind, such as POLITICS IS BUSINESS\(^5\) (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 3-6 56-60). This would represent the viewpoint of metaphor as a cognitive function. Terms in the field of metaphor studies vary, and some terms have become linked to specific theoretical pre-suppositions. As I will not adhere directly to a particular theory in this study, I will use the terms as follows:

**Vehicle\(^6\)** for the area of life a metaphor arises from, usually, but not always, a more basic element than the phenomenon it refers to, for example the commercial transaction in example (1)

**Topic\(^7\)** for the area of life a metaphorical phenomenon addresses, the content of an utterance, for example the political proposal in example (1)

**metaphor** for a linguistic phenomenon found in discourse, which has a potential to be identified as a metaphor (Metaphor Analysis Project and MetNet 2006) and may have a tension or incongruity between the Vehicle and the Topic (but not always), metaphor includes *metonymy, simile* and *comparison*

**linguistic** in the connection of **linguistic metaphor** means that all kinds of linguistic phenomena, such as grammar, syntax, phrases or object relations can be a part of metaphor (Low & Cameron 2002, 88)

**multiword unit** for a metaphorical phenomenon that extends to more than one lexical word (Low & Cameron 2002, 85)

**discourse unit** for a lexical, grammatical or phrasal unit which operates at linguistic level and participates in creating a sense

---

\(^5\)Conceptual metaphors are normally written in capitals, to separate them from linguistic metaphorical expressions, as the separation of these two is crucial in this theory.

\(^6\) I will use Vehicle with a capital V to separate the use of this term from the lexeme.

\(^7\) I will use Topic with a capital T for the same reason.
**utterance level** for a larger stretch of discourse, the level at which a metaphorical phenomenon can sometimes be identified, for instance

**metonymy** for a structure where a part of the Topic is used to refer to the whole Topic, or where the expression indicates a causal relationship with the Topic, as in: *they know who us the better buy* [sic] (Borosage 2000)

**simile** for any expression or a chain of expressions which compares an item, entity, idea or process to another, often signaled with *like, as, as if or similar to*, as in: *voters who stick with a party two or three times when they're young, like consumers buying a product, tend to develop an allegiance that stays with them* (Roth 2007)

**comparison** for a phenomenon in discourse, possibly stretching over several discourse units, in which an item, entity, idea or process is compared with something

**metaphoricity cline** for a phenomenon when some metaphors are more metaphorical than others, or where it is difficult to separate literal and metaphorical usage (Low & Cameron 2002, 86)

**activation** for the thoughts, ideas or a certain interpretation a metaphor brings to mind, the aspect of literal *buy or sell* it highlights (often called entailment in the Conceptual Metaphor Theory)

**resonance** for the phenomenon when a discourse unit relates to metaphorical sense although it is expressed in a non-metaphorical sense (Low & Cameron 2002, 86)

**conventional metaphor** for an expression which is so lexicalized that the incongruity seems no more apparent
novel metaphor for an expression which applies a Vehicle in a way not previously attested

semantic field for a phenomenon when different expressions seem to share a common semantic nominator

In this categorization of terms and in the procedure for metaphor identification, I follow some notions suggested by Low and Cameron (2002, 85, 86, 87-88), Cameron (2003, 3-6, 9-13, 22-23), Deignan (2005, 86-88, 195-197, 30-32) and Steen (2007, 321-322), but the definitions and the choice of terms are my own. These guidelines suit the quantitative, discourse-centered approach I wish to apply.

It should also be noted that I will not address metaphors in spoken discourse in great detail. It has been claimed by Cameron (2003, 267-268; 2007, 109-112) that metaphorical occurrence in conversation has specific features often neglected in metaphor studies. Although I analyze spoken discourse (TV and radio talk shows), neither the interactional nature of metaphors nor metaphors repeated or elaborated in conversation will be specifically addressed.

2.1 Metaphor in political discourse

In the following sections, I will introduce some ideas of political language and metaphors from the viewpoint of political communication research and cognitive semantics.

2.1.1 Political language and metaphor studies

It is generally agreed that political activity is by its nature linguistic activity: language does not just reflect the events, it is a part of the events (Geis 1987, 18; Heywood 2004, 3). Chilton (2004, 16-18) proposes that politics and language have a mutual evolution history: for the survival of species, humans developed systems of shared responsibilities, shared knowledge and shared procedures. In this process, cooperation was needed, and language serves cooperation. Language serves as a mark of in-group membership and it can create and maintain social order. But there is a contrasting force, too, the struggle for power. This struggle means competition for the assets and benefits in social life, a competition which sometimes amounts to coercion (Chilton 2004, 16-18, 45-47). To
avoid violence and to maintain civil society, the struggle for power has to be amended with negotiations which constitute the default position of politics (ibid.). An election, for instance, is one basic form of political negotiation. Even if this state of continuous negations creates complexity and unbalance in society, there seems to be no alternative. As Winston Churchill (1947) said: “[..] democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried.”

Negotiations need a suitable language to be successful, as political goals can be achieved with persuasive language. Political persuasion or convincing can be direct or indirect. Due to the complex nature of metaphors and their assumed power to invoke assimilations and emotions, they are considered to be efficient indirect communication tools for social values or beliefs. Beer and De Landsheer (2004) state that "the power of metaphor is the power to understand and impose political order" (30). They emphasize that metaphors are important in the struggle to create collective meanings and to reflect the meaning of power (ibid. 7). There are also limits of using language as a political tool which can be seen in the sanctions society will impose on those who break the social code. In earlier eras, profanity, blasphemy or offensive language against a sovereign were considered a crime, for instance. In our age, political correctness is required for anyone who speaks publicly of minorities, for example, but sanctions do not extend to criminal punishments, they are more by nature social exclusion. As far as colloquial expressions are concerned, there have been different levels of acceptance for informal expressions in written genres or in public discourse. In sum, language use and its limits reflect the social structure of society.

There is a noteworthy difference in the research of political language between Europe and The United States. In Europe, there is a strong tradition of Critical Discourse Analysis, but in the United States it is practically non-existent (Kaufer & Hariman 2008, 475-476). The American research tradition has focused on rhetoric and political communication in general, and metaphor studies of American political discourse have been based on political psychology or political persuasion in the fields of political science and communication (such as Howe 1988, Lakoff 1996, Mio & Katz 1997, Wilson 1990). The aim of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is to reveal hegemonies created by discourses and to make power structures maintained by discourses visible.
(Charteris-Black 2004, 29). Hence CDA has also an empowering, emancipating role. From the viewpoint of CDA, Chilton (2004) has proposed that the function of linguistic expressions in political discourse in general is to legitimize or to delegitimize, to represent or to misrepresent and to coerce (45-47).

In this thesis, the analysis of power relations is limited to the analysis of some conservative and liberal positions expressed through metaphorical language in media, and I will not apply a CDA frame, which usually does not place great importance to frequency. Yet I concur with Chilton (1996) when he argues that metaphorical expressions may not be merely a stylistic choice since metaphors are often deeply embedded in discourses (37). In political discourse, they arise from the cultural and ideological context which interacts with language. Americans often hold that freedom of speech guaranteed in their Constitution allows a fairly equal struggle for power “in the marketplace of ideas”\(^8\) and do not consider their political system particularly repressive. Whether repression or freedom prevails in America is not an issue in this study. It may not be beneficial in this framework to argue that metaphors always reflect power or power deprivation (Charteris-Black 2004, 30). A general view on political news in the American context will be further elaborated in Section 3, where changes in news production and their effect on language use are addressed.

Metaphors as political communication are one aspect of this study. My limited viewpoint, though, will be evaluation of some phenomena with metaphors. Many features of political framing and power relations expressed through language, as well as the multimodal nature of political communication (visual and symbolic, for instance) are excluded from this research design. As this study is mostly carried out with quantitative methods, it may yield some information on how the recurrence of metaphorical expressions is related to ideology and genre. These findings may later contribute to research on political communication at a more general level.

\(^8\)This phrase is said to be coined by Supreme Justice William Brennan in 1965, it refers to freedom of expression.
2.1.2 The Conceptual Metaphor Theory and the political metaphor

I will now present some applications of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory in political discourse studies. As some of the previous research on conservative and liberal metaphor use in the United States is based on this theory, it is relevant to assess it. My summary is mostly based on Lakoff (1996), Chilton (2004, 2006) and Cienki (2005). In this context, I will use terms related with the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which differ from the terms defined on pp. 10 - 11.

In the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, linguistic metaphorical expressions are seen as instantiations of some cognitive metaphor, a thinking model (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 3-6; 56-60). The theory suggests that abstract thinking is based on embodiment, our physical experience of the world. According to this theory, a source domain, usually more concrete, is mapped to a target domain in the mind. Conceptual metaphors are usually expressed as “A is B” structures, for example POLITICS IS BUSINESS. A linguistic instantiation of this conceptual metaphor would be, for instance:

(2) Watching the two presidential debates, one can't help but notice the stark differences between each party's approach to these core issues. And it's hard to see how the general electorate is going to buy what the Democrats are selling. (Kudlow 2007)

It is yet clear that not all buy or sell expressions can be identified as instantiations of this conceptual metaphor, which in itself is hypothetical. There is no clear evidence that this Conceptual Metaphor exists.

Chilton has made some ground-breaking studies on political language and conceptual metaphor. Among his various studies, a study on Cold War discourse showed that security metaphors were often expressions that suit ‘container’, ‘path’ or ‘force’ schemas (Chilton 1996, 50-55). The container schema, for instance, emphasizes the importance of boundaries, the inside-outside contrast. Other frequent thinking models in political discourse seem to be ‘the front-back schema’ and ‘the up-down schema’ (Chilton 2006). Hence, politics could essentially be seen as going forward or backtracking and gaining or losing height. The basic thinking model of ‘above’ usually correlates with good or powerful, and ‘below’ with bad or being under control. The Latin-based expressions sovereign and subject reflect these senses. In a similar vein, only going forward is good, progression has a positive connotation. In modern Western politics, four other basic
thinking models have been found: ‘body politic’, ‘the ship of state’, ‘buildings’ and ‘machines’ (Peil 1983 as cited in Chilton 2006).

Lakoff (1996) has made a suggestion for comprehensive, fundamental conceptual metaphors in American two-party politics: A STRICT FATHER for conservative ideology and A NURTURING PARENT for liberal ideology. Cienki (2005) has investigated this conceptual model using empirical data: he studied the language of the TV debates between Al Gore and George W. Bush in the 2000 United States presidential election. He found few expressions directly related to these concepts (Cienki 2005, 279).

There are some other studies where Lakoff’s A STRICT FATHER and A NURTURING PARENT models have been investigated as possible explanations for American political discourse. In a study on the United States Congressional debates on the Iraq war, no clear evidence for partisan preference was found (Republican or Democratic), when the lemmas protect and punish were chosen as possible expressions of the Lakovian model (protect for Parent, punish for Father) (Miller & Johnson 2010, 47, 71-72).

As the empirical research on Lakoff’s model has not been very productive, I will not apply it in this paper. While his ideas have received some positive response (Kövecses 2005, 174-176), they are often thought to be too simplistic, or not to correlate with the reality of political actions. For instance, national economy is not merely a linguistic concept or a thinking model: taxes cannot easily be replaced by membership fees, an alternative term for taxes suggested by Lakoff. If one fails to pay taxes, there are criminal sanctions, whereas if one fails to pay membership fees, consequences are not as drastic (Pinker 2007, 259-260). Moreover, NATION IS A FAMILY, a Conceptual Metaphor implied by this model, has been criticized for not having adequate explanatory power on capitalistic American society (Goatly 2008, 386-387). Pinker (2007) has argued that conceptual metaphors can only exist as competing predictions, like competing scientific theories, in need of empirical facts to be proved correct (260). Lakoff himself admits that his model is not fully developed and that there is no adequate methodology to empirically investigate these models (Lakoff 1996, 158). It has been said that “it is sometimes difficult when reading Lakoff to know where his political advocacy ends and his cognitive-linguistics scholarship begins” (Goldstein 2008).
2.2 Metaphorical Vehicles in genres

There are two main questions with regard to buy and sell metaphors and genre: how genre-specific are these metaphors and is there any preference for certain types of metaphors in the political news genre? Since my intention is to study whether buy and sell metaphors are applied in a different way in different subgenres, it is relevant to examine previous studies on metaphors, their Vehicles and genre.

Several scholars suggest that the most frequently found Vehicles in political discourse seem to represent a controversy of some kind: war, sport or competition (Deignan 2005, 27; Kövecses 2002, 62; Kövecses 2005, 174-176; Scheithauer 2007, 80, 84). Taking into account the struggle for power described in Section 2.1, this is not surprising. Journey, nature and family as Vehicles are frequent as well (Scheithauer 2007, 84). With respect to buy or sell metaphors, no studies addressing specifically them have been found.

Although there are several case studies on how metaphors participate in framing political issues in the United States (see e.g. Ivie & Giner 2009, Kitis & Milapides 1997, Lee & Morin 2009, Scheithauer 2007), there are no studies on the genre-specificity of political metaphors. Vehicles in political news have not been studied exhaustively either. Howe (1988, 191) was one of the first to suggest that both war and sports metaphors dominate American political discourse. Mio (1997, 123-126) reported several Vehicles found in American studies, such as container, disease, machine, family or nature. Ivie and Ritter (1989) studied Republican George H. W. Bush’s representation of America as “heroic” in the 1988 presidential election as against his challenger’s (Democrat Michael Dukakis) more “managerial” framing of foreign politics.

Kövecses (2005) has investigated cultural variation of metaphors and makes some observations on American politics. Vehicles such as war, personification (nations as persons, for instance) or sports are found in many cultures, but sports as a Vehicle seems to have various elaborated expressions in the American context, especially from football or baseball (Kövecses 2005, 120, 191). In China, the most usual domains for sports metaphors are table tennis, volleyball or soccer (ibid. 120). In addition, he points out that
show or entertainment are prominent Vehicles in American politics regarding especially elections (although he presents little evidence for this) (ibid. 187).

2.3 Quantitative metaphor analysis

Quantitative methods have sometimes been applied in metaphor studies which focus on one genre or subgenre. Koller (2004) has studied metaphors in business news from the gender aspect and Charteris-Black (2004, 113-134) has studied metaphors in sports news, for example, but they have used a mixed-method approach combining corpus methods, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory and CDA. Hence, frequency as such has not been the main interest. Jäkel (2003) compared British and German financial news coverage, in which motion metaphors dominated. He comments on the question of frequency in this genre by saying that these metaphors probably comprise 90% of all linguistic metaphors in the research corpus, both in German and British business news (ibid. 313-315). So, metaphor frequency and genre seem to be interdependent according to his study. In a study on cross-cultural election night metaphors in media, Scheithauer (2007, 105) found that Vehicles are remarkably similar across cultures in this genre (journey, war, nature, for instance). Her data were the TV election night news in Britain (the 1997 election), in Germany (the 1998 election) and in the United States (the 2000 presidential election). Business as a metaphorical Vehicle ranks as the 5th most frequent in her study. The percentage for business metaphors, though, was low: 3% of all expressions are business metaphors (Scheithauer 2007, 92-93, 100).

With respect to election news as a specific subgenre in political discourse, Vertessen and De Landtsheer (2008) make an interesting observation about the similarities of political language during elections and during crises (275, 282-283). A crisis in this context means an event that raises national anxiety level, such as a war. They apply a method called “collective evaluative measuring”, first developed by De Landtsheer as a “metaphor power model” (De Landtsheer 1998, 131-136; De Landtsheer & De Vrij 2004, 63-64, 172-177). In this model, metaphorical expressions are given a number for emotional value and intensity, and these numbers are then counted to present the affective density of a news report. Vertessen’s and De Landtsheer’s findings show the importance of metaphors in elections: a clear preference for metaphors during election
time was discovered in the Belgian news coverage they analyzed, whereas during the two other research periods outside election time, the affective, emphatic expressions seemingly decreased (Vertessen & De Landtsheer 2008, 282-283).

De Landtsheer (2009) comments on the lack of quantitative metaphor studies from her own theoretical viewpoint, political-semantic approach, in which metaphors are seen as rhetorical devices with no emphasis on any specific cognitive or linguistic theory. She says that her Metaphor Power Model is one of the few quantitative methods applied, although she concedes that some research has been conducted with mixed methods such as Zinken (2004). She also underlines the importance of studying metaphors as a political style (De Landtsheer 2009, 64).

Following the research tradition in political communication, De Landtsheer has found in her studies that metaphors increase in political discourse, when certain conditions are met. The conditions are as follows:

**Table 1. Context factors of metaphor use** (De Landtsheer 2009, 73-74).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context factors</th>
<th>who are stimulated to metaphor use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>political crisis &gt;</td>
<td>Media, politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military crisis &gt;</td>
<td>Media, politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic crisis &gt;</td>
<td>Media, politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political party &gt;</td>
<td>Right wing, extremist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &gt;</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media technology &gt;</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media audience &gt;</td>
<td>Popular, broadsheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media organizer &gt;</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections &gt;</td>
<td>Media, politicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of De Landtsheer’s results, the research design of this study incorporates some of the variables attributed to metaphor frequency: extreme political affiliation, commercial TV (cable TV) and elections.
2.4 The metaphorization level: the proportion of literal and metaphorical expressions

“No word is an island.” (Stewart 2009, 56)

In this section I will address the proportion between metaphorical and non-metaphorical expressions. I will call this phenomenon metaphorization level.

Literal and metaphorical proportion levels of lemmas have received little attention in metaphor corpus studies. Berber Sardinha (2008) says that when the term *metaphoricity* is searched for, or the term *metaphorization*, few results are found in metaphor research literature. Berber Sardinha studied differences of Language for Specific Purpose Portuguese (spoken business discourse) and general Portuguese. He found that there was a very high tendency in business Portuguese to use some words only in their metaphorical sense (Berber Sardinha 2008, 142-143). He also suggests models for probabilistic metaphor research (ibid. 143-144).

In studies where phrasal structures have been investigated, some coincidental findings of metaphorization levels have been made. According to Stubbs (2003, 217), phrasal or multi-word expressions seem to be important features in naturally-occurring language, and thus, it is possible that these expressions carry more semantic value than single words or grammatical forms. Collocation is another phenomenon which has been studied in connection with metaphors, but also as a general issue in language acquisition or language change. Stubbs has investigated cultural connotation and collocation and has found some consistency with regard to some very general words, such as *small*, *big* or *way*. These words seem to be much more frequent in their metaphorical sense than in the literal sense (Stubbs 1995, 382-386; Stubbs 2003, 228).

With regard to collocation and grammar, Deignan (2005) has made several contributions to metaphor research. Some of her findings indicate that differences of literal and metaphorical occurrence levels might be important, but this has not been her main objective. Considering the aims of this study, however, these findings are interesting and point out aspects of metaphorization that have received little attention.
Firstly, she suggests that based on her corpus research, some collocations, such as *to pay a price* or *rise and fall*, have a strong tendency to be used only in their metaphorical sense (Deignan 2005, 210). This observation may shed some light to polysemous words: patterns of language may offer clues to how they are acquired or learned (ibid). Their occurrence in fixed or semi-fixed patterns may help the disambiguation of senses (ibid.). Her observations could serve as a research model in this study: is the polysemous nature of *buy* or *sell* dependent on fixed expressions or linguistic patterns? Then there is the evidence of how some words do not occur at all as literal expressions in some grammatical forms. According to Deignan, *budding*, for instance, is 97% metaphorical and *blossomed* 98% (178-180, see also Berber Sardihna 2008, 128). All these observations confirm that the relation of the literal and metaphorical occurrences is worth investigating.

Secondly, she argues that there seem to be several preferred forms or constraints in the grammar of metaphor (Deignan 2005, 145). Sometimes there are word class preferences: verbs, for example, have been found to count for 50% of metaphors in one study (Cameron 2003, 89). Deignan (2005, 160-161) posits that body part metaphors seem to fall into three categories: some relatively free (*heart* = center, *hand* = help), some relatively fixed (*shoulders* = responsibility) and some nearly always used with a word from the target domain (*head of state*). In an earlier study, Deignan and Potter (2004) found—almost as a by-product in a study on cross-cultural metaphors—that the metaphorization levels of body part words was high: 65% of *head* and *heart* occurrences and 50% of *hand* occurrences were non-literal in British English. Even though some of these expressions might be nearer to idioms than metaphors, Deignan (2007) argues that this could still be significant when examining metaphorization: metaphor and metonymy as formulaic phrases could prove to be a fruitful research area (104).

### 2.5 A summary: the research design

To summarize, political communication research prefers to address metaphors as a style, a discourse strategy or as rhetoric, whereas the Conceptual Metaphor Theory addresses metaphor more as a fundamental thinking model. The style or discourse strategy approach emphasizes metaphors as a linguistic choice, while the cognitive view holds that thinking models define the linguistic expressions.
In this paper, the linguistic and pragmatic phenomena will be the major interest. My research interests in naturally occurring language—represented by corpora—are genre-specificity, metaphorical use of expressions based on *buy* or *sell* as compared with their literal use, multiword units of *buy* and *sell* metaphors and the evaluative aspect of these metaphors. In this study, *buy* and *sell* are not primarily seen as representations of some conceptual metaphors, although they may signify some similarity between political actions and commercial actions (such as an opportunity to choose between several options, at a cost). Principally, **BUY** and **SELL** are addressed in this study as polysemous words: they have several other senses in addition to their basic commercial sense. Metaphoricity is approached more as a cline than a clear division into literal and metaphorical, and in order to do that, the discourse context must be taken into account. Multiword unit metaphors will be specifically addressed. As Müller (2008, 58) says, language is the most elaborated vehicle for conceptual metaphors, thus, to look carefully at the linguistic structure is reasonable, this structure is not just “surface noise” (Deignan 2007, 101-102; Low & Cameron 2002, 84).

Critical Discourse Analysis will not be applied in this study, as quantitative metaphor analysis, a method not typical for CDA will be carried out in this study. I will, however, consider Chilton’s notion of the culturally embedded nature of metaphors relevant, and this question will be addressed in this study to some degree, from the standpoint of *buy* and *sell* metaphors as intertwined with American business ideals. Mainly I will approach metaphors as a style and as a part of chosen ideological identity which may be reiterated by metaphor use.
3 Negative metaphors in news discourse

In this section I will provide some ideas on how negative evaluation can be conveyed with buy or sell metaphors. I will also analyze how partisan politics and the structure of news media can affect the language in American political discourse.

3.1 Negativity and metaphorical expressions

In a study on metaphor-based idioms and fixed expressions, Moon (1998) found out that 89% of these expressions have evaluative value (228). Even if the majority of metaphors are not idioms, evaluation may still be the raison d’être of metaphors, the essence of them, possibly because metaphors enable indirect expression of evaluation. Charteris-Black (2004, 33) argues that one of the major contributions provided by Corpus Linguistics concerns evaluation: it has been found to be inherent at the discourse level even when lexemes are not particularly evaluative. However, negative evaluation in language is a large research topic, and in this study, I do not pursue to discover anything specific on negativity in language in general. As I will classify expressions into negative, neutral or positive, it is yet reasonable to define some textual and contextual factors of negativity. The partisan use of negative metaphors in news discourse is the principal interest, it will be further explored in Section 3.2.

One objective point of departure to negativity is the definitions given in dictionaries for buy and sell expressions. In the Longman Dictionary (2005), for example, buy (as a figurative expression) is defined as to believe something that someone tells you, especially when it is not likely to be true. Many sell expressions, especially phrasal verbs, have a negative definition in dictionaries, such as sell out, tough sell, sell-by-date or sell short (The Oxford English Dictionary 1989). The etymology of proverbial sell expressions shows that the emerging expressions are often negative, such as sell one’s soul or sell someone down the river (ibid.).

BUY or SELL as literal expressions seem to carry no negative weight. When they are used as metaphors negatively, the connotation usually arises from the object or subject of buying or selling, other lexical environment or syntax. The interpersonal nature of metaphors is also relevant: a writer or a speaker can express his or her own opinions with
metaphors, quote directly someone else’s opinion or refer to these possible opinions indirectly. For example in some cases in election news, the writer seems to communicate the feelings of the electorate which (s)he does not seem to share. The following extract (3) illustrates this phenomenon:

(3) Find a plaid rock. Put a really good chameleon or a really good politician on a plaid rock, and they will turn plaid. Call it adaptability, call it retooling, call it selling out, it doesn't matter. It works. Al Gore's desire to become president overrode his own ego and made him willing to change his entire approach to campaigning. Bill Bradley, on the other hand, wasn't even willing to stop sucking on throat lozenges while giving his speeches. Gore became warm and fuzzy--many people vote based on which candidate they like most--while Bradley remained cool, reserved, and remote. From first day to last he gave the impression, accurate or not, that he liked The People more than he liked people. (Simon 2000)

Furthermore, there are different shades of negativity. Irony or asking rhetorical questions may provide a lighter negative frame than direct negativity. Example (4) shows how liberals may ironically frame Republican tax policies:

(4) Michael Boskin of Stanford filled the same role in Bush Senior's White House and participated in the heretical act (for Republican true believers) of raising the top income tax rate to reduce the deficit. These two and some others are no longer pilloried as sellouts by the hardcore supply-siders (Newt Gingrich, who led the back-bench rebellion against George Senior's tax increase, has since retired to the stud farm). (Greider 2000)

Another objective measure to gauge negativity is the use of no/not or other negative word in the context of metaphorical buy, which is more negative in general than sell. The particles no/not/never/none or other negative expressions (hardly, unlikely, doubt, refuse) are applied much more with metaphorical buy expressions than with literal buy expressions. In the election corpus of this study, for example, metaphorical buy expressions are used with negatives in 41% of the occurrences, whereas literal buy expressions are used with negatives in only 5% of the cases.

It is however important to bear in mind that a mere no or not does not make an expression negative from the pragmatic viewpoint: what is bought, the object, is usually the evaluative element. Especially in conservative media, not buying is often used as a testimonial phrase, as praise to someone’s sensibility or judgment. An example:

(5) There is nothing more dangerous to entrenched Washington power than a populist conservative who looks unlikely to buy into Washington's creature comforts. Take a close look at Governor Palin's record on ethics and energy in Alaska, and it becomes clear what this Beltway outburst is actually about. (“The Beltway Boys” 2008)

In this study, negativity will be defined along these practical lines: is a presidential candidate assessed to be a good candidate for President? Is a party assessed as likely to win the election in the context where the metaphorical expression is used? Is the
expression in the context for or against a specific candidate or a party? The identification of the targets of evaluation and the evaluative value of expressions will be further elaborated in Sections 4.4 and 4.5. Because the emphasis is on the evaluation of the candidates, it may sometimes be necessary to interpret a fairly long passage of text to determine whether the negativity (or positivity or neutrality) expressed with \textit{buy} or \textit{sell} metaphors relates to a candidate, his/her party or other target.

3.2 Partisan news discourse, political polarization and negativity in news in the United States

In this section, some aspects in American partisan news, polarization and negativity, will be addressed as possible factors increasing \textit{buy} and \textit{sell} metaphors in news language.

In general, both the content and presentation of news have been changing over the last 20 years. It has been said that news reporting today shows a tendency for personalization, dramatization and emotionalism (Scheithauer 2007, 76). This usually means a preference of human interest or conflict stories which are presented in simplified black-and-white, sentimental terms. It may also mean exaggeration of the controversial aspect. Sometimes this kind of news production has been called either “infotainment” (news presented as entertainment) or “confotainment” (news presented as controversies) (Lauerbach 2007, 1336). These trends should be found in election news, where drama and controversy are usually the prevailing topics and where soft news\textsuperscript{9} stories have increased. Furthermore, Cook (2001, 186) argues, that media cannot be called a monolith institution anymore, and its fragmented audiences cannot be considered a one, fixed audience. Fragmentation may be seen in the use of language that signifies in-group identity: metaphors may be one linguistic device for it, especially in partisan media.

Since the 1960s, visual media have taken over from the newspapers and magazines as primary sources for news (Cohen 2008, 58-66; Patterson 2002, 176), and television has been known to provide drama to elections, either real or produced (Gulati, Just & Crigler 2004, 241). In 1987, the Federal Communications Commission in the United States abolished the Fairness Doctrine: the companies having license on air waves were no

\textsuperscript{9}soft news = news on social or personal issues (family, health, food, travel or science, for instance) as against “hard news” (news on politics, crime or war).
longer required to broadcast balanced views on controversial public issues (Whittaker, Ramsey & Smith 2009, 10-11). The Telecommunications Act in 1996 further deregulated the restrictions in broadcasting (ibid. 11-12). Thus, in the 1990s, conservative talk radio and cable channels of every political affiliation joined the competition for audience and advertising (Gulati, Just & Crigler 2004, 246; Cohen 2008, 58-61).

In the 2000s, Internet emerged as a new force in the media environment, and blogs, YouTube and social media (such as Facebook) gained foothold very rapidly (Cohen 2008, 58-61). Cable news, for instance Fox News and MSNBC, have introduced a new kind of media sphere: more partisan news and news produced as entertainment (Coe, Tewksbury, Bond, Drogos, Porter, Yahn & Zhang 2008, 201-202; Gulati, Just & Crigler 2004, 243). The arrival of soft news followed the deregulation of broadcasting rules, and big broadcasting companies were forced to compete with the “infotainment” and human interest stories cable TV preferred (Patterson 2002, 76-78). In a study on news coverage of national government, clear evidence was found that news reports on national politics and public issues have significantly declined from 1980s to 2001 (Sinclair 2006, 334-335). In election news, reporting on polls, strategies, gaffes and controversies have become the prevailing topics, the “game-frame” (Gulati, Just & Crigler 2004, 240-241, PEW 2008). According to one study, 53% of news was so-called horse race news in the 2008 general election (PEJ 2008). All these changes in society may have influenced language in the news.

American political climate has long been described, justly or not (Galston & Nivola 2006, 5-10), as polarized. On the one hand, this polarization means divided government (Pfiffner 2000, 34): the majority in Congress and the President have been from opposite parties for 30 years, excluding the years 1993-1995, 2003-2007 and 2009-2010. On the other hand, polarization may mean growing or sharpening differences between conservative and liberal parties with regard to central political issues: the role of the federal government, taxes, education, foreign policy and several social issues (racial and gender equality, abortion, homosexual rights, religion’s role in public life, stem cell research, sex education in schools or gun control). Many of these issues date from the

---

10 horse race = elections presented as a competition only
1960s, when American society moved to the liberal end of the ideological spectrum. The opposite turn to more conservative direction took place in the 1980s: the decade saw the Reagan revolution, the creation of conservative think tanks and the re-alignment of the conservatives of different interests (Sinclair 2006, 36-66). In the 1980s, social conservatives, neoconservatives and business-oriented conservatives joined their forces and the Republican Party won three presidential elections in a row.

Substantial parts of the American electorate, though, have moved towards independent identity as a voter: registrations as an independent voter have been growing all the time since the 1950s (Pfiffner 2000, 33-34; Patterson 2002, 39-40, 42-44). In 2008, 37% of the voters in the United States identified themselves as independents (Bardes, Shelley, & Schmidt 2004, 280). Thus, in the elections the victorious presidential candidate has to appeal to this large center of voters (Pfiffner 2000, 30-31). Sometimes this political culture has been called more fragmented than ideology-driven: there are no central issues or parties that would gather voters into permanent coalitions (Pfiffner 2000, 35).

In the historical perspective, there has always been a wide variety of ideological branches in the United States. Some researchers wish to remind that the present parties and the present media are still less divisive than, for example, parties and media at the beginning of the 20th century or in the 1960s (Easterbrook 2006, 258; Galston & Nivola 2006, 5-10). Others simply claim that polarization is the price Americans have to pay for the First Amendment of the Constitution, freedom of speech (Easterbrook 2006, 257-258).

In general, though, a shift to more negative reporting has taken place in American news media. This trend has been confirmed especially in election news, even when the stories which address polls and campaign strategies have been excluded from studies (Patterson 1993, 66-77). It has sometimes been said that there is no conservative or liberal bias in American media, just a negative bias (Patterson 2002, 64-66). Even the tone of coverage of the presidents has become negative (Cohen 2008, 88-92), only national crises such as the pivotal event of 9/11 make media revert towards a more patriotic or elevated style (Patterson 2002, 65). Furthermore, there has been some debate on what is called a “structural bias”: losing candidates and candidates with poor poll numbers receive negative coverage regardless of the party (Gulati, Just & Crigler 2004, 239).
Some concerns have been raised over how media have been replacing the party process for example in the nomination of presidential candidates (Pfiffner 2000, 21; Patterson 1993, 267) and how media corporations have pushed their competitors from the market (Bagdikian 2004, 3). Thus, the original idea of free speech and free political participation has been said to be distorted. It has also been suggested that it is difficult to say which has been more influential in the rise of the negativity, partisan polarization or cable news, since these phenomena emerged in the same period, from the 1980s onwards (Cohen 2008, 100-101).

With respect to language use, it is probable that conservative and liberal argumentation have not remained unchanged by these changes in media in general. The comparison of the election news with the comparison corpora, for instance Fox News corpus, should reveal something of this development. The election news data in this study is to a large extent based on opinion periodicals: nearly all articles in the liberal subcorpus are from high quality journals and ca. 72% of the conservative subcorpus articles as well. There is a long and worthy tradition of opinion magazines in the United States: the conservative National Review and the liberal The Nation, for instance, have been commenting politics for decades and they are respected as voices of ideological criticism (The Nation 2011, National Review 2011). Their circulation is not very wide, but they have a certain status in the political sphere. Yet a format change may have taken place in these partisan magazines in the 2000s: blogging has become a major format in written political discourse, and many longer, reflective articles are now published both in print and online (Cohen 2008, 58-61). With the advent of blogs, interaction between journalists and readers may have moved from Letters to the Editor section to the sphere of blogs, where responses are more immediate. As a consequence, there should be changes in the language of these up-market, even elitist political journals in the election corpus.

It is not possible in the frame of this paper to study how the immediate response factor advanced by blogging (or other ‘ubiquity’ factors in the information age) has contributed to the language of the political magazines. However, it is reasonable to assume that polarization, negativity, increased colloquialism, the “game-frame” in elections and a more rapid news production process have enhanced the number of buy and sell metaphors, since they are informal and tend to be used negatively.
4 The data and the method

In this section, I will describe the contents of the election news corpus in detail. The comparison corpora are also described (conservative and liberal news magazines, cable TV and radio). I will also outline how an expression is defined as metaphorical in this study. The metaphor identification procedure applied will be illustrated in Section 4.3. All concordance searches were carried out with AntConc3.2.1 concordance program. The results of comparisons will be shown as standardized frequencies of occurrences per one million words (for short, hereon: sf), if not otherwise noted. In the comparisons of occurrences, the differences are sometimes reported in percentages. These percentages are based on the standardized frequencies, not the absolute numbers (the Sections 5 and 7.6 are exceptions). Detailed information about the expressions defined as metaphorical and classified as having a positive, negative or neutral evaluation is in the Appendix B.

4.1 The election corpus

There are 1 392 articles in the election corpus, of which 753 are conservative and 639 liberal. The corpus data of 2008 were mostly compiled from a website RealClearPolitics, which is a center-right oriented political website offering a daily collection of news from other media outlets. This compilation took place during two periods: from May 2007 to October 2007, and from August 2008 to October 2008, to cover both the primary period and the general election period. In addition, some material was compiled directly from major media websites, for example The Wall Street Journal's website. With regard to partisan lines, I have included in the corpus only the evident, self-proclaimed conservative or liberal publications. As a result, the articles are mostly from well-known periodicals or newspapers and there may be more opinion articles than news reports in the corpus.

The corpus data for 2000 and 2004 elections was compiled from electronic media archives in the summer of 2010. The major publications in the 2008 corpus were now chosen as sources, in order to make 2000, 2004 and 2008 corpora comparable with each other. The 2000 and 2004 corpora were created by doing searches with words such as Bush, Gore, McCain, Bradley, Gephardt, Dean, Kerry, Edwards, primary, primaries, caucus, Iowa, New Hampshire, presidential, election, electorate, electoral, Democratic,
Republican, candidate or candidates. The articles thus found were then chosen if the major theme was a candidate in that election (one of the nine). The publications (and their word count) in the election corpus are as follows:

**Table 2. The publications in the election corpus.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>conservative media</th>
<th>word count</th>
<th>liberal media</th>
<th>word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The American Conservative</td>
<td>6 208</td>
<td>The American Prospect</td>
<td>114 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American Spectator</td>
<td>81 436</td>
<td>The Huffington Post (online)</td>
<td>2 477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Thinker (online)</td>
<td>15 895</td>
<td>In These Times (online)</td>
<td>2 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arizona Republic</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>The Nation</td>
<td>172 097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg (online)</td>
<td>9 213</td>
<td>The New Republic</td>
<td>186 776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boston Herald</td>
<td>1 825</td>
<td>The New Yorker</td>
<td>147 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary Magazine</td>
<td>7 026</td>
<td>Rolling Stone</td>
<td>21 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Christian Science Monitor</td>
<td>1 084</td>
<td>Salon (online)</td>
<td>153 607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>4 400</td>
<td>Slate (online)</td>
<td>34 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Events</td>
<td>20 607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Review</td>
<td>160 517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RealClearPolitics-blogs (online)</td>
<td>45 430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhall (online)</td>
<td>1 461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Leader</td>
<td>527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. News and World Report</td>
<td>97 328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Washington Times</td>
<td>12 827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Weekly Standard</td>
<td>116 058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wall Street Journal</td>
<td>204 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>786 017</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>834 733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corpora of 2000 and 2004 do not have so great a number of publications as the corpus of 2008, because of the limited archives: the archive of *The New Yorker* for 2000 is not free, for example, and the archives for *Slate* or *The Washington Times* in 2000 do not exist. With regard to the 2000 subcorpus, it may not be as representative as the others, because in the years 1999 and 2000 electronic archiving may not have been

---

11The decision to collect data from RealClearPolitics.com was made in order to apply at least some degree of randomized, semi-objective data selection. The greater number of conservative publications is due to this choice, since the site seemed to offer a larger selection of conservative media than liberal. See also section 6 on the article length.
regular or consistent. However, the compilation process showed that there was a saturation point at the level of ca. 190 000 words, after which the standardized frequency of *buy* or *sell* metaphors did not notably change.

When divided into two parts following the ideological lines, the conservative subcorpus is 786 817 words and the liberal subcorpus 834 788 words. When divided into smaller subcorpora, the word counts are as follows:

**Table 3. Partisanship and the subcorpus word count in the election corpus.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>partisanship</th>
<th>election 2000</th>
<th>election 2004</th>
<th>election 2008</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>262 484</td>
<td>224 181</td>
<td>300 152</td>
<td>786 817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal</td>
<td>225 205</td>
<td>283 419</td>
<td>326 109</td>
<td>834 733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>487 689</td>
<td>507 824</td>
<td>626 261</td>
<td>1 621 550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the aim was to include in the corpus the basic, most typical text types in the written subgenre of political news, news reports and opinion articles were preferred as data. I have generally attempted to avoid any conscious topic choice when copying the articles, so as to achieve a wide range of topics (although the candidates were the principal interest, not any general issues). The only topics or text types that I have consciously discarded are polling news, interviews, book reviews and articles about the candidates’ spouses—although the last principle is fairly difficult to follow regarding Bill Clinton, not only a spouse, but a former President. Interviews resemble more spoken discourse, polling news are not by nature interpretative and thus may not have many metaphors (at least, not *buy* or *sell*), and book reviews represent a different genre.

**4.2 The comparison corpora: news magazines, Fox News, MSNBC, Limbaugh and National Public Radio**

The election corpus is compared with three different news corpora: conservative and liberal news magazines, conservative and liberal cable TV news and conservative and liberal/moderate radio news. The four subgenre corpora word counts are as follows:
Table 4. Word count in different corpora.\textsuperscript{12}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word count</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>786 817</td>
<td>834 733</td>
<td>1 621 550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>2 093 964</td>
<td>1 736 062</td>
<td>3 830 026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV</td>
<td>3 298 924</td>
<td>814 156</td>
<td>4 113 080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio</td>
<td>1 226 972</td>
<td>3 037 749</td>
<td>4 264 721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>7 406 677</td>
<td>6 422 700</td>
<td>13 829 377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The news magazines corpus is comprised of these publications found in the COCA news and opinion magazines section over the years 2000-2008: Harper’s Magazine, The Mother Jones and The Washington Monthly for the liberal media, The American Spectator, National Review, U.S. News and World Report and USA Today Magazine for the conservative media. In Fox News, programs such as Brit Hume show, Greta Van Susteren show, Hannity and Colmes show, Bill O’Reilly show, John Gibson show and Fox Sunday show comprise the largest part of the conservative cable TV corpus. In the liberal cable TV corpus (MSNBC), Joe Scarborough show, Chris Matthews show and Keith Olbermann show account for 57% of the words, and in the National Public Radio corpus Talk Nation, All Things Considered, Daybreak and Morning Edition shows for 68% of the words. In the Appendix C there is information on the comparison corpora in detail.

There is a difference in the time span between the Fox News and MSNBC corpora: MSNBC corpus is from 2004-2006, as none other period was available in the COCA, whereas from the FOX News subcorpus, I have selected the years 2001-2008. The Limbaugh data is from the 1992-1996 (none other available) and the NPR (National Public Radio) data is from the years 2005-2008.

There are somewhat different program or article types in these corpora, and hence metaphor use may vary. The main difference between the election news corpus and the comparison corpora is that both conservative and liberal news magazines and the center-

\textsuperscript{12} The numbers on three comparison corpora from The Contemporary Corpus of American English are based on information given by Mark Davies on the www.americancorpus.org site. The latest information update was April 12\textsuperscript{th}, 2011.
left *National Public Radio* publish or broadcast not only political news, but, for example, news on financial, educational or environmental issues. News on books, entertainment, life style or health are also frequent, and in *Harper’s Magazine* there is a tradition of literary essays. In the Fox News corpus, the data is mostly from political talk shows, but there are some business shows also, such as *Neil Cavuto* which accounts for ca. 10% of the Fox News corpus used in this study. Some other shows (*John Gibson* or *Bill O’Reilly* for instance) have a mixed program profile: a selection of topical issues, political or other.

### 4.3 The identification of metaphorical expressions based on buy and sell

The lemmas of *buy* and *sell* in the four subgenre corpora were manually analyzed and expressions were classified into metaphorical and non-metaphorical. There are 3 137 *buy* occurrences and 2 278 *sell* occurrences in all the corpora together (Table 5).

**Table 5. The numbers of all buy and sell expressions in the election corpus and in the comparison corpora.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>buy, all occurrences N = 3 137</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>1 622</td>
<td>1 487</td>
<td>3 137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sell, all occurrences N = 2 278</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>1 072</td>
<td>1 206</td>
<td>2 278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After closely reading and analyzing the contexts of potential metaphors, the occurrences were then classified as metaphorical or non-metaphorical. When a discourse event potentially metaphorical is identified, there are several factors to be taken into account:
the discourse units, which may include marginally metaphorical parts and parts either larger or smaller than a lexical unit,

• the paradigmatic or syntactic aspects of the metaphorical phenomenon (such as the object of the verb *buy* or *sell*, unusual use of syntax or defining the paradigm of *buy* or *sell*), and

• defining the Vehicle and the Topic: is there any incongruity or tension between them?

As the objective of this study is to analyze also more complex structures of figurative speech, the focus was at the discourse level in the identification of possible metaphorical expressions. It should be noted, though, that there are some metaphorical phenomena in which Topic is difficult to locate, such as ellipsis or substitution (Low & Cameron 2002, 87; Cameron 2003, 10-11). These occurrences will be analyzed on the basis of the other aspects of metaphor: the utterance level, the discourse co-text, the grammatical function or the metaphorical resonance, for example.

As I will compare metaphorical and literal occurrences in Section 7, this identification process affects also the number of literal occurrences. I have excluded the nouns *buyer* and *seller* from the paradigm of *buy* and *sell*, except for the expression *buyer’s remorse*, which occurs only in its metaphorical sense. The metonymic *a buy* and *a sell* are included but only the expression *a tough/hard/difficult/soft/easy sell* occurs frequently as a metaphor. New coinages of verbs such *unsell out*, *oversell* or *resell* are included, as well as an adjective *sellable*. Some idiomatic or proverbial expressions, such as *buy time* or *sell a bill of goods* are included. Proper names (e.g. *The Best Buy*, *The Selling of The President*) and compounds (e.g. *best-selling* or *best-seller*) are excluded.

Because my American informants\(^{13}\) think that *to buy votes*, *to buy a Senator*, *buy influence*, *favors* or *legislation* are synonyms with *bribe* and have no clear figurative sense, these expressions are not included as metaphorical. The same applies for *buy off*.

---

\(^{13}\) Eugene Holman, Joseph Flanagan. It is yet possible that there are metaphoricity clines in some expressions, such as *buy votes*, as Joseph Flanagan underscored (e-mail to author 27\(^{th}\) Sept, 2011).
4.3.1 The identification of the most usual types of buy or sell metaphors

I will give some examples of how the metaphor identification was conducted. Example (6) shows a typical way of using sell as a metaphor in political discourse:

(6) MR RUSSERT Senator Chafee, one of your Republican colleagues we talked about earlier, Lindsey Graham, "[sic]Who has spent weeks attempting to recruit Democratic support for a plan to restructure Social Security, said that Republican [sic], made a strategic mistake' by initially focusing on a proposal to create individual investment accounts.... He said the accounts by themselves will not fix the solvency problem Social Security faces as baby boomers begin to retire. We've now got this huge fight over a sideshow. It's always been a sideshow, but we sold it as a main event."

SEN CHAFEE Yes, he's making some good points, and as I said, there are other ways to address Social Security: raising the caps, indexing for inflation. These go a long way to addressing the solvency. (Meet The Press, 2005)

Senator Chafee is asked about the measures to reform Social Security in the United States when president George W. Bush had proposed private saving accounts as a way to proceed (Social Security is a federal program called Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance, OASDI). Tim Russert formulates this effort in his question as It's always been a sideshow, but we sold it as a main event. Sold in this context means offering to be accepted. Alternatively sold can also be interpreted to mean the quite vigorous political process where the President and others give public speeches and interviews on the subject to create political momentum. The discourse unit is one word, sold, but the sense of sold is elaborated in the context with the object main event (and the sideshow). Main event and sideshow reflect the relative importance of the offered solutions. The Vehicle for this metaphor is commercial transaction and the Topic is political action or process. Perhaps surprisingly, the metaphor sold does not sound odd in a context where the Topic is related to finances.

Here is another example (7) from the radio corpus, from a National Public Radio talk show on the same topic, Social Security:

(7) But what's clearly the case here is that on Capitol Hill, which is a very important audience, the president had a very rough week. He wasn't about, Alex, trying to sell the American public [sic]. He was about trying to sell other Republicans [sic]. You had Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist saying that the pacing of the legislation is going to be up to the public, initially sounding as if he was putting it off and distancing himself from the plan. (Chadwick 2005)

At first glance, it seems that there is something missing, because the President is perhaps not selling (in the sense of to betray) the American public or Republicans: there is no object of what or where to he is selling them nor a phrase sell out. In this extract from spoken data, the speaker leaves out the preposition to, but to identify this as metaphor, it
can be assumed that the discourse context requires that the sense is sell to, to offer for consideration or acceptance. The Vehicle is commercial transaction and the Topic is the President’s political proposals.

As for metaphors based on buy, here is example (8) of a buy metaphor in the sense to believe. The Vehicle is commercial transaction and the Topic is tax cut proposal:

(8) If so, the turf belongs to him. In this week's poll, on almost every major domestic issue, voters prefer Mr. Kerry; on some, such as health care, he has widened his advantage in recent months. Although Mr. Bush retains a small edge on taxes, voters buy the Democrat’s argument on rolling back the tax cuts for wealthier Americans. There are a couple of sleeper issues, like stem-cell research, that Sen. Kerry hasn't capitalized on yet. There's a lot to work with. (Hunt 2004)

Here is another, a more problematic buy metaphor (9):

(9) PRICE-HEADLEY-BIG: I think so, Neil. I mean we've seen a lot of complacency among investors. You know, usually, when the summer lulls and everybody starts to not worry about the market anymore, it gets a little bit time to worry. And so were expecting that the next few months could be time to go to a safe haven portfolio, looking for stocks like Newmont Mining, for example, as a gold stock. I think, you know, Mets, 18 percent. The S&P is up 10 percent. That's a great place to be over the next year. I'm saying watch out below.!

CAVUTO: What about you, Tony?!

TONY-DWYER-FTN-MI: Yes, I do not -- I do not buy the big sell-off. [sic] I mean to get a big sell-off, you're going to have to have bad news and not just complacency. You're also going to have to get bad news, and the news is not getting worse. The news is getting better. Now I think certain IT companies like Microsoft, for instance...!

CAVUTO: Information technology.!

DWYER:... yes -- have been sort of overvalued based on their growth.14 (Cavuto 2003)

The Vehicle is commercial action and the Topic is the expectations in the stock market which can lead to big sell-off. That a literal sell-off can be used with this buy metaphor indicates a very high level of conventionality of this metaphor type. Example (9) shows how identifying metaphors in spoken discourse may be difficult because of the fuzzy context in transcripts: spoken communication often relies on repetition and on the possibility of clarification if needed. Hence, a metaphor intentionally produced by a speaker and understood as a metaphor by a recipient is not easy to identify in transcripts.

---

14 Neil Cavuto show seems to be a difficult show to transcribe based on the numerous exclamation marks and elliptic sentences. I did not mark the extract with [sic] because it would have made the text difficult to read.
4.3.2 Borderline cases in identification

The main borderline type that is excluded as a metaphor is to buy in the sense of to bribe. As dictionaries state that buy off is a synonym for bribe, that phrasal expression is also excluded, even though in some cases it can mean trading of something else than money.

There are 85 borderline expressions of this type in the corpora. Here are four examples of the excluded expressions:

(10) It is the political convention of political conventions to pretend that political platforms matter. They don't. They are merely a way to buy off people who care deeply about issues, but can be bought off with the right language in political platforms. It's hard to imagine any President telling his advisers to follow a particular policy because of the language in his party's platform. This doesn't work for the poohbahs who are here to relive the good old days when conventions, like the press, really mattered. (Berman 2007)

(11) What ever happened to John McCain's outrage at the Swift Boat ads and at Bush's failure to condemn them? McCain now says "I'd like to see him go furrier. But I'm not making this some kind of big issue." Was McCain bought off by the prominent speaking slot he was given at the Republican National Convention? Or was he promised a major cabinet post when Powell or Rumsfeld retires? The New Republic's Franklin Foer thinks it's because McCain still harbors presidential ambitions, for which he needs to burnish his regular Republican credentials. (Peters 2004)

(12) Sanctioning Tyranny? joy [sic] Gordon's thesis that Iraqis suffer because of economic sanctions and not because of Saddam Hussein "Cool War," November 2002 is sadly mistaken. Iraq's economy was already in shambles when I left the country in July 1980. Saddam was spending whatever money there was on weaponry. Rundown schools and hospitals were everywhere; water and electricity shortages were common. Yes, education was free, but only because Saddam used it to spread his propaganda. Yes, Saddam offered free medical care, but health care was used to buy ideological loyalty. To be treated in one of the better hospitals, you had to have a letter from a Baath Party official stating that you were a loyal member. (Biddle 2003)

(13) From 2004 onward, however, McCain has been moving rightward again, emphasizing his support for the Iraq War and the War on Terror. So far, this move appears to have cost him support among independent voters and reporters without buying him many friends on the right. Conservatives still have the impression of him they formed when he was tacking left. Besides, even in the last two years he has taken some stands to which a lot of conservatives object. (Ponnuru 2007)

As an example how a sell expression can have some metaphorical resonance, but is yet excluded, here is a passage describing how the John Edwards's campaign is selling a briefing book:

(14) Edwards's ads have been the inverse of Dean's. While Dean never talks about his upbringing and has yet to flesh out a comprehensive governing philosophy, Edwards's first ads were soft biographical spots highlighting his humble roots, and his latest ads emphasize his policy proposals. Like no other candidate, Edwards has a laser-like focus on specific policies that affect Americans in their everyday lives, from health insurance for children to help with tuition costs to reducing the burden of consumer debt. The campaign has so much faith in the power of specificity that its latest commercial mocks the whole idea of the political ad. "John Edwards believes America's challenges require more than can be said in thirty-second ads," says the voice-over--somewhat ironically, given how kind the 30-second ad has been to the senator's career. The spot consists mostly of a quote from, er, The New Republic, praising Edwards's domestic policy and offers viewers a phone number to order the senator's 64-page
This ‘selling’ could be ambiguous in the sense that a briefing book ‘sells’ (promotes) candidate Edwards as well.

There is one expression which seems to refer to a purchase both literally and figuratively, with phrases people were too invested and bought into an illusion. I have included this expression as metaphorical:

(15) He took prospective buyers on aerial tours, so they could scout property from the clouds. That many buyers would have no equity until the property was entirely paid off did not deter them. On opening day May 21, 1958, Phillips made $4.25 million. Two years and another $20 million in sales later, Phillips pulled out. He'd drawn back his curtain, but people were too invested to admit that they'd bought into an illusion. The Holly Corporation promptly pursued making Phillips's dream a reality. (Jeffrey 2002)

There is a case (16) where the object resentment is unusual with buy and hence in the context it is ambiguous, but I have included this as metaphorical:

(16) Steven Inskeep: How long do you think it took for America’s image to decline, and how long do you think it’ll take for it to get back?  
Undersecretary HUGHES: Well, it’s been decades. In my own lifetime, I remember living overseas. I grew up, my dad was in the Army, and my mother always used to tell me that we were such a generous country, and yet we only bought resentment sometimes from the countries we tried to help. Yeah, one of my frustrations as a communicator is that a lot of times people don't even know what we've done. I was in Latin America, and on the way down, I asked our Latin America expert how much we had increased development assistance to Latin America during President Bush's administration. We've doubled development assistance to Latin America during President Bush's administration, and not one leader I met with knew that. (Inskeep 2006)

Bought seems to refer to the result of helping foreign countries financially, and resentment is a side effect of this help. It could be said that this expression is a variation that belongs to the semantic field of bribe which buy shares.

4.3.3 Similes and proverbs

One perhaps unexpected result is that in this data there are few similes based on stem word buy or sell. Some are more complex and can be interpreted only at the utterance level, such as this:

(17) Even when they are aligned perfectly with the organization's strategic goals, many projects fail because there is an assumption that they somehow will be implemented, as if by magic. Like a shopper on a buying spree forgetting how the credit card bills will be paid or even how all the stuff will fit in the car the organization's leaders often fail to plan resource deployment so projects do not bump into each other or have teams squabble over common resources. (Graham 2006)
In this extract, the Topic is governing projects and the Vehicle is shopping behavior. Poor project management is directly compared with impulse shopping without required funds or transport for the things bought. The form of simile points out directly to weaknesses in managing several projects at the same time, although the content of this criticism depends on what one thinks of mounting credit card bills or delivering an overload of stuff home. In this case, the metaphorical discourse unit is the entire clause starting with the signal of comparison *like*.

In one news article, a commercial simile is a starting point of the theme of presidential candidates as brands:

(18) **IT'S NO STARTLING** insight to point out that presidential candidates sell themselves as if they were breakfast cereal or laundry detergent. So it was perhaps inevitable that this would be taken a step further by studying consumers . . . er, voters . . . along these same lines. Accordingly, a new survey asked respondents to define the candidates in terms of popular advertising brands. Bush supporters, for example, think Mr. Bush is Bud Light and Mr. Kerry is Heineken. Kerry backers see Mr. Bush as IBM and Mr. Kerry as Dell. (Steinberg 2004)

Most of the comparisons are rather indirect, such as examples (19) and (20):

(19) Candidates as cars: **Would you rather buy a used car from Bush or Gore?** The site asks people to select the kind of car each candidate reminds them of. Mr. Gore has slipped several percentage points lately, according to www.autotrader.com, as his car image has been changing among the company's target audience (blue-collar workers age 21 to 45). (Heinauer 2000)

(20) In some respects, Kerry has been running a campaign more suitable for re-electing an incumbent senator: Look at my résumé, look at my record, look at my advisers. But as Ralph Whitehead, professor of public service at the University of Massachusetts, observes, "**If you want to sell a vacuum cleaner, you don't talk about its virtue, you demonstrate it. And Kerry has not yet demonstrated his assets.** He talks about them. On the other hand, with his strong position against the war, Dean has led." (Corn 2003)

In example (19), candidates Bush and Gore are compared with used-car salesmen, an old adage of asking if someone is trustworthy. In the example (20), candidate Kerry’s campaign tactics is illustrated as poor by comparing him with a salesman who does not show the product but only talks of it. In all these cases, some aspect of political action is compared with commercial action.

---

15 In this example, two different, unrelated metaphorical expressions based on cars are applied: the used car salesman and candidates as cars. I will address only the first one which is based on sell verb and identify the Vehicle as commercial action.
There is one occurrence of sell in which a hypothetical structure and a hyperbole are applied (21):

(21) The desperation of the supply-siders is most apparent in the columns of the Journal's editorial page, which harbors the most fervent apostles of the Laffer curve. This essential tenet of supply-side theory holds that tax hikes cannot raise government revenue because tax increases will slow down the economy, leaving the government larger chunks of a smaller pie. The Journal has frequently illustrated the point with a chart purporting to show that federal tax revenues have never risen above 20 percent of GDP and, therefore, never will. According to the Journal's logic, the upper-bracket rate hikes of 1990 and 1993 should have so devastated the economy that by now people would be selling off their tooth fillings and clubbing rats for food. It hasn't quite worked out that way, of course. (Chait 1999)

In this case, selling off is literal, but the entire comparison can be understood as figurative. Selling off their tooth fillings and clubbing rats for food refer to the financial destitution which never took place. It can be asked if this expression is figurative and especially if the verb sell counts as metaphorical. I have included this expression as metaphorical.

Then there are proverbs or other fixed expressions, such as sell one's soul, sell your birthright or sell someone down the river. There are four expressions of this type in the corpora. Here is one example:

(22) HAGERTY: Towey says if the court had gone the other way, the entire faith-based initiative could have been jeopardized. And he says the ruling comes at a critical time. After Hurricane Katrina, he says, religious groups rushed to the scene, and the government not only plans to reimburse some of them but wants them to play a larger role.

Mr-TOWEY: I think it's going to bolster an awareness by governors and mayors that it's safe to partner with faith-based groups. I think it's going to tell faith-based groups, Oh, we can do this work without having to secularize and sell our soul in order to provide a public service.'[sic] It's a complete vindication of President Bush's Faith-Based and Community Initiative. (Norris 2005)

There is a resonance in this expression, because the context is religion’s role in political sphere: the verb secularize creates ambiguity as it seems to be literal.

4.3.4 Discourse metaphors and comparisons

Metaphor can occur in a longer stretch of discourse where the metaphorical resonance is created with metaphorical, marginally metaphorical and literal elements together. In the election corpus, there is this stretch of discourse in which the senses are related to each other and together create metaphorical sense:

(23) "Politicians can't be overexposed," said Mr. Della Femina, the famous ad man. "Since they can have a life and death effect on us, no one gets tired of them. This is not, 'Am I going to get tired of Bruce Willis?' We're stuck with them. Given how much power they have, eight months of campaigning is a
drop. They are the only people selling a product you can't return. You're buying a president for four years." (Henninger 2004)

In buying a president for four years, the sense is that a vote cannot be canceled and ousting the president is impossible. Thus, there is a direct comparison of a presidential election and a commercial action in the passage as a whole. The verbs sell or buy are not metaphorical as such. The words product, return, sell and buy together constitute the comparison, but none of them are clearly metaphorical by themselves. The reference to the movie star Bruce Willis also reinforces the ‘presidents as products’ comparison. Although this occurrence can be identified as metaphor in its entirety, it is not possible to say which discourse unit is metaphorical. So there is a specification problem. The Vehicle can be identified as commercial customer satisfaction, the Topic is the unsatisfactory level of information on presidential candidates. The cline of metaphoricity is also well represented by this example, and the identification must be made at the utterance level. There is incongruity in the utterances they are the only people selling a product you can't return and you're buying a president for four years, because a president is not a commodity on sale, and election follows different rules than a commercial action. Because the activated sense, satisfaction, has been created in the co-text before these expressions occur, these utterances are easily understood.

Even a highly conventional metaphor, such as buy time, can be reformulated in discourse in a way that requires not only identification but also interpretation:

(24) To put all this in context: Defense secretary Robert Gates admitted candidly in mid-March that without sectarian reconciliation among Iraqis the strategy won't work. Indeed, the entire point of the surge is to bring such reconciliation about by, in Gates’ words, “buying the Iraqis time,” [sic] But that’s the problem. The United States is ever more dearly buying time, and Iraq is ever more freely spending it. As this article goes to press, the parliament is set to embark on a two-month vacation, during which, if current trends hold, 200 more American troops will be killed. The Democratic Party, fresh from its wins in the midterm elections, understands this. (“The Bitter End” 2007).

In this case, the direct quote by Gates, buying the Iraqis time, is somewhat unclear. The Vehicle is elusive as the usual buy time sense (to delay something in the hope of a better result) does not fit this context. It is possible that the Secretary of Defense Gates meant to use the phrase buy up, which literally means to buy quickly something as much as possible (Longman 2005). In the later reformulation the writer adopts Gates’s phrase, and a more complicated sense of time being not of essence in preventing violence becomes manifest with the phrase dearly buying time. In addition, the commodity aspect of time is
activated with the new formulation *spending time freely*. The Topic is the war in Iraq in which the American actions are not deemed to be successful. The metaphorical sense is created at the utterance level, in which *buy* and *time* lexemes resonate as ambiguous expressions, as do *dearly, freely* and *spending* as well. They are fit for both literal and metaphorical interpretation: *dearly* (with cost), *freely* (without boundaries or without cost) and *spending* (lose or use).

In example (25), there is no comparison, but the utterance is hypothetical and not literal in some sense:

(25) The political press is abuzz with overblown stories of a Clinton-Obama rift. There are some hard feelings, but less than you'd think, given the closeness of the primaries. But I have a seven-point plan for uniting the Obama and Clinton wings of the party: Attack, attack, attack, attack, attack, attack. The way to unite an internally divided organization is to identify an external threat. The Obama delegates will be buying beers for the Clinton delegates once they're focused on how disastrous a third term for Bush-McCain would be. But no one is telling them. If the Democrats do not spend the remaining days of their convention -- hell, the remaining days of the campaign -- in an all-out assault on the ruinous Bush-McCain policies, they will lose. (Begala 2008)

In this case, the hypothetical prediction of how the Clinton delegates she won in the primaries will become Obama supporters in the Democratic National Convention is described with the phrase *The Obama delegates will be buying beers for the Clinton delegates*. The *buying* act is a pragmatic reference either to persuasion, bonhomie or gratitude expressed as *buying drinks*. The ambivalence of the sense arises from the pronoun *they* in *they're focused*: they can refer either to all delegates, to Obama delegates or to Clinton delegates. There is some part of the Topic missing: the conversion of the Clinton delegates to Obama supporters extremely rapidly, perhaps? If the basis for metaphor is that the verb *buy* should be metaphorical, this expression should be excluded. There is no incongruity or tension in the verb *buy* or in at the utterance level. Hence I have excluded it.

Some of the more unusual objects of *buying* or *selling* are *peanut butter, dog food, blue sky, sermon* and *sunshine*:

(26) Bauer manager Frank Cannon says Mr. Forbes is rejected merchandise. With Mr. Forbes losing in 1996 and spending an estimated $60 million on his current campaign, Mr. Cannon says, conservatives "know him, and they're not buying that brand of peanut butter", (Calmes 1999)

(27) There, flipping pork, was Lamar Alexander -- an eminently decent and qualified man who has visited 64 of Iowa's 99 counties, but just can't sell the dog food. (Tapper 1999)
(28) Obama merely needs to make the case that he's serious enough, so that when his ideas are matched with his charisma, he can build a national consensus for policies better than any other candidate. "We all bought Bill Clinton's blue sky," says Iowa Waterloo County Democratic Chairwoman Teresa Wolf, who is not backing a candidate. "Why not Obama's as long as it's a blue sky." (Dickerson 2007)

(29) Bush and Gore Are Making Religion a Big Issue, and Praying Voters Buy The Sermon It's been generations since so many politicians have talked so much about Jesus--and their personal relationship with him. Just back from a jog, George W. Bush is game to talk more. He slings a towel over his shoulder and plops into a seat on the patio of the Texas governor's mansion. "What are we talking about?" Faith. "Good. I like talking about faith." Five minutes later, he's discoursing on the Crucifixion and whether Jews can enter heaven. ("Governors don't decide that.") (Dickerson 2007)

(30) "The fun... the sunshine, the relaxation. Our idea is to get the public to go see a ball game, win or lose," said P.K., who then told a young Bill Veeck, who would later become one of the greatest impresarios in the history of baseball, to lant [sic] the ivy. It was his way of selling the fans the sunshine. (Cohen 2001)

The sense of peanut butter and dog food is that a candidate cannot make himself accepted by the voters. Blue sky and sunshine are figurative expressions for some idealistic, too-good-to-be-true character of things. When voters buy the sermon, they accept the talk about religion the candidates make. Sermon is in the context a metonymy for religion.

Then there are three rather extraordinary occurrences: I don't want them buying all the chairs, sell chopsticks and swing voters are voters you can rent but not buy:

(31) Both Obama and Clinton have talked about bringing all interested parties to the table to create universal health insurance. But Obama, who like Edwards distinguishes himself from Clinton by refusing contributions from political action committees and Washington lobbyists, also says, "I don't mind insurance and drug companies having a seat at the table. I just don't want them buying all the chairs." (Moberg 2007)

(32) "If Mr. Zhu Rongji had come to see me in the Oval Office as he saw Bill Clinton, I would have told him, 'Sir, you're going to stop persecuting Christians. You're going to stop bullying our friends on Taiwan. You're going to stop pointing missiles at us. Or you're going to have sold your last pair of chopsticks in any mall in the United States of America.'" ("On the Stump at Ames" 1999)

(33) You can bet that between now and November, both candidates will be trying mightily to make that connection. "Swing voters are voters, you can rent, but you can't buy," says Goeas. "They don't lock in permanently. Either you have to be there constantly or be the last one they're talking to." (Allen, Cohen, Smith & Tobin 2000)

In example (31), candidate Obama takes a stance on the role of the insurance companies in the prospective negotiations over health care reform. An idiom a seat at the table which means having a say/power, participating in decision making, is used to describe the role of the insurance companies. A seat at the table is reformulated into I just don't want them buying all the chairs. Buy seems to be used in the sense that comes close of the sense
bribe. Seat is converted into chairs. Chair is a metonymy for a table, and in this idiom it is a table at which negotiations take place. Hence, there seems to be a chain of metonymies: negotiations > a table > a seat/chair at the table.

In example (32), there is a metonymic phrase *Or you're going to have sold your last pair of chopsticks in any mall in the United States of America.* *Going to have sold* is not metaphorical as such, because the larger context is China’s export to The United States, and *selling* is the essence of export. *Chopsticks,* in contrast, is metonymic, a part for the whole. In addition, it is a pejorative expression referring to Chinese products and how unessential or poor they are. There is also another metonymic structure, *any mall* for the domestic market of the United States. If the basis of a metaphor is defined in the largest possible context, it can be said that it is hardly sensible to assume that China’s premier Zhu Rongji would personally enter a mall in the United States to *sell* chopsticks. Therefore, the expression is metaphorical. The verb *sell* in *sell chopsticks* is a borderline case, it should be excluded if only the metaphorical value of words based on *sell* is a criterion for inclusion. Yet the utterance level is highly figurative, and it also represents a contrafactual structure: Pat Buchanan, from whose speech this citation is, was never elected President of the United States.

When swing voters are referred to *voters you can rent and not buy,* as in example (33), the voters are compared to commodities. Yet it is interesting that in this case, one of the most usual senses of *buy,* to bribe, is not activated. Grammatically, *voters you can buy,* is a phrase similar to expressions often used in the sense of bribe. *Rent* could even strengthen the bribing scenario, but in fact it does the opposite, it disambiguates the sense from bribe to something else. The inconstancy of the support from swing voters is revealed as the sense of this expression (because renting is a temporary thing). The fickleness of swing voters becomes clear in the next sentence which describes the relationship with them. Different elements of *buy* become activated and this may explain the difference between the senses: when *buy* is used in the meaning of bribe, the (criminal) possession element of transaction is activated, but when *buy* and *rent* are used in the sense implied in this extract, the nature of possession as relative or conditional is activated. *Buy* has the sense of ‘becoming a constant supporter’.
Lastly, there is a phrase the better buy. In example (34), candidates Gore and Bush in the election of 2000 are compared by using a phrase: they know who is the better buy [sic].

(34) If elected, Bush will have a mandate and a majority to enact the reforms. Worse, he’ll get bipartisan cover from the New Democrats, the money wing of the Democratic Party. He’s also for negating the minimum wage, leaving it to the states; dismantling environmental regulation; repealing affirmative action, limiting a woman’s right to choose; and generally frontline for the corporate leveraged buyout of government. Think of the Gingrich Congress without Clinton’s veto. That’s why corporations are flooding the Republican Party with record contributions. They know who is the better buy [sic]. (Borosage 2000)

A buy is here metonymic: the result for the process, a noun derived from the verb. In addition, the phrase is elliptic: who refers to Bush, who has been named, and to Gore, and Gore has not been named. This phrase resonates significantly with the sense of buy as bribe, because flooding with record contributions is in the same semantic field as bribe, but campaign donations are not criminal. Yet they can be considered acts of support with expectations, a return of favors in the future.

In all these four examples (31, 32, 33 and 34), it can be doubted that the verb buy or sell as such is metaphorical, but I have included them as metaphors. In (31) and (33), the sense is very close to bribe or buy off. As insurance companies can have a legitimate role in negotiations and no reference to criminal or unfair activity is found, I have decided to include this multiword, phrasal figurative expression into metaphors. All the chairs phrase seems to refer to the too great influence of insurance companies in the health care in general. In (34), money, buyout and donations all refer to literal financial activity, but it does not seem to be criminal or dubious. The sense of the better buy is a better choice. Yet it resonates with the literal sense, if the aspect of supporting a candidate with record contributions is the activated sense.

4.4 The target of evaluation in the election news corpus

The closest context of buy or sell metaphors, the subject or the object of it, for instance, was the measure in defining who or what is the evaluative target of an expression. If this practice did not reveal evaluative value, the target of evaluation was analyzed in the ca. 200 word context of the metaphorical expression. The expressions were divided into categories with regard to targets as follows:

2) the Republican Party, its policies or politicians or representatives (other than in 1, includes vice-presidential candidates and primary candidates other than 1): REP2000, REP2004, REP2008

3) the Democratic Party, its policies or politicians or representatives (other than in 1, includes vice-presidential candidates and primary candidates other than 1): DEM2000, DEM2004, DEM2008

4) other targets: OTHER2000, OTHER2004, OTHER2008 (when an expression addressed candidates of both parties, it was classified as OTHER)

The target of evaluation was sometimes difficult to specify. The topic may be general in the stretch of text in which buy or sell metaphor occurs, but the larger context addresses one candidate’s tax reform proposal, for instance. There are also several expressions which address several candidates at the same time: these are generally included into OTHER category. The division into classes Republican, Democrat or OTHER was sometimes difficult, as many political issues are general, but can also be assessed to be core issues of either Republicans or Democrats. Labor unions and feminism, for instance, have traditionally been Democratic issues, and limited federal government and taxes Republican issues.

In examples (35) and (36), I have interpreted that the expressions evaluate both McCain and his campaign tactics and Obama’s media coverage. but I have defined the target to be McCain (neutral) in the first and OTHER (negative) in the second:

(35) The McCain campaign sees Palin as more than tough enough to withstand the feeding frenzy here this week -- and in fact, they think it might help her. Schmidt said the more the media digs into the story of Bristol Palin's pregnancy, the less the public will respect the press (and the more voters will buy the McCain team's assertion that Barack Obama is getting a free pass from reporters). The campaign ratcheted that argument up Tuesday, canceling a McCain interview with CNN after the network's Campbell Brown body slammed campaign spokesman Tucker Bounds Monday night. (Madden 2008)

(36) Nonetheless, it’s clear that Obama has lost control of this campaign. And he will not seize back the initiative with the sometimes halting, conversational and sadly reluctant sound bites he has been producing. The excitement Obama created at the beginning of the year has vanished, perhaps

I will use OTHER capitalized, when it is a term referring to a target of evaluation, in order to separate the term from the lexeme.
because his campaign (and, yes, many columnists) bought into the McCain campaign's
demonization of the big rallies. Absurdly, McCain is now contesting the terrain of change -- and
doing so at celebrity rallies of his own. (Dionne 2008)

In the second example, the word *demonization* makes it related to McCain. Yet, as the
theme in general is Obama’s campaigning style and its problems, I have concluded that
the expression addresses candidates of the opposite parties together, and hence it is
classified as OTHER (negative).

In example (37), I have defined the target to be candidate John Edwards and not Hillary
Clinton or Obama who are both referred to. Thus the target is the Democratic Party. The
evaluative value is neutral, although if the target were Clinton, it would be negative.

(37)If that's the case, then I think it has huge implications for both Obama and Edwards--namely, it
suggests both men have been running the wrong campaign. *In a nutshell, I think Edwards is the
most obvious beneficiary of any buyer's remorse Hillary might provoke.* Edwards is a white guy
from North Carolina with a thick Southern accent and a moderate record in the Senate. Barack Obama
is a black guy from Illinois with an exotic name and only three years in federal office. If you're an
Iowa Democrat who wakes up in a cold sweat in January worried about nominating someone (Clinton)
who may be a tough sell in Middle America, the person you probably run to is Edwards, not Obama.
(For the record, I think there are all sorts of reasons to be skeptical of this snap judgment about who
plays better in Middle America; I just think it's one the typical caucus-goer is likely to make.)
(Scheiber 2007)

Then there is a case where President George W. Bush and America are addressed
together:

(38)For governance, Bush has the task of leading a country that believes in American exceptionalism in a
world in which that idea is, for many, off-putting if not repugnant. This is why Bush has taken pains to
explain that the "nonnegotiable demands of human dignity" are not just American but universal, the
gift of God or, if you will, imperatives imposed by secular ideas of liberty and equality. America's
specialness has been its good fortune in asserting and trying to uphold those ideals earlier than others
and having the strength, and therefore the obligation, to advance them around the world. *Abu Ghraib
makes that message harder to sell, but we must persevere.* (Barone 2004)

I have classified the target as Bush and the evaluative value negative, because the
reference to Abu Ghraib war prison scandal is negative, and it is estimated to make
selling a message harder for America, and the connection to America is via the
presidency of Bush. The entire article, though, is very positive for Bush and emphasizes
how his choices have been mainly right.

4.5 Negativity in the election news corpus

Negativity was assessed according to the same principle as the target of evaluation: if the
negative framing appeared in the close context of the metaphor, the expression was
classified as negative. When the context was not so close, expressions have been assessed case by case neutral, positive or negative. In many cases, the negative value of things *bought* is apparent (*sell* seems to be more neutral in this aspect). Examples (39), (40) and (41) represent unequivocal evaluation. The phrases *phony optimism* or *claptrap* are negative (39 and 41). *Kerrys and Deans* is more complex but the idea of not accepting Northern candidates in the South is clear (40). The context of *buy* as a metaphor indicates without doubt that the sense of *buy* is *to believe* (stupidly so).

(39) Americans don't *buy* the *phony optimism* about Iraq that George Bush and Dick Cheney peddle -- their own intelligence agency doesn't believe it. If the question is framed, as the president prefers, whether it was good to have gotten rid of Saddam, most people say yes. Who wouldn't? (Hunt 2004)

(40) North Carolina Sen. John Edwards has a powerful argument in his bid to be the Democratic nominee when he says, "What I give people is a candidate who can win everywhere in America." Translation: "We Southerners ain't gonna vote for no Yankee! You suckers up North will take our Clintons and Carters, but we just ain't buyin' Kerrys and Deans." (Maher 2004)

(41) As Wright's role model, James Hal Cone, put it: "If God is not for us and against white people, then he is a murderer, and we had better kill him. The task of black theology is to kill Gods who do not belong to the black community... . . . Black theology will accept only the love of God which participates in the destruction of the white enemy." *How much of this claptrap did Obama buy?* Well, he stayed at Trinity for 20 year —until political expedience tore him reluctantly away. But has he really left the fold? (McCarthy 2008)

It is not always the closest lexical environment that defines the negativity. In example (42), a reader has to assess if Bush-Rove politics are good or bad, and how does that relate to Obama's campaign strategy (*doesn't mean he's a wimp* does not reveal evaluation without the context):

(42) Obama won't do that, though, because his message is change, and because he has more integrity than McCain does. This is not "naive" and "idiotic," as Terence Samuel at The Root calls Obama's response to the "lipstick affair" -- it is part of a larger strategy. Obama has shown as well as anyone that he is a rough-and-tumble politician who doesn't shy from a fight. *But his campaign has made central his commitment to changing the way we do politics. That doesn't mean he's a wimp, but it does mean he can't buy into the Bush-Rove politics that McCain now espouses*. Obama remembers, to recall the old adage, it's not worth wrestling a pig: You get dirty, and the pig likes it. (Fernholz 2008)

I have identified example (42) as neutral: although the tone is generally positive for Obama, there is no direct stance on the tactics of the Obama campaign.

There are some cases in which direct evaluation is avoided by using rhetorical questions, or other forms of indirect negativity (hypothetical structure, for instance). In example (43), I have assessed the evaluation to be neutral (the target is Obama). The occurrence in
example (44) is deemed as negative (the following prediction they won’t makes it negative). There is thematic repetition in both of these examples, and in cases like this, I have counted the occurrences as separate (two neutral buyer’s remorse metaphors in sample 43 and one neutral bought it metaphor and one negative voters will buy it in example 44.

(43) Should Democrats Be Feeling Any Kind of Buyer’s Remorse? As Democrats kick off their national convention to nominate Illinois Sen. Barack Obama as their nominee for president, there is little or no evidence that activists or insiders are having second thoughts about the party’s standard-bearer. In other words, buyer’s remorse has not settled in, and it probably won’t unless Republican Sen. John McCain (Ariz.) nips Obama at the wire 10 weeks from now. Yet only the most uncritical party insider could avoid asking himself or herself the obvious question as delegates gather in Denver: Did Democrats, who two years ago placed no higher priority on selecting a candidate than on picking someone who could win back the White House in 2008, really pick the right person to carry the party’s banner this year? (Rothenberg 2008)

(44) There’s only one problem: there’s a word for a spousal co-presidency in the English language or at least a system where one can ascend to higher office on the basis of marriage: It’s called a “monarchy.” So far, the press certainly has bought it. [...] The larger question, of course, is whether the voters will buy it, too. The guess here is that, ultimately, they won’t. Royalism has never had that many fans on this side of the Atlantic. To the extent we’ve tried a similar idea recently — with the current president, a/k/a “Junior” — things haven’t exactly worked out in spectacular fashion. (Stark 2007)

Hypothetical structures are often neutral. In this example (45), the modal structure If you buy into this logic makes the assessment neutral:

(45) For Gore, however, choosing a running mate may be more of a zero-sum game. [...] Of the 56 House Democrats from the swing states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Missouri, 52 voted against PNTR—a ratio of 13 to one against the Clinton-Gore position.) And if you buy into this logic, as The Wall Street Journal’s Al Hunt did in a recent column, you end up suggesting such candidates as Missouri’s Gephardt or Durbin of Illinois. (Meyerson 2000)

The following case (46) shows ambiguity: the interviewee considers Obama the best choice for Alabama veterans, but also admits that it’s a hard sell in Alabama. I have defined this occurrence as negative.

(46) Eyes alight, Smith leaned forward and described how his battalion lost a paratrooper in the district of Sangin; he helped carry the flag-draped coffin onto a C-17. But, soon after his unit left Afghanistan, in April, “the Taliban were back in Sangin, because we didn’t have the troops to hold that city.” Smith now lives in Huntsville, Alabama, where he is Obama’s point man for veterans statewide. “I was told I’ve got the hardest job in the campaign. I’ve got to explain to veterans in Alabama that a liberal black attorney is better for them than a conservative white war hero. It’s true—but it’s a hard sell in Alabama.” (Packer 2008)

17 The topic is Hillary Clinton as a candidate and as a spouse of Bill Clinton.
Example (47) is an opposite case. The negative, ironical condemnation of the too easily satisfied press is one argument, but the Obama campaign’s prospects of winning the election look good in the view of this passage; thus, it is positive for Obama. If the target were identified as OTHER (press, mass media), the value would be negative:

(47) This is what the journalists have been reduced to: the level of indentured field hands at a Russian monastery. With such a castrated press corps in tow, Obama doesn’t have to work very hard to "sell" his message. The whole process has been streamlined, politically and culturally, to smooth the spread of the party's propaganda: The speech is already written, the press is already on board, and everybody’s already working together to crank out those fish patties. (Taibbi 2008)

Example (48) shows how one can avoid taking a clear stance immediately first by making a direct quote and then by asking a rhetorical question:

(48) "His staff is making a good faith effort to reach out to pro-lifers," says Michael J. New, an assistant professor at the University of Alabama and author of a widely circulated National Review Online essay on how Giuliani could court pro-lifers. New has also discussed pro-life issues with Giuliani's staff. A focus on adoption is a "little more substantive than 'safe, legal, and rare,'" says New, referring to Bill and Hillary Clinton's abortion mantra. Still, "I'm really not sure that pro-lifers are buying what he has to sell here." What is Giuliani trying to sell? At a campaign stop in Fort Dodge, Iowa, on August 6, the mayor focused on adoption policy. (Continetti 2007)

I have defined the first and the second metaphorical discourse units pro-lifers are buying and what he has to sell here as negative. The last discourse unit, trying to sell is defined as neutral for the candidate Giuliani. In total, then, this extract contains three buy or sell metaphors.
5 Buy and sell metaphors in the corpora: the quantities and the proportional distribution

There are 396 buy metaphors in the corpora and 355 sell metaphors (in total, 751). The absolute numbers for identified buy and sell metaphors are as follows:

Table 6. Metaphor distribution in the four subgenres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>buy N = 396</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sell N = 355</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to buy and sell, metaphors occurring in simple discourse units that express the basic figurative senses seem to prevail in this data: expressions based on the lemma BUY with the sense to believe something that someone tells you, especially when it is not likely to be true (Longman 2005) and expressions based on the lemma SELL with the sense to try to make someone accept a new idea or plan (ibid.) dominate. In the corpora, 90% of the 396 figurative buy expressions (N = 358) have the sense to believe, and if buyer’s remorse is included to the same sense, the number is 93% (N = 367). Within sell metaphors, 56% of the 355 metaphorical sell occurrences (N = 198) have the sense to try to make something accepted. I will call this sell + [OBJECT] -type, as the metaphorical sense depends on what is sold (sell oneself is included into this category). There are other types of sell metaphors that come very close to this sense:

- tough/hard/difficult/easy/soft sell, 10% of the occurrences (N = 36) (difficulties in making something accepted)
- *sell well does not sell*, 6% of the occurrences (N = 21) (to succeed, to fail)
- *selling point*, 5% of the occurrences (N = 16) (an advantage in an offer)
- *sell short*, 3% of the occurrences (N = 9) (to undervalue or to belittle something)
- *be sold*, 3% of the occurrences (N = 9) (to accept something wholeheartedly)

In total, these types account for 81% (N = 289) of the *sell* metaphors in this data. The other *sell* types that occur in these data are:

- *sell out*, 13% of the occurrences (N = 44) (to betray)
- proverbs, such as *sell down the river*, *sell one’s soul*, and novel metaphors, 6% of the occurrences (N = 21)

The metaphorical senses of these expressions were checked in three dictionaries: *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1989), *Collins COBUILD English Dictionary* (1995) and *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2005). Some information given in *The Oxford Dictionary* was presented in Section 1. There is somewhat different information on some expressions in the dictionaries. For *buyer’s remorse*, only *The Oxford English Dictionary* recognizes the expression and yet it is dated as 1966. *The Oxford English Dictionary* gives for *hard sell* the sense aggressive salesmanship or advertising, and enumerates examples for it from the 1950s in American usage. There seems to be no separate metaphorical sense for *hard sell* or *tough sell* in the OED, only the general sense of metaphorical *sell*, to convince (someone) of the worth of (something), is given. The *Longman* dictionary gives for *hard sell* two senses: a way of selling something in which there is a lot of pressure on you to buy and if an idea is a hard sell, it is difficult to get people to accept it). For *tough sell*, *Longman* gives only the metaphorical sense (something that is difficult to persuade someone about). *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines one use of *to sell* (to succeed, to fail) as finding purchasers and the *Collins* dictionary as when something sells it, is bought by the public in large quantities. No separate metaphorical definitions are given.
6 The genre-specificity of the metaphorical buy and sell

In this section, a genre as a possible pragmatic factor and an explanation for occurrence levels of buy or sell metaphors is investigated. The question is whether buy or sell metaphors are genre-specific in the subgenres investigated in this paper (election news, news magazines, cable TV news and radio news). The partisan nature of these metaphors will also be addressed.

A genre or a subgenre is, however, a problematic variable as it is no easy task to define the crucial differences between subgenres. Multiple criteria can be applied to define the differences. The spoken/written parameter is one factor which divides election news and news magazines in contrast to cable TV and radio shows. In the written news genre, there is a difference between news reports and opinion articles. There are practical factors in news production, such as the publication format, the length of an article or a segment, publication/broadcasting frequency and the planned audience. In the election corpus, for instance, there are daily newspapers and weekly or monthly published periodicals. One difference within the election news corpus is that in liberal media articles tend to be longer than in the conservative media (especially in The New Yorker). That is the reason for the greater number of conservative articles in the election news corpus (753 as compared with 639). Similar differences in editorial policies or favored formats may be found in other partisan media, and these practices may affect metaphor use.

In spoken media, one genre parameter is that talk can be a monologue, a dialogue or a group conversation. Spoken news communication tends to be more casual and less reflective than written news reports. However, talk shows today are always somewhat pre-planned, the language use is more fabricated than natural conversation and participants or interviewees are usually expert commentators. Yet the elite opinion journals of the election news data (such as National Review or The New Yorker) represent a very different subgenre than cable TV, for instance. It is possible to compare spoken political discourse on commercial cable TV—which often aims at controversy—and the reflective opinion articles published weekly or monthly. They are certainly both political discourse, but they represent the opposite ends of the news commentary spectrum. The designated audience, the scope of the articles, the program format or the editorial choices may greatly vary. In this study, the production aspect of news business is not addressed.
However, it is important to underscore that genres and their similarities or differences depend on various factors excluded from this research design.

First, the general occurrence level of all buy and sell metaphors in the four subgenres in partisan media is analyzed (Figures 1 and 2).

The buy occurrence levels (Figure 1) follow the subgenre boundaries: buy metaphors are frequent in the election news and in the cable TV news but scarce in the news magazines and in the radio news. Hence it seems that buy metaphors are specific for one written news genre and one spoken news genre. There are slightly more buy metaphors in the conservative cable TV news and conservative radio news than in their liberal counterparts, but in general, there are no systematic partisan differences.

**Figure 1. Buy metaphors in the four subgenres by partisanship**

![Chart showing buy metaphors in four subgenres by partisanship](image)

N = 396, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 word

Sell seems to be an election metaphor, as there are from 54% to 92% more sell metaphors in the election data than in the other subgenres (on average 72%) (Figure 2). There seems to be no great partisan variance in the election data. In the cable TV, sell seems to be popular in the liberal MSNBC, and in the radio data there is a conservative edge in the frequency.
In Sections 6.1-6.5, the link between subgenres and multiword unit metaphors will be examined, but in this analysis, pragmatic subgenre factors are limited to the written/spoken parameter and political news/election news parameter. The major factor that is addressed in this analysis is political partisanship. In this investigation, I will follow the notions on multiword unit metaphors discussed in Section 2.4. For instance, even if the distribution of buy metaphors suggests that they are characteristic for two subgenres, there may yet be differences in the buy multiword units inside one subgenre. I have chosen for genre-based analysis three categories of buy metaphors and four categories of sell metaphors. These multiword types are:

1. buy it/buy that/buy this (from hereon: buy it -type)\(^{18}\),
   -as in: do you buy that?

2. buy into
   -as in: not all of Edwards' campaign advisors initially bought into the idea
for the spot

\(^{18}\)Buy it/that/this -type category is limited to those expressions in which it/that/this is not followed by a complementary clause or noun. Expressions such as ‘Asked by Byron York of National Review if he bought that theory, McAuliffe said he did’ are excluded from this category, they belong to the buy + [OBJECT] category.
3. *buy* + [OBJECT] (other than *it*/this/that)
   - as in: *voters bought this anti-Washington message*

4. *sell* + [OBJECT], includes *sell oneself*
   - as in: *in Texas, as elsewhere, the tort reformers exploited the rate hikes as part of a scare campaign to sell reform*

5. *tough/hard/difficult/soft/easy sell* (from hereon: *tough sell*-type),
   - as in *Giuliani was among those chosen to present the Administration’s idea of the issue to the public, and he did not use the soft-sell approach*

6. *sell well/does not sell*-type (from hereon: *does not sell*-type)
   - as in: *for another, protectionism has not sold well on the presidential level since Herbert Hoover’s campaign in 1928*

7. *sell out*
   - as in: *instead, Kerry looks like more and more of a sellout every time he shifts positions*

6.1 *Buy it*-type

There seems to be a preference for *buy it*-type metaphor only in the cable TV: *Fox News* and *MSNBC* use this phrase more when compared with other subgenres (Figure 3). It has a conservative edge in all subgenres but one, news magazines.

**Figure 3. Buy it*-type metaphor occurrence.**

[N = 129, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words]
Table 7. The absolute numbers of occurrence for *buy it.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>buy it</em> N = 129</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is an example of typical *buy it* occurrence from the conservative cable TV:

(49)GIGOT: [...] We are back with our Dan Henninger and Mary O'Grady. Also joining the panel is Columnist John Fund. Dan, the narrative here on some -- part of some people who liked Eliot Spitzer what he did was that he was a great man who did great things as a prosecutor and just got tripped up here on this personal foibles. *Do you buy that?*

HENNINGER: I *don't buy it at all.* I think Eliot Spitzer was a man who was simply unhinged from normal norms of personal and professional behavior. ("Fox News panel discusses", 2008)

This phrase may be frequent because it often works as a somewhat confrontational opening for discussion in TV talk shows: *do you buy* is a regular opening question, and it encourages an interviewee or a participant to respond, for instance, *no, I don't buy that.*

It may be typical for talk show genre in general. The entire *COCA* was consulted to find further evidence for the frequency of this phrase either on TV or on radio (Table 8). The subcorpora of the *COCA* in which buy phrases in general can be expected to be found are business sections of newspapers and business magazines (the *COCA* codes for these are *NEWS: Money* and *MAG: Financial*). These subcorpora rank as second and ninth in this frequency list. All the spoken corpora in the *COCA* represent TV or radio channels. Spoken media have a high level of occurrences of this phrase in all subcorpora (independent TV channels rank as first, others from third to eighth, except *National Public Radio*, which is 17th). The trend is clear: this multiword unit is frequent in no other parts of the *COCA* than the business magazines, the business sections of newspapers and the TV or radio shows.
Table 8. The occurrence level of [buy] it|that|this -phrase\textsuperscript{19} in the COCA.

| [buy] it|that|this -phrase in the entire COCA, frequency ranking | SECTION NAME | PER MILLION | TOKENS | WORDS |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| 1                                                           | SPOK:Indep    | 43.51       | 189    | 4,343,343 |
| 2                                                           | MAG:Financial | 42.23       | 222    | 5,256,801 |
| 3                                                           | SPOK:FOX      | 41.58       | 246    | 5,916,135 |
| 4                                                           | SPOK:NBC      | 41.43       | 241    | 5,817,458 |
| 5                                                           | SPOK:CBS      | 40.01       | 494    | 12,347,287 |
| 6                                                           | SPOK:CNN      | 32.98       | 665    | 20,161,550 |
| 7                                                           | SPOK:MSNBC    | 31.93       | 26     | 814,156  |
| 8                                                           | SPOK:ABC      | 29.31       | 443    | 15,114,475 |
| 9                                                           | NEWS:Money    | 28.48       | 213    | 7,477,721 |
| [....]                                                       | [....]        | [....]      | [....] | [....] |
| 17                                                          | SPOK:NPR      | 24.01       | 409    | 17,031,484 |

Even if it is taken into account that some occurrences are from business talk shows on TV, the numbers indicate that buy it metaphorical phrase may be typical for mediated spoken discourse. As this phrase is used on all major TV channels (NBC, CBS and ABC), on cable TV (CNN in addition to Fox News and MSNBC) and on independent channels (Oprah, Geraldo and Limbaugh), its use may not be genre-specific for political discourse.

6.2 Buy into and buy + [OBJECT] -type

Buy into and buy + [OBJECT] types differ little with regard to semantics: both express believing in something. Yet the occurrence levels are different with regard to partisanship. Buy into is systematically applied more in the liberal media than in the conservative media, as can be seen from Figure 4:

\textsuperscript{19} The search was made with the following command: [buy] it|that|this
Table 9. The absolute numbers of occurrence for buy into.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>buy into</th>
<th>N = 82</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is an example of a typical buy into expression from the liberal election news:

(50) But even if Obama's courtship of evangelicals and Catholics succeeds in smoothing over this sticking point, is it a wise strategy? By emphasizing their religious credentials, Democrats are implicitly buying into the right's phony charge that Democrats hate religion (see Ronald Aronson, "All Ye Unfaithful," page 52) without necessarily shifting the terms of what it means to be religious. (Posner 2008)

Buy + [OBJECT] -type is slightly favored in conservative media, except in the conservative news magazines (Figure 5):
Figure 5. *Buy + [OBJECT] -metaphor occurrence.*

![Figure 5](image)

N = 147, standardized frequency x/1,000,000 words

Table 10. The absolute numbers of occurrence for *buy + [OBJECT].*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>buy + [OBJECT] N = 147</em></th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is a typical example of *buy + [OBJECT] expression from the conservative election corpus:  

(51) Another Bubblehead blind spot. I'm bumping into a lot of critics who do not buy the legitimacy of small town mayorship (Palin had two terms in Wasilla, Alaska, population 9,000 or so) and executive as opposed to legislative experience. (Noonan 2008)

Even if there is no great difference in the sense of these expressions, it is possible that the type *buy + [OBJECT]* is preferred in the conservative media, because it is more direct. *Buy it* multiword unit is also direct to the point of being blunt. They both have a quality of straight rejection when used with a negative *no/not*, and they are casual and colloquial. Maybe they thus better suit conservative ideology, which is generally considered to be a more practical and realistic approach than liberalism. The stereotypes of populist and
plain-spoken conservatism and elitist and complex liberalism can hence be illustrated in
the use of these phrases.

6.3 Sell + [OBJECT] -type

Sell + [OBJECT] -type is the most frequent type of the metaphors in this analysis. As
was illustrated in Figure 2, sell is typical for election news genre, and the sell + OBJECT
occurrences follow the subgenre boundaries, although in the liberal data this genre-
specificity is less apparent, because there is no great variance between the liberal election
news and the liberal cable TV news (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Sell + [OBJECT] -type metaphor occurrence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here is a typical example of *sell* + [OBJECT] -type in the liberal election news:

(52) But the assumption that the Democratic Party can make itself credible on defense through the personal heroism of its leaders trivializes its problem—much as the Republican Party does when it finds black and Hispanic spokesmen to sell its urban policies. ("Our Choice", 2004)

There may yet be differences in what is *sold*, though, but that is not in the frame of this study. I will suggest one possible difference: liberals seem to have referred to the Iraq war as something George W. Bush *sold* to Americans in a negative sense. This seems to concern the liberal MSMBC, and also the liberal election news (in 2004 and 2008) and the liberal news magazines. In contrast, the conservative media have used this type of expression neutrally about the positions of the Bush administration. The Iraq war became a topic in 2002, and the war was begun in 2003.

Here is a typical example of *sell the war* phrase from the liberal media:

(53) Because what matters is not what's on television but the ghostly afterimage that lingers in our minds and clouds our vision after we turn off the television. *It's all too easy to envision a time when, the White House will no longer feel compelled to sell a projected war to the American people but can merely pitch it to Jerry Bruckheimer*, whose new series will show us why we need to spread our influence-preferably by force, since diplomacy is less apt to translate into compelling TV-throughout the Middle East. (Prose 2004)

6.4 *Tough sell and does not sell* -type

There is a liberal edge in the *tough sell* type metaphors in every subgenre (Figure 7).

**Figure 7. Tough sell –type metaphor occurrence.**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subgenre</th>
<th>lib</th>
<th>cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

N = 36, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words
Table 12. The absolute number of occurrences for tough sell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tough sell N = 36</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is an example of a typical tough sell expression from the liberal election news:

(54) If you're an Iowa Democrat who wakes up in a cold sweat in January worried about nominating someone (Clinton) who may be a tough sell in Middle America, the person you probably run to is Edwards, not Obama. (For the record, I think there are all sorts of reasons to be skeptical of this snap judgment about who plays better in Middle America; I just think it's one the typical caucus-goer is likely to make.) (Sheiber 2007)

There is a conservative edge in the does not sell-type occurrences in all subgenres except in the news magazines (Figure 8).

**Figure 8. Does not sell-type metaphor occurrence.**
Here is an example of a typical \textit{does not sell} expression from the conservative election
news:

(55) But no one likes naked calculation, and Clinton worries Democrats [sic] traumatized by the experience
of their last few presidential candidates. Because liberalism typically doesn't sell in American
presidential politics, liberal candidates tend to run as culturally conservative centrists—i.e.,
phonies. It sank both John Kerry, who couldn't even order a Philly cheesesteak properly, and Al Gore,
who adopted three such utterly different personas in three national presidential debates that his
performances could be a case study in abnormal-psychology classes. (Lowry 2007)

Expressions \textit{tough sell} and \textit{does not sell} share a semantic field: they refer to difficulties
in getting something accepted, in political discourse usually a proposal or a political
candidate. For some reason, liberals prefer \textit{tough sell} -type and conservatives prefer \textit{does
not sell} -type in the data. This kind of difference shows how ideological identity and
metaphor use may be linked. The \textit{does not sell} -type occurs rarely in the sense to \textit{sell well}
(to succeed) in the conservative data: it is used negatively in 81\% of the cases (17 out of
21 occurrences). When \textit{tough sell} and \textit{does not sell} constructions are counted together,
conservative and liberal media seem to use these expressions fairly evenly (28
occurrences in the conservative media, 27 occurrences in the liberal media, and the
standardized frequency for both 4).

\textbf{6.5 Sell out -type}

\textit{Sell out} -type is favored only in the liberal election news (Figure 9). There may be some
other stereotypes here, such as liberal prejudice of deeming the Republican Party as
easily betraying the interests of the people, but one reason for the frequency of \textit{sell out} is
liberal self-criticism. This will be further explored in Section 9 and in Section 10.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{The absolute number of occurrences for \textit{does not sell}.}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
& \textit{conservative} & \textit{liberal} & \textit{all} \\
\hline
does not sell & 21 & & \\
\hline
election news & 6 & 2 & 8 \\
news magazines & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
cable TV news & 10 & 0 & 1 \\
radio news & 2 & 0 & 2 \\
all & 19 & 2 & 21 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
Here is a typical example of sell out expression in the liberal election news:

(56) Neither Obama, who would like to argue that he could transform politics in the old Confederacy, nor Giuliani, who has been selling out to the likes of Ralph Reed since the 2002 midterms, should care so much about his chances in the Deep South. (Keating 2007)

### 6.6 A concluding note: buy and sell metaphors, genre and partisanship

As was suggested at the beginning of these comparisons, some metaphor types may account for the frequency of buy metaphors in these subgenres. The Figures 3, 4 and 5 in Sections 6.1 and 6.2 show that there is some variation in the occurrence of the buy multiword types. Figure 10 shows the level of buy metaphors when buy it -type and buy + [OBJECT] -type expressions are excluded. The buy metaphors in the cable TV news
are mostly of these types. If they are excluded, *buy* expressions are genre-specific only in the liberal election news, and moreover, there is a liberal edge in the occurrences in all subgenres.²⁰

**Figure 10.** Metaphorical *buy* expressions without *buy it* -type and *buy* + [OBJECT] -type.

![Graph showing frequency of metaphorical buy expressions](image)

N = 120, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words, absolute numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15. Absolute numbers for metaphorical expressions without <em>buy it</em> and <em>buy</em> + [OBJECT] -type.</th>
<th>cons</th>
<th>lib</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>buy into</strong> + others, N = 120</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, the comparisons of *sell* multiword unit metaphors shed some light on the genre-specificity of *sell* in the election news subgenre: it is attributed to *sell* + [OBJECT] expressions especially in the conservative election news and *sell out* expressions in the liberal election news.

²⁰In the figure 10, all *buy* metaphor types are taken into account, such as *buyer’s remorse* and other metaphors, not only *buy into* -type.
7 The metaphorization level of **BUY** and **SELL**

In this section, I will compare the occurrence levels of metaphorical expressions and literal expressions. There may be differences in subgenres when it comes to the proportion of metaphorical and literal *buy* or *sell* phrases: *buy* or *sell* metaphors may be favored more in some subgenres than others, and this can affect literal use.

Yet it is not very straightforward to examine the literal versus metaphorical proportions, as there may be various reasons for the literal *BUY* or *SELL* to occur, some more accidental, some more systematic than others. The quantity of news on economy or on business in the political news genre is an obvious factor, as are the campaign finances (advertisement purchases, fundraising or donations) in election news. The financial backgrounds of the candidates are usually examined in campaign news, such as Bush’s career as a businessman, Hillary Clinton’s investments in cattle futures and real estate speculation, Kerry’s and McCain’s wealth and property management with their respective wives, both millionaires, or Barack Obama’s real estate deals. In the 2000 election, Gore campaigned on the economic achievements of the Clinton era, in 2004 Bush wished to enhance the ownership society, and in September 2008, worsening economy and worldwide fears of deep depression became the main issue in the presidential election. Health care insurance (buying it, making it accessible to all Americans) was one of the contested issues in the 2008 election.

What could actually be expected is that in news genres where coverage of economy, business or finances is common, there would be less *buy* or *sell* metaphors, as one of the common sense expectations is that metaphors are effective only if they are from other domains than the theme or the Topics of a text. If there still is a relatively high frequency of *buy* and *sell* metaphors in election news, it suggests that this metaphor use is attributed to the situation, election, which thus overrides the contrasting domain principle.

In what follows, I will analyze how the use of **BUY** or **SELL** in the literal sense varies in political news subgenres. The proportions of literal and metaphorical occurrences will be compared. The comparisons will be carried out with regard to different expression types.
These types are the same as in the subgenre comparison of metaphorical expressions (see Section 6 for detailed classification):

1. *buy it*
2. *buy into*
3. *buy + [OBJECT]*
4. *sell + [OBJECT]*
5. *tough sell*
6. *does not sell*
7. *sell out*

7.1 *Buy it*-type

It seems that when *buy it* expressions are applied as metaphors, it sometimes has a reverse effect on literal use: when metaphors increase, literal expressions decrease and vice versa (Figure 11). This phenomenon happens mostly in the election news and in the news magazines, and to a lesser extent in the cable TV.

**Figure 11. Buy it: metaphorical vs. literal occurrence.**

N = 91 for non-metaphorical expressions, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words
Table 16. Absolute numbers of occurrences for literal “buy it.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>buy into</th>
<th>N = 91</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 *Buy into* and  *buy + [OBJECT]*-type

Literal “buy into” expressions are not frequent in any subgenre, and there are no reverse patterns (Figure 12). The literal “buy into” is naturally typical only for business news.

**Figure 12. Buy into: metaphorical vs. literal occurrence.**

N = 19 for non-metaphorical expressions, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words

Table 17. Absolute numbers of occurrences for literal “buy into”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>buy into</th>
<th>N = 19</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To some extent, there is a reverse pattern in *buy + [OBJECT]* occurrences: when
metaphors increase, literal expressions decrease and vice versa, especially in the liberal
media (Figure 13).

**Figure 13.** *Buy + [OBJECT]*: metaphorical vs. literal occurrence.

Table 18. Absolute numbers of occurrences for literal “*buy + [OBJECT]*”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>buy + [OBJECT]</em> N = 2 518</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>1 278</td>
<td>1 240</td>
<td>2 518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Sell + [OBJECT]-type

It is significant how little non-metaphorical sell + [OBJECT]-type expressions there are in the election news: there are slightly more literal expressions than metaphorical in the liberal media, but there are no great differences (Figure 14). This further strengthens the case of sell being a genre-specific metaphor. In other subgenres, there are considerably more literal sell + [OBJECT] expressions.

Figure 14. Sell + [OBJECT]: metaphorical vs. literal occurrence.

N = 1 766 for non-metaphorical expressions, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words

Table 19. Absolute numbers of occurrences for literal “sell + [OBJECT]”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sell + [OBJECT] N = 1 766</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1 002</td>
<td>1 766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a slight reverse pattern: when sell + [OBJECT]-type metaphors grow, non-metaphorical expressions decline, especially in the liberal media. The greatest gap between literal and metaphorical occurrence levels is in the newsmagazines. This may be
due to their regular coverage on business news. Yet the occurrence of literal sell expressions may be circumstantial, the topics or issues that require the use of this phrase are unknown.

7.4 Tough sell and does not sell -type

Literal tough sell expressions are scarce in these subgenres (Figure 15). Literal tough sell expressions probably are typical only for business or marketing news.

Figure 15. Tough sell: metaphorical vs. literal occurrence.

Table 20. Absolute numbers of occurrences for literal “tough sell”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tough sell N = 8</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Does not sell” -expressions occur as literal only in the conservative cable TV and in the radio news (Figure 16).
Figure 16. *Does not sell*: metaphorical vs. literal occurrence.

N = 33 for non-metaphorical expressions, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>does not sell N = 33</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 **Sell out**-type

There are extremely little non-metaphorical “sell out” expressions in these data. In the radio news, literal “sell out” expressions occur at higher level in both partisan media than the respective metaphorical expressions (Figure 17).
Figure 17. Sell out: metaphorical vs. literal occurrence.

N = 51 for non-metaphorical expressions, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words

Table 22. Absolute numbers of occurrences for literal “sell out”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sell out N = 51</th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.6 A concluding note: the proportion of metaphorical occurrences

To sum it up, the proportion of metaphorical occurrences out of the all occurrences is now examined with regard to expression types. The percentages of the metaphorical expressions in each type are presented in Figures 18 and 19. The basis for this calculation is the absolute number of sell expressions, not the standardized frequencies. As can be expected, buy + [OBJECT] and sell + [OBJECT] have the lowest proportions, since this kind of phrase is frequent in literal use. The more fixed multiword types score the highest percentages. All the sell metaphor types score high numbers in the election data. Only one multiword type, buy into, has a slightly higher number in the cable TV and in the radio data than in the election data.
Figure 18. The proportion of metaphorical occurrences: *buy* (three types)

Figure 19. The proportion of metaphorical occurrences: *sell* (four types)
Table 23. The absolute numbers of occurrence: metaphorical *buy* (three types).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>buy metaphors, ( N = 358 )</th>
<th>buy + [OBJECT]</th>
<th>buy into</th>
<th>buy it</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. The absolute numbers of occurrence: literal *BUY* (three types).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>buy literal, ( N = 2 631 )</th>
<th>buy + [OBJECT]</th>
<th>buy into</th>
<th>buy it</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>2 518</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2 631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. The absolute numbers of occurrence: metaphorical *sell* (four types).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sell metaphors, ( N = 300 )</th>
<th>sell + [OBJECT]</th>
<th>tough sell</th>
<th>does not sell</th>
<th>sell out</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. The absolute numbers of occurrence: literal *SELL* (four types).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELL literal, ( N = 1 858 )</th>
<th>sell + [OBJECT]</th>
<th>tough sell</th>
<th>does not sell</th>
<th>sell out</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election news</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news magazines</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cable TV news</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio news</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>1 766</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1 858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Buy and sell metaphors in the election news

In this section, only the election news data will be investigated. The occurrence levels of *buy* and *sell* metaphors in the election news corpus will be addressed from two different standpoints: the diachronic distribution of *buy* and *sell* metaphors in the 2000, 2004 and 2008 elections and the evaluative use of these metaphors (the numbers of negative and non-negative metaphors).

8.1 Diachronic developments in the buy and sell distribution

There are 210 *buy* and *sell* metaphors in the election news corpus. There are more *sell* metaphors than *buy* metaphors in the election news, as was seen in Figures 1 and 2 in Section 6: there are 71 *buy* metaphors and 139 *sell* metaphors.

There are some differences in the occurrence levels in the timeline (Figure 20). Both *buy* and *sell* occurrences have increased from 2000 to 2008, but the increase has not been continuous, there is fluctuation. It is difficult to say in a timeline of only eight years if this increase is permanent or if fluctuation will continue. Still, the increase is 17% in the conservative corpus and 24% in the liberal corpus, they are relatively high numbers in such a short time.

**Figure 20. Buy and sell occurrence in the election news in 2000, 2004 and 2008.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Buy</th>
<th>Sell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words
Table 27. Absolute numbers for *buy* and *sell* occurrence in timeline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the trends of *buy* and *sell* occurrences are analyzed separately, there is considerable variance (Figure 21). The greatest increase of occurrences concerns *buy* metaphors in the conservative media: the occurrence level has grown from 27 (sf) to 69 (sf), which is 63% over three elections.

In the liberal media, there is a slightly different pattern, it concerns *sell* metaphors: the occurrence level of *sell* has increased from 67 (sf) in 2000 to 104 (sf) in 2008. That is a 36% increase, and 104 is actually the highest partisan occurrence level in 2008 (and second only to conservative *sell* in 2004, sf 107).

**Figure 21. Buy and sell occurrence and partisanship in 2000, 2004 and 2008.**
Table 28. Absolute numbers for buy and sell occurrence and partisanship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sell</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the evidence in Figures 20 and 21, it can be concluded that even if there is no difference between conservative and liberal media with regard to buy and sell metaphors in total, they yet have a different partisan occurrence profile in the timeline. The increase of buy in the conservative media and sell in both partisan media may result from the increase of negative buy or sell expressions, which will be investigated in Sections 8.2 and 9.

8.2 Negative buy and sell metaphors in the election news

In this section, I will show how the conservative and the liberal media use buy and sell metaphors as evaluation in general. The focus is on the quantitative analysis of metaphors with regard to timeline, partisanship and the negativity/neutrality aspect. The occurrences of buy and sell are investigated both together (both buy and sell, the general negativity level) and separately (how they differ with respect to negativity).

There are 132 negative buy or sell metaphors in the election corpus (63% of all, 210, thus, there are 78 non-negative expressions). In the conservative media, there are 26 negative buy metaphors and 40 negative sell metaphors, in the liberal media there are 22 negative buy metaphors and 43 negative sell metaphors. The absolute numbers are as follows:
Table 29. Negatively evaluative *buy* and *sell* metaphors in the corpus: the absolute numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>negative <em>buy</em> metaphors N = 47</th>
<th>2000 N</th>
<th>2004 N</th>
<th>2008 N</th>
<th>all N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conservative <em>buy</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal <em>buy</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>negative <em>sell</em> metaphors N = 85</th>
<th>2000 N</th>
<th>2004 N</th>
<th>2008 N</th>
<th>all N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conservative <em>sell</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal <em>sell</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the election corpus, there are slightly more negative expressions in the conservative news and non-negative in the liberal news (*buy* and *sell* are counted together, Figure 22):

Figure 22. Negative and non-negative *buy* and *sell* expressions and partisanship.

Table 30. The absolute numbers for negative and non-negative metaphors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 210</th>
<th>negative</th>
<th>non-negative</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, negative metaphors have increased, whereas non-negative metaphors have stayed at the nearly same occurrence level (in this calculation, *buy* and *sell* are counted together) (Figure 23). The growth rate of negative *buy* and *sell* metaphors is 36% from 2000 to 2004, and then there is a 3% decline in 2008.

**Figure 23. Negative and non-negative metaphors, timeline of 2000, 2004, 2008.**

This indicates that the negative value inherent in these metaphors may be one reason for their growth. Increased negativity in news in general may have influenced the increase of these metaphors.

There is variance in the partisan distribution of these expressions, when they are analyzed with respect to the timeline of the 2000, 2004 and 2008 elections (Figure 24). The liberal negative *buys* and *sell* metaphors stay at a fairly even level from 2000 to 2008, on average at 82 (sf). In the conservative media, negative metaphors grow 60% from 2000 to 2004 to the level of 116 (sf). Then the occurrence level drops 20%, to 93 (sf). The average increase from 2000 to 2008 is hence 40%.
There are two phenomena here worth noting. First, it seems that negative metaphors have increased in the conservative media, but not in the liberal media. It is possible that the partisan polarization and the increase of negativity depicted in Section 3.2 concerns more conservative media than liberal media. The national trauma of the 9/11 attack and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan can also have a role in this, since conservative and liberal ideology adhere to different beliefs and agendas as regards to these events and the presidency. On the other hand, negative buy or sell metaphors were in 2000 more characteristic of liberals, although not at the level of the conservative media in 2004 and 2008. Negative evaluation—at least with buy and sell metaphors—seems to have moved from the liberal media to the conservative media from 2000 onwards. Second, the 2004 and 2008 elections were framed by George W. Bush’s agenda as President. Republicans were the party of the incumbent president in 2004 and 2008, and from 2003 to 2007 they also had a majority in Congress. In 2000, when liberal media used more negative metaphors, the Democratic Party had an incumbent President, and the incumbent Vice President Al Gore was the Democratic candidate. This hold on power may be reflected in metaphor use, although it is difficult to say why the party in power (or its media) had a need to use negative metaphors. Why opposition rhetoric should be less negative than the governing party’s remains unclear. It is more plausible that the partisan polarization accounts for the differences. As this finding concerns only buy and sell metaphors, it cannot be generalized. In Section 9 and 10 the targets of negative criticism are addressed in detail.
In the conservative media, *sell* metaphors have been in negative use more than *buy* metaphors in 2000 and 2004 (Figure 25). In the election of 2004, *sell* metaphors reached the level of 80 (sf), which is a 66% rise from the level of 2000. Then in 2008, there is a 34% decline, but yet a higher number than in 2000. Negative *buy* metaphors have been growing sharply, the increase is 78% from 2000 to 2008: so, they seem to be the reason for increased negativity in the conservative media. *Sell* metaphors have grown on average 50% from 2000 to 2008.

**Figure 25. The timeline of negative metaphors in the conservative media.**

In the liberal media there is neither growth nor permanent decline of negative *buy*, but there are less negative *buy* metaphors than *sell* metaphors (Figure 26). Negative *sell* metaphors have grown a little (6%).
It is now fairly well established in this study that the increase of negative metaphors is related to the negative use of buy in the conservative media, and that negative sell metaphors have grown in the conservative media as well. Now the non-negative buy or sell metaphors are further investigated. The absolute numbers in the election corpus are as follows:

**Table 31. Non-negative buy and sell metaphors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>non-negative buy metaphors N = 24</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conservative buy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal buy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>non-negative sell metaphors N = 54</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conservative sell</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal sell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-negative buy and sell metaphors grew 49% in the liberal media from 2000 to 2008 (Figure 27). In the conservative media, non-negative buy and sell metaphors have decreased, but the decline has not been continuous, on average 40%.
So, non-negative metaphors have increased in the liberal media and decreased in the conservative media. It is, however, important to bear in mind that this does not mean that there is less negativity in the liberal media: there may be other devices to express negative evaluation in the liberal media.
9 The targets of negative evaluation with buy or sell metaphors in the election news

In this section, I will show how conservative and liberal media evaluate negatively the nine presidential candidates with buy and sell metaphors, and how metaphors are used to criticize either the opponent party or the own party (the Republican Party for conservatives, the Democratic Party for liberals). The timeline of the occurrences will be analyzed as well. I will also suggest some reasons for the differences found.

9.1 The opponent party or the own party as a target

When it comes to targets of evaluation, there is an interesting difference (Figure 28): liberals employ negative buy and sell metaphors considerably more of their own candidates or their own party than conservatives of their own. There are 43% more of self-critical expressions in the liberal media than in the conservative media and 34% more metaphors critical of the opponent party in the conservative media than in the liberal media.

Figure 28. The target of negative evaluation: the opponent party or the own party.
Table 32. The absolute numbers for the target of evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>conservative</th>
<th>liberal</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opponent party (criticism)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own party (self-criticism)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This observation lends support to the common stereotype of Democrats in American politics: they are often seen as having more internal party wars, and these intramural differences are also made public more easily than similar differences inside the Republican party (Dagnes 2010, 9-10). There may also be simpler explanations to this difference: Democratic candidates Al Gore and John Kerry in the 2000 and 2004 elections have often been called uninspiring. This may be hindsight, because both Gore and Kerry lost the election, and Gore an exceptionally close election which was solved only by the historical Supreme Court decision which ended the vote recount in Florida. Bill Clinton has been ascribed to say that the difference between Democratic and Republican behavior in elections is that “Democrats fall in love, Republicans fall in line” (Pelosi 2010). Thus he underlines the need of the Democrats to get inspired. The rise of non-negative metaphors in the 2008 election data also suggests that there may be some truth in the Democratic need of inspiration, as Barack Obama was hailed as a charismatic candidate in 2008.

In contrast, it is possible that conservative media truly support the nominated candidate of the Republican party, or at least restrain from colorful public criticism over elections. In the 2008 election, for example, Republicans had a wide range of presidential candidates in the primaries, and a controversial vice-presidential candidate, Sarah Palin. Yet none of the tension this may have caused is seen in the number of negative metaphorical expressions addressed in this study, except perhaps in the small rise of negative buy metaphors used of the 2008 candidates, McCain and Giuliani (see Section 9.3. Figure 32). Ronald Reagan famously said that he follows the 11th commandment:

---

21 The colorful populist Mike Huckabee, the feisty ex-New York mayor Rudy Giuliani, the libertarian Ron Paul, a senator turned into TV-star (Law and Order), Fred Thompson, Mormon Mitt Romney, for instance.
“Thou shall not speak ill of a fellow Republican” (Fastenberg 2011). Perhaps this adage still counts.

This difference becomes even more pronounced when the timeline of conservative negative assessment of the opponent party is analyzed: it seems that after the 2004 election the frequency fluctuates little. *Buy* and *sell* expressions that assess negatively the opponent party grew sharply (78%) in the conservative media from 2000 to 2004, and the level has stayed high in 2008. In the liberal media, the level of negative *buy* and *sell* metaphors which target the opponent party has decreased a little from 2000 to 2008 (Figure 29).

**Figure 29. Criticism: the opponent party as target.**

![Figure 29](image)

Conservative N = 40, liberal N = 29, standardized frequency x/1,000,000 words

The highest number of negative *buy* and *sell* metaphors which target the own party (46 sf) is in the liberal corpus in 2004. Conservatives are significantly less self-critical, at least with *buy* or *sell* metaphors (Figure 30).
Figure 30. Self-criticism, the own party as a target.

conservative N = 19, liberal N = 33, standardized frequency x/1 000 000 words

9.2 The main targets of negative evaluation\textsuperscript{22}: the nominated Democratic candidates

With respect to presidential candidates, John Kerry, Barack Obama and Al Gore lead as targets of negative \textit{buy} and \textit{sell} metaphors (Figure 31), they are all the nominated candidates of the Democratic Party. George W. Bush and Hillary Clinton come even at the fourth place.

\textsuperscript{22} Two Republican candidates participated in two elections: George W. Bush in 2000 and 2004, and John McCain in the primaries of 2000 and as the nominated candidate in 2008. The frequency is based on the word count of 2000 and 2004 subcorpora for Bush and 2000 and 2008 corpora for McCain. This slightly skews the numbers for McCain, because he was not anymore written about in the general election period in 2000. If only the primary phase of the 2000 subcorpus were taken into account, his numbers would be higher.
9.3 The targets of negative buy metaphors: Kerry, Clinton and Obama

Conservatives employ negative buy metaphors of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, liberals employ them of John Kerry (Figure 32).

John Kerry is the target of most liberal buy metaphors, and the liberal media seem to use them of the candidates of the opponent party very little. It is important to recall here that
the absolute number of *buy* metaphors is low, 47, and that in the conservative media—as illustrated in Section 8.2—negative *buy* metaphors were scarce in 2000 (N = 4) and 2004 (N = 6). When conservatives target Clinton and Obama with *buy* metaphors and very little others, it is because conservative media have just started to use more *buy* metaphors in 2008 (N = 15). In 2008 even their own candidates, Giuliani and McCain are targets of *buy* metaphors in the conservative media.

The absolute number for negative *buy* occurrences in the case of Kerry is six in total, four in the liberal media and two in the conservative media. The negativity about Kerry may partly be explained by the following example (57) from the liberal media, in which *buy* metaphors are applied negatively twice. It is also interesting that this comment on the weaknesses of the Kerry campaign is in the middle of a positive assessment of Kerry, his capability of responding to criticism constructively. This shows how the Democratic self-criticism works in discourse.

(57) AFTER NINE TIMES AROUND THE TRACK, I'M CONVINCED that the presidency is something that requires more fate than ambition. Sometime Jupiter aligns with Mars, sometimes it doesn't. And when Kerry started campaigning in earnest in early 2003, he-not for the first time in his career-came out of the blocks miserably. Since 1982, every one of his fights has required a second wind. What I think is most relevant to a possible Kerry presidency is that he has, up until now, always listened to criticism when he has been screwing up, and he has responded forcefully.

The initial year of his presidential campaign was almost fatal because of two rookie mistakes influenced by hubris: Kerry bought into front-runner-ism via fund-raising yardsticks, and, worse, he bought into a presentation based mostly on himself, his war record, and his résumé. What was missing from the calculus was a Democratic electorate in Iowa and New Hampshire (and nationally) that was more interested in how national policy might improve its members lives, not just in Iraq or even in the much-celebrated "anger." (Oliphant 2004)

Here is an example of a *buy* metaphor critical of Hillary Clinton in the conservative media:

(58) There is a sense that Sen. Obama is rising, a sense for the first time in this election cycle that Mrs. Clinton just may be in a fight, a real one, one she could actually lose. It's all kind of wonderful, isn't it? Someone indulged in special pleading and America didn't buy it. It's as if the country this week made it official: We now formally declare that the woman who uses the fact of her sex to manipulate circumstances is a jerk. (Noonan 2008)

### 9.4 Targets of negative *sell* metaphors: Gore and Kerry

With regard to *sell* metaphors, John Kerry is the candidate of whom most conservative negative *sell* metaphors are used, but Al Gore is negatively framed by conservatives and liberals alike (Figure 33). Obama is addressed negatively with *sell* metaphors in the
conservative media at a slightly higher level than Gore. Hence it is usually the nominated candidates of the Democrats who are criticized with these metaphors.

**Figure 33. Candidates as targets of negative sell metaphors.**

It is noteworthy that in an election where the incumbent vice-president of their preferred party is a candidate, liberals turn their back on him (at least with sell metaphors). The Clinton era legacy with its scandals may have been a mixed blessing for Democrats, and it can have a role in the dissatisfaction with Gore.

The absolute number of occurrences is eight in the case of Kerry and eight in the case of Gore as well. Here is an example of a sell metaphor critical of Gore from the conservative media:

(59) New Democrats would disagree with this assessment. They would probably note that Gore also came out in his speech for targeted tax cuts and demanded further reductions in crime; that he boasted of his support for the Gulf War; that he talked about reducing the national debt rather than spending the surplus; that he continues to support the death penalty and missile defense. All true. But these positions highlight the perversity of Gore's political strategy: He is selling mostly Clintonian policies with the rhetoric of an unreconstructed liberal. (Ponnuru 2000)

Yet another example, a sell metaphor critical of Gore from the liberal media:

(60) On environmental issues, for all of Gore's well-documented failings, the two candidates speak and act as if they come from different planets. Again, Gore is both an environmentalist and a political pragmatist. Judged by the demanding standards that Gore himself laid out in his book *Earth in the Balance*, he is a sham and a sellout. To take just one example, the Clinton/Gore Administration opened up Alaska's precious National Petroleum Reserve, selling the first oil-drilling leases in May 1999. Compared with George Bush, however, Gore is Mother Nature herself. If elected, he will
arguably be the most environmentally sensitive and sophisticated politician ever to occupy the Oval Office. (Alterman 2000)

Yet again this example (60) shows that liberal self-criticism can be complex: the negative evaluation of the candidate is in the middle of a long comparison which in fact judges Gore to be a superbly better candidate than George W. Bush. There is a corresponding occurrence to this, example (38) in Section 4.4, in which President Bush is generally well appreciated in the article (in the conservative media), but a single reference to the Abu Ghraib prison scandal makes the expression *harder to sell* negative, and hence the expression is classified as negative.

George W. Bush is the second in frequency as a target of negative *sell* metaphors by liberals, but the third target is again a Democrat, Hillary Clinton. George W. Bush’s relatively low numbers with both *buy* and *sell* metaphors show the limitation of this study: he must have been framed negatively by Democrats in both elections in which he was a candidate (in 2000 and in 2004), but it must have taken place with other devices than these metaphors. The so-called structural bias, the incumbent President as a candidate remaining more shielded from campaign criticism (Zeldes, Fico, Carpenter & Diddi, 2008, 397) may have contributed to the fact that Bush received less scrutiny in the liberal media. It is also good to bear in mind that the United States was at war during the election 2004 (Afghanistan 2001, Iraq 2003) (Benenson & Moore 2008, 420-421). Another structural factor in American politics may explain the scarceness of negative assessment: at a time of external threat, criticism against the leader of the country will be more easily regulated or self-censored in media. Moreover, George W. Bush’s troubles began in earnest only in 2005, when the intelligence information about the WMD threat (weapons of mass destruction) in Iraq was revealed as dubious and the hurricane Katrina and its aftermath made Bush highly unpopular (Benenson & Moore 2008, 421).
10 Discussion

On the basis of data in this study, it seems that sell metaphors are specific for election news subgenre. Business as a Vehicle in political discourse, even in election discourse, is not the first and foremost with respect to frequency. War, sports, family, journey and building Vehicles usually dominate political discourse (Deignan 2005, 27; Kövecses 2002, 62; Kövecses 2005, 174-176; Scheithauer 2007, 80, 84). Still, it is significant that figurative expressions based on sell are somewhat specialized terms in the American political news genre: there are from 55% to 92% more sell metaphors in the election data than in the other subgenres (on average 72%). Moreover, the metaphorization level of sell is high in the election news: on average 47% of all sell expressions are metaphorical in this data. Therefore, elections as events seem to enhance use of buy or sell metaphors. It would be interesting to know whether buy and sell metaphors occur at any notable level in other genres than political news discourse, in order to confirm the genre-specificity of metaphorical sell, for instance.

If some metaphors become genre-specific, they may, in the first place, affect the way issues are interpreted in this genre, and secondly, they may seem unusual in other genres. As was discussed in Section 2, politics in a democracy is a state of ongoing negotiation. Since buying or selling is a kind of a negotiation between a buyer and a seller which aims to mutual benefit, satisfaction or compromise, sell and buy share a semantic field with to negotiate, to make a deal, to bargain, to offer a choice, to accept or to suggest—or even to take a risk, to gamble or to betray.

Some buy or sell metaphors tend to occur in multiword units, and the occurrence level of these multi-word types varies with regard to subgenre and partisanship. The most frequent metaphor type in this data, though, is sell + [OBJECT]—type, which strictly speaking is not a fixed phrase since the object varies. Yet the object of selling is often the element that makes an expression a metaphor, and often it contributes to negative evaluation. In the election discourse, it is natural to feature campaigns or candidates as selling themselves, selling ideas, tax cuts or a health care reform.
In a similar vein, the president’s political operations are often called *selling* in the cable TV, news magazines or radio news. In the entire COCA, president or his administration is the subject of *selling* something in a metaphorical sense 156 times in the period of 1990-2010. Hence it can be assumed that the political actions or operations of a President are regularly portrayed with *sell* metaphors. Election period usage may have moved to the news coverage on the presidents. Dagnes (2010, 11) argues that campaigning for office and campaigning for public policy can no more be seen as separate processes.

To some degree, the data especially in the comparison corpora indicate that *sell* + [OBJECT] -type metaphors were applied frequently with respect to the Iraq war. The war was framed in the liberal media as *sold* to the American public on false premises by President Bush and his administration (14 occurrences), whereas in the conservative media, this *sell the war* phrase was rarely used, except in one discussion on Fox News about the right moment or way for President Bush to *sell the war*. Thus, it could be argued that ideology may affect the frequency of *sell* metaphors, such as issues which partisan media wish to frame as *selling*. There might be other similar differences in the objects of *sell*, but this study will not address this question comprehensively.

*Sell out* phrase in the sense of political betraying or not keeping promises is American usage which emerged in the 1890s according to The *Oxford English Dictionary*. “*Sell out*” as a literal expression is still in use in the sense of *closing a business permanently*. In its literal sense it may be neutral or negative. The data in this study show that the metaphorical phrase was used especially in the liberal election news: liberals usually wish to insinuate a betrayal of higher ideals, and they use this expression equally of their own politicians and of conservative politicians (46% of *sell out* expressions, six occurrences, were used as negative evaluation of the Democratic politicians in the liberal election news, whereas no negative *sell out* expressions were applied of Republican politicians in the conservative election news).

---

23 The search terms were *president*, *administration*, *Clinton*, *Bush* or *Obama* in 1 to 6 word span before and after the lemma of *sell*.
As such, *sell* is not a significantly partisan metaphorical expression in itself. Some types of *sell* metaphors, however, seem to constitute the genre-specificity of *sell* metaphors more than others: *sell + [OBJECT]* -type in the conservative election news and *sell out* -type in the liberal election news. So, there is this minor difference in the partisan use of *sell*: conservatives and liberals prefer different types of *sell* expressions in the election data.

Partisanship correlates sometimes with usage patterns in a very subtle manner. Liberals seem to prefer *tough sell* -type and conservatives *does not sell* -type, even though there is only a marginal difference in their metaphorical senses (in the literal, commercial sense, *tough sell* means an energetic effort to get someone to buy something, *does not sell* means not finding purchasers). This suggests that there are phrases which seem to belong to either conservative or liberal identity.

With respect to *buy* metaphors, they have a different occurrence profile than *sell* metaphors. First, they seem to be favored in the election news and in the cable TV news. In the news magazines and in the liberal radio news *buy* metaphors are scarce. Second, the metaphor type preferred in the conservative and liberal cable TV news and to some degree in the conservative radio news is the *buy it* -type. This indicates that there may be a register difference in usage: the *buy it* -phrase may be typical for spoken news.

There are some partisan features in the use of *buy* metaphor types: while the *buy it*-type is slightly favored in the conservative data, there is a clear, consistent liberal edge in the occurrence of *buy into* expressions. Moreover, the *buy + [OBJECT]* -type shows a slight conservative edge in the election news and in the radio news. These types also share a semantic field; they all have the sense *to believe*. Hence it seems that stylistic choices may explain this phenomenon: I would suggest that the *buy it* and *buy + [OBJECT]* -types are more direct and brusque than the somewhat elaborated *buy into*-type. This difference may reflect the stereotypes of practical and direct conservatism as against idealistic and complex liberalism. In addition, *buy into* -expressions resonate sometimes with other senses than *to believe*: a parallel sense *to apply*, *to put into use* can be identified in some cases. Here is an example (61) of this:

(61) BROWN: Fox News caught up with Romney in Des Moines. He was forced to window shop today because of the weather. **It may be time for Romney to buy into a much more**
aggressive Iowa strategy. The latest Rasmussen poll shows Huckabee well out in front of the previously long-time Iowa leader Romney. But when asked repeatedly about going negative on Huckabee, Romney ignored the question. (Hume 2007)

From the empirical data in this study, it can be seen that there is a metaphoricity cline in the use of buy and sell metaphors, they do not always seem to fall neatly into metaphorical or non-metaphorical categories, as was demonstrated in Section 4.3. Some extended metaphors in authentic discourse resonate with literal or marginally metaphorical senses, which is exemplified in examples (24), (31), (32) and (33) in Section 4.3.4. This finding supports the results by Deignan (2007): she has addressed semi-fixed metaphorical expressions and points to the metaphoricity cline found in them (104). Yet most of the buy or sell metaphors are very conventional and easy to identify, these conventional expressions account for 93% (N = 701) of all buy and sell metaphors. This is in accordance with Steen, Dorst, Herrman, Kaal & Krennmayr (2010), a study that showed that 99% of metaphorical expressions are conventional in some genres (785, 789).

However, it is worth noting that despite the high level of conventionalized buy and sell metaphors, both buy and sell can be taken into novel use, as illustrated by the two expressions buying the Iraqis time or sell the dog food (repeated here from from Section 4.3.4 examples 24 and 27):

(62) Indeed, the entire point of the surge is to bring such reconciliation about by, in Gates' words, "buying the Iraqis time. "[sic] But that's the problem. The United States is ever more dearly buying time, and Iraq is ever more freely spending it. ("The Bitter End" 2007)

(63) There, flipping pork, was Lamar Alexander -- an eminently decent and qualified man who has visited 64 of Iowa's 99 counties, but just can't sell the dog food. (Tapper 1999)

Some probably new uses of metonymic sell can be seen in the following examples:

(64) ROBERTS: You know, I asked the Democratic pollster that over the weekend, and his answer was absolutely not. The Democrats are nowhere. No one, according to the polls, knows who they are or what they stand for, and perhaps if the public is sufficiently angry with the [Republican]s, if oil prices go up or they feel strongly enough that the country is off on the wrong track, it could boost the Democrats in the next election regardless of their own plans. But right now it's very hard to see. As this pollster put it to me, No equivalent of a Contract with America that the Republicans had to take the House in the midyear election in 1994,' the Democrats hope to do something with the Republican ethics problems, that -- Bill Frist selling his HCA stock has raised some questions. And, of course, ongoing investigations of Tom DeLay -- they're trying to say majority leaders in both Houses are ethically tainted. They're going to have a little trouble making that a big sell to the American public.

MONTAGNE: Well, Cokie, does the fact that the Democrats seem to be, as you describe it, drifting mean that the president doesn't have to worry about his next appointment to the Supreme Court? (Montagne 2005)
(65) During an interview at the Sioux Falls headquarters of Vote Yes for Life, the organization she heads that's campaigning to uphold the state ban, Unruh spoke about her own abortion years ago and her campaign to focus not on confrontation but on the personal stories of women like her who have had or considered abortions. But activists on both sides are riveted by the bottom-line question voters here will answer next week: Can Unruh's new sell persuade South Dakotans to endorse a state law that ignores a U.S. Supreme Court precedent and makes no specific abortion exceptions in cases of incest or rape, or when a mother's health is threatened? (Halloran 2006)

Even though metaphors in spoken discourse were not specifically addressed in this paper, there is a significant finding in this respect: seven out of twelve discourse metaphors in the section 4.3.4 are direct quotes (examples 23, 24, 26, 28, 31, 32 and 33). This shows that it might be useful to examine novel metaphors and complex discourse metaphors especially in spoken discourse.

When the occurrence level of some multiword metaphor types is high, the literal occurrences of the same multiword phrase sometimes seem to decrease, and vice versa. This phenomenon concerns sell + [OBJECT] -type, buy + [OBJECT] -type and to some degree buy it -type, but less other multiword types. So a reverse occurrence pattern is occasionally found. On the basis of this study, Deignan’s (2005, 2007) results regarding multiword unit metaphors as one driving force in metaphoricity are to some degree corroborated, as far as buy and sell metaphorical phrases are concerned.

One objective of this study was to find out how the evaluative value of buy and sell metaphors varies in partisan election news. Negative buy and sell metaphors seem to be more frequent than non-negative expressions in the election data, 63% (N = 132) of the occurrences are negative and 37% (N = 78) non-negative. Negative metaphors have grown only in the conservative media, the growth rate has been on average 56% from 2000 to 2008 (with some fluctuation). Negativity in the conservative media has risen, because non-negative buy and sell metaphors have decreased in the conservative corpus, and because of the considerable and steady increase (78%) of negative buy metaphors from 2000 to 2008. Sell metaphors have also grown in the conservative media at the average of 58%.

In the liberal media, the level of negative expressions has stayed fairly even from 2000 to 2008, but there is an interesting difference between the conservative and the liberal
media with regard to the target of negative evaluation: liberals criticize their own candidates or party much more than conservatives their own. There are 43% more self-critical expressions in the liberal media than in the conservative media, and 34% more metaphors critical of the opponent party in the conservative media than in the liberal media.

Negative buy or sell metaphors are mostly used of Democrats John Kerry, Al Gore, and Barack Obama. George W. Bush comes only as the fourth in this order of negative criticism. Conservative echo-chamber negativity\(^{24}\), strengthened with the liberal self-criticism especially with regard to Kerry and Gore, may explain the high numbers of the Democratic candidates. Yet it seems that some buy or sell metaphors which criticize Kerry or Gore could also be classified as neutral: the context of these metaphors is complex. George W. Bush’s low numbers show the limitations of this study: he must have been negatively framed by liberal media, but not with buy or sell metaphors. It is also possible that Bush in 2004 had an advantage of a structural bias in media, both as an incumbent President and as a wartime President (Gore as an incumbent Vice-President in 2000 did not receive such privilege). The election of 2004 seems to have been a significantly polarized period when negative buy or sell metaphors were used by both parties. The bitter, contested election in 2000 which Democrats finally lost, the 9/11 attack in 2001 and the Afghanistan and Iraq wars may have contributed to this.

It was discussed in Section 3 that news production process often seems to lead to simplification or dramatization of issues. Metaphors serve this aim by providing easy access to abstract concepts and by conveying direct or indirect evaluation. Changes in news language towards more informal style have been noted in several diachronic studies (see for instance Hundt & Mair 1999). As buy and sell metaphors are colloquial, their increase may be related to increased informality. New media and the broadcasting legislation changes reported in Section 3.2 may have contributed to the increase of metaphors as well. Yet it can be questioned if metaphors simplify too much or offer a biased version of politics. The hiding aspect of metaphors may not be beneficial for

\(^{24}\) ‘Echo-chamber effect’ means patcheting up issues dear to conservatives by repeating stories other media have already published, each media outlet legitimizing the other. (see in detail Hall Jamieson & Cappella 2008).
understanding power relations and operations in politics. A frequent complaint of some, especially the left wing of the liberals, is that a “dumbing down” process happens too often in media with regard to complex social issues (Lilleker 2006, 69-72; Dagnes 2010, 61-62, 76, 88). A variant term for this phenomenon is “tabloidization” (Baker & Ellege 2011, 147): it refers more broadly to the ‘infotainment’ or ‘confrontainment’ phenomena. In this study, however, no great difference was found in buy and sell metaphor use between conservatives and liberals: both partisan media apply these expressions. It is possible that in the ongoing competition of making an appealing representation of daily politics, media needs to use all the tools they can, and progressive political media have to revert to simplifications, following the ‘plain-spoken’ conservatism. The self-critical assessment with buy or sell metaphors is cherished only by liberals, although this liberal negative evaluation is a rather complex phenomenon in discourse, as was shown in examples (55) and (58) in Section 9. Further studies on how conservative or liberal media reify and reiterate their own ideological identity and frame the opponent ideological identity would be needed, and this study shows that it could be fertile to study evaluative metaphors applied by conservatives and liberals.

Is the emergence of metaphorical expressions dependent on some pragmatic factor, and if it is, how can this emergence be detected and explained? In the view of this thesis, a need to express negative evaluation indirectly or a need to question credibility seem to be possible reasons for the increase of buy or sell metaphors. There may have been a need to create an expression which principally means ‘not believing’, and buy metaphors serve that end. Sell seems to have a specialized role: political offers or proposals seem to be expressed in this way for some reason, maybe because the political campaigns have evolved into huge operations with forceful outreach to citizens. Both buy and sell metaphors may have filled a semantic gap. The negativity inherent in these expressions has probably enhanced their use. Channell (2002, 55) raises the question of how negative polarities of evaluative lexis seem to have significantly increased: this observation was made during the compilation of the Collins COBUILD Dictionary of English (1995). This paper supports the finding that negative expressions seem to have increased. Political polarization and cable TV may have attributed to the negativity as well.
There could be other driving forces in the evolution of language that can be discussed here only fleetingly because of the limitations of this study. The language of business pervades American society, and as freedom of trade is an essential American belief, it is easy to see how elections could be seen as a series of transactions whereby the best offer finds a buyer after a fair competition. Writing about elections as consumer actions and commercial comparisons may have enhanced the use of business metaphors. Referring to presidential candidates as brands (such as cars or beer) has not been an entirely unknown practice in media. As early as 1972, the columnist Art Buchwald was quoted in the *TIME* magazine when he was commenting on the ambiguous situation with one candidate in the Democratic primaries, Ed Muskie:

(66) To Humorist Art Buchwald last week, Muskie's breakdown seemed more like an automobile recall. Citing "engineering difficulties and lack of consumer acceptance" for withdrawal of "the Muskie" from the market, Buchwald noted the faint hope for final victory as a compromise candidate: "While the 'Muskie' will not be sold in Ohio, Michigan, New York or California this year, it will be on display in the showroom at the Miami Convention Center in case anyone still wants to buy it." (The press: the hairline fracture, 1972)

It can be assumed that historical reasons have influenced the evolution of *buy* and *sell* as metaphors. As Kövecses (2005) has said, our selection of metaphors depends on who we are, how we construct our identity and what our ultimate concerns or interests are (180). As a nation, the United States is without doubt the business leader of the world, and it may well be that this American identity is reflected in metaphor use.

The limitations of this study are based on the research design. First, it is obvious that a study of only two lemmas (*buy* and *sell*) does not allow an analysis of metaphors in political discourse in great detail, or a more sophisticated analysis of negative evaluation. Second, the most difficult problems are the complexity of metaphor identification, the definition of the evaluative value and the target of metaphorical expressions. This was discussed in Sections 3.1, 4.3 and 4.4: there is always some subjectivity in the classification of expressions. The negative self-evaluation by Democrats might prove to be more multi-layered, if the classification procedure had not been based on the closest discourse context of a *buy* or a *sell* metaphor. Even though the negative value of a *buy* or *sell* metaphor was in many cases apparent, the larger discourse context seemed to be equally important in evaluation. This shows that it is difficult to study evaluation on the basis of lexis alone. Third, the period 2000-2008 with only three elections is too short for
conclusive results about the diachronic change in the occurrence of buy or sell metaphors.

Other limitations concern the research corpora. The most important weakness is the mock radio corpus which really is comprised of the Rush Limbaugh cable TV show. It can be assumed that the show was mostly based on the format of the Rush Limbaugh show on radio and that Limbaugh himself did not change his radio persona to do that TV show. The fact that it is already problematic to have a subcorpus based on a single news commentator’s show makes it even more important to state that the conservative radio data may not be as representative as other subgenres.

With regard to the representativeness of other subcorpora, the 2000 election news corpus may not be as representative as other election subcorpora, because of the lack of the electronic archives or because archiving may not have been regular or consistent. There may be other unbalances in the corpora with regard to partisan identity in media. It was not always possible to easily define a news medium as conservative or liberal. There are a few publications in the conservative election news corpus that would possibly be called more centrist than conservative, such as U.S. News and World Report, Forbes or Bloomberg. Secondly, editorial policies may be the reason for the uneven distribution of some metaphors in the corpora. Buy metaphors occur rarely in The Mother Jones and Harper’s Magazine, which comprise 35% and 32% respectively of the liberal news magazine corpus, so most of the buy metaphors found in the liberal news magazine data are from The Washington Monthly (33% of the corpus). There are no buy metaphors in The New Yorker data, which comprises 18% of the liberal election news corpus. These numbers show that there might be differences in metaphor use with respect to publication type. Further studies could be suggested: are colloquial expressions or negatively evaluative metaphors typical for some news magazines, for instance?

In spoken discourse, metaphorical expressions may increase because of repetition, characteristic for conversation, or because participants adopt expressions from each other. Moreover, lack of clarity in transcripts makes it sometimes difficult to interpret the meaning. With regard to adopting expressions from other participants in conversation, there is one incident in the Fox News corpus when the right time for the President to ‘sell
the Iraq war’ was discussed, and there are five sell metaphors in a period of ca. two minutes’ conversation. So, if they all were excluded as repetition, the claim that only liberals discussed the war in Iraq in terms of selling would be even stronger.
11 Conclusion

Metaphor in discourse and metaphors as discourse events which join together grammar, context and political objectives were the principal interest in this study. The following research questions guided this study: how genre-specific are buy and sell metaphors, how are they distributed in partisan political news and what kind of metaphorization levels of buy and sell can be found in authentic discourse? Moreover, negative evaluation conveyed with these metaphors in the partisan news coverage of three presidential elections in the United States (2000, 2004, and 2008) was one aspect in this study. The data comprised four text corpora which represent American political news genre: election news (1.6 million words), news or opinion magazines (3.8 million words), cable TV news (4.1 million words) and radio news (4.3 million words). All corpora had a conservative and a liberal subcorpus.

On the question of genre-specificity, sell was found to be a genre-specific election news metaphor: there were on average 72% more sell metaphors in the election data than in the other subgenres. Moreover, the occurrence levels of metaphorical and literal sell + [OBJECT] -type expressions were nearly even in the election news. All other sell metaphor types were more frequent than their literal counterparts in the election data. With respect to political subgenres in this study, there were some indications that different metaphor types might be preferred in some subgenres more than others, such as the buy it -type in spoken news. Although neither buy nor sell were partisan as such, some types of theme were more partisan than others. The buy into -type seemed to be characteristic for liberal political discourse. Some metaphor types were favored in partisan subgenres, such as the sell + [OBJECT] -type in the conservative election news and the sell out -type in the liberal election news. Sometimes there were reverse patterns in partisan use: conservatives preferred the does not sell –type metaphors and liberals the tough sell -type, and to some extent this applied also to the conservative use of the buy + [OBJECT] -type and the liberal use of the buy into -type.

With regard to negative evaluation, negative metaphors were found in the election news data more than non-negative metaphors: there were 36% more negatively evaluative buy and sell metaphors than non-negative in the election news. The increase of negative buy
metaphors (78%) in the conservative election news was especially great from 2000 to 2008. Liberals used negative buy and sell metaphors of their own candidates and party much more than conservatives of theirs. Some of the familiar stereotypes of liberals and conservatives are confirmed by these numbers. Democrats (liberals) are generally seen as having more internal disagreements and their intramural differences are also made public more easily. In contrast, the Republicans (conservatives), even though they are often described as having “a large tent” of a party (social conservatives, business-oriented conservatives and neo-conservatives), seem to have more discipline: they support the nominated candidate of their party in public, or at least restrain from colorful criticism during the elections. There is one caveat to this notion: the liberal negative self-evaluation was in some cases complex and dependent on the large discourse context. Metaphors seemed to be used more in order to create a stylistic effect than to actually criticize.

The future research topics suggested by this study concern at least five domains. First, what kind of further evidence can be found for the findings that sell metaphors are genre-specific in election news or that certain buy metaphor types, for instance buy it -type, may be typical for spoken political subgenre? Genre-specificity of metaphors has not been studied exhaustively from the empirical point of view: what kind of genre differences are there in metaphor use in authentic discourse and why? This study shows that even within closely related political subgenres there is variance. The relationship of metaphors both with genre and register should be more fully explored, as Steen et al. (2010), Krennmayr (2011) or Pasma (2011) have already done.

Second, the multiword type of metaphor as an explanation for metaphorization level is in accordance with earlier studies (Deignan 2005, Deignan 2007). This raises the question whether phrasal metaphor in authentic discourse leads the evolution of metaphors. The proportion of the literal and metaphorical occurrence levels in general could also be further examined, in order to understand how metaphor occurrence is dependent on Topics and contexts.

Third, the evaluative aspect of buy and sell metaphors and the partisan differences found in this study show something of the relationship between metaphor use and ideological
identity: constructing ‘self’ and ‘other’ or ‘us’ and ‘them’ identities in political discourse could be investigated with regard to other metaphors than buy or sell. As Critical Discourse Analysis has increasingly been applied together with cognitive or corpus methods (see for instance Hart 2011, Salama 2011), this could prove to be a productive new research area. Fourth, a study on the diachronic development of buy and sell metaphors could reveal pragmatic factors that have induced the growth of, for instance, buy metaphors in the last 40 years.

Finally, a note on the quantitative research design applied in this study. There is the pivotal question: does frequency matter, and if it does, how does it matter? The departure point of this study was that ideological identity may be revealed in metaphor use by comparing quantities, and especially the quantities of negatively evaluative metaphorical expressions. This expectation was at least partially confirmed and shows that shifting foci between quantitative and qualitative analysis is useful. The ongoing debate over different levels of metaphor occurrence and identification shows the significance of the topic (see e.g. Kövesces 2008, Steen et al. 2010). This paper suggests that the relationship between frequent metaphorical Vehicles and some less frequent but genre-specific metaphorical expressions should be explored further.

To conclude, this study shows that a quantitative study in which many comparison corpora are consulted can reveal characteristics of metaphors previously unnoticed. The research design of this study can fairly easily be applied in other genre studies. However, the way into consistent view on metaphors both as a discursive and conceptual phenomenon seems long, because no central forces or general principles have been found in metaphor use in authentic discourse studies so far. Taking small steps in this field, one by one, will some day lead to better metaphor identification procedures, better discourse analysis and better understanding of cognition and political identity.

As a highly unlikely contender for the highest office in the United States, candidate Obama referred to the power of words in 2008: “don’t discount that power” (see the quotation in the beginning of Section 1). Words carry a sense, words carry social identities and words carry potential political clout. As I started with Obama, I will end with Obama, with a possible discourse metaphor from authentic spoken discourse: it
shows all the complexities of elliptic, context-situated figurative speech which requires cultural and political knowledge to be understood. In 2009, when the health care reform proposal received poor poll numbers in the United States and the trust to the new President was fading rapidly, Obama was asked in the Oval Office by his advisers, if he was still feeling lucky. He replied: “My name is Barack Hussein Obama and I am sitting here. So yeah, I’m feeling lucky.” (Alter 2010, 399)
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**APPENDIX A. A list of abbreviations**

Abbreviations for the publications, TV and radio shows in the corpora (the file names)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>abbreviation</th>
<th>the name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amconservative</td>
<td>The American Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amthinker</td>
<td>The American Thinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>azcentral</td>
<td>The Arizona Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg</td>
<td>Bloomberg.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Beltway</td>
<td>The Beltway Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Cavuto</td>
<td>Neil Cavuto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Election</td>
<td>The Fox News Election Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Gibson</td>
<td>Charlie Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_HC</td>
<td>Hannity &amp; Colmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Hume</td>
<td>Brit Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Journal</td>
<td>The Fox News Journal Editorial Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Live</td>
<td>The Fox News Live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_News</td>
<td>The Fox News News Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_NewsWatch</td>
<td>The Fox News News Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_O’Reilly</td>
<td>Bill O’Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Sunday</td>
<td>The Fox News Sunday show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Susteren</td>
<td>Greta van Sustern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Watch</td>
<td>The Fox News Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Zahn</td>
<td>Paula Zahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harper</td>
<td>The Harper’s Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huffingtonpost</td>
<td>Huffingtonpost.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inthesetimes</td>
<td>InTheseTimes.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>The Mother Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Abrama</td>
<td>Dan Abrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Carlson</td>
<td>Tucker Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Cosby</td>
<td>Rita Cosby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Matt</td>
<td>Chris Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_MeetPress</td>
<td>Meet The Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Olbermann</td>
<td>Keith Olbermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Scarb</td>
<td>Joe Scarborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nation</td>
<td>The Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natreview, nationalreview, natrev</td>
<td>National Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newyorker</td>
<td>The New Yorker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_ATC, NPR_ATCW</td>
<td>All Things Considered, All Things Considered Weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_Daybreak</td>
<td>Daybreak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_Morning</td>
<td>Morning Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_NewsNotes</td>
<td>News Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_Saturday</td>
<td>Weekend edition Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_Sunday</td>
<td>Weekend edition Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_TalkNation</td>
<td>Talk Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospect</td>
<td>The American Prospect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rcp-blogs</td>
<td>blogs on RealClearPolitics.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Magazine/Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rollingstone</td>
<td>The Rolling Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salon</td>
<td>Salon.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slate</td>
<td>Slate.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spect, spectator</td>
<td>The American Spectator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tnr</td>
<td>The New Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>townhall</td>
<td>townhall.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usatoday</td>
<td>USA Today Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USNWR, usmwe</td>
<td>U.S. News &amp; World Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>washmonth</td>
<td>The Washington Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeklyst, weeklystandard</td>
<td>The Weekly Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wsj</td>
<td>The Wall Street Journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. A list of the buy and sell metaphors

Election news, conservative, buy
The first category is the target of evaluation and the election year (e.g. BUSH00= BUSH2000) and the second is the value of evaluation (NEG for negative, POS for positive, NEUTR for neutral)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUSH00</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>rong with this idea, except that Americans aren't buying it. They rejected it in 1996 when Bob Dole tried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>ve, that we are less safe today. Americans don't buy the phony optimism about Iraq that George Bush an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>gh Mr. Bush retains a small edge on taxes, voters buy the Democrat's argument on rolling back the tax c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH04</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>very focused.” But he warns conservatives not to buy into the hype about the opposing team. For exampl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>basis of marriage: It’s called a “monarchy.” So far, the press certainly has bought it. Part of that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>question, of course, is whether the voters will buy it, too. The guess here is that, ultimately, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>bowing to party rules. Some of the news media bought into that, with The New York Times reporting: “T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>indulged in special pleading and America didn’t buy it. It’s as if the country this week made it off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>knowledge. God save the country if voters actually buy into Dean’s health care socialism, but at least h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>rd to see how the general electorate is going to buy what the Democrats are selling. To a person, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>try. Asked by Byron York of National Review if he bought that theory, McAuliffe said he did. The Unocal de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIULIANI08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>lying to social-conservative voters who might not buy their free-market economics. As a tactical matte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIULIANI08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Still, &quot;I'm really not sure that pro-lifers are buying what he has to sell here.&quot; What is Giuliani tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERRY04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>the zealot. Edwards vs. Kerry: Look who doesn't buy the presidential candidate’s critique of the Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERRY04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>m is bigger than dead presidents. Nobody alive is buying his act, either, and he has only himself to blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCAIN00</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>reform he's not a true conservative, but I don't buy that,” says Salmon, who supports McCain-Feingold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCAIN08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>u so far, especially when primary voters don't buy your message. If you're the maverick, you need t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCAIN08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>(It turned out they weren't.) Similarly, McCain buys unconditionally into the idea that a diverse wor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCAIN08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>ed, making a true uprising unlikely. &quot;I don't buy it,” Cook said. “No money, no infrastructure le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCAIN08</td>
<td>NEUTR</td>
<td>anty would be economic policy. McCain has never bought into the supply-side school, which argues that t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCAIN08</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>ent of mind, and even though didn't necessarily buy him on all the issues, they liked his style,” sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAMA08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>te enemy.” How much of this claptrap did Obama buy? Well, he stayed at Trinity for 20 years — until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAMA08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>ough. Should Democrats Be Feeling Any Kind of Buyer's Remorse? As Democrats kick off their nati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAMA08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>the party's standard-bearer. In other words, buyer's remorse has not settled in, and it probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAMA08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>for governing the country. Americans just aren't buying into them. The Beltway Boys Even as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAMA08</td>
<td>NEUTR</td>
<td>udacity of Hope, Obama expands on his vision. He buys into the narrative that Franklin D. Roosevelt sai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER00</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>ing voters are you can rent, but you can't buy,” says Goeas. &quot;They don't lock in permanently. Ei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Cable TV (Fox News), conservative, buy
g time. But I don’t think the president has bought himself some time this week. He was trying to stave of democratic attempts to
The president was clear and commanding, and the polls say the American public bought his agenda – at least for now. In the beginning of
able to hook up the phone and give them a line of bull that they bought for some reason. They’re not buying it from Bush. GINGRICH: Look
them a line of bull that they bought for some reason. They’re not buying it from Bush. GINGRICH: Look, the Europeans liked Clinton because
All right, so even if you take your tenor, which I don’t buy for one second because an AA meeting does depend on a higher power, but
this high-strength aluminum, normally used for nuclear weapons, for aircraft. Do you buy that? POWELL: That’s what they say. We have a
this play or die fear that some thought only one could survive, do you buy that? WELCH: I do not think so at all. I think,
, are the ones that will feel the pinch, this year. Do you buy that? GATES: Well, I think they will be challenged just like all
foreign policy goes, it’s been a terrible week. We couldn’t even buy support in the U.N., much less sell our argument. And I think,
11 and Iraq. Thats why they’re by and large saying, we don’t buy it. GIULIANI: The connection is there is terrorism. The connection is not
percentage of GDP, and they will be declining as… CAVUTO: Did you buy the Congressional Budget Office numbers that they were talking well
20 percent higher in the market? CLARIDA: Well, I think what we buy is that if this package is passed, that on balance it will be good
? ! TONY-DWYER-FTN-MI: Yes, I do not -- I do not buy the big sell-off. I mean to get a big sell-off, you’re going to
a lot more of that kind of stuff to justify these multiples. Do you buy that, Price? ! HEADLEY: Heres the problem. (CROSSTALK)
! NAPOLITANO: Yes. I FELDMAN: You have to buy into the idea, if you are going to run in a Democratic election,
is being issued into office. I NAUERT: So people really have bought into the thing that Clinton used to say, during his first time around,
the people of Iraq. ! GIBSON: Well, OK. I buy that. But 30 percent-plus of the British public don’t. And the worldwide
. ! GIBSON: OK. Let’s just say that I’m buying your scenario. How will we know it? With all the people who just
. ! GIBSON: Ian, Ian, hocus-pocus. We’re not buying that here. Stand by. Let me go back to Trace Gallagher in Santa
, as you may know, lawyers for Andrea Yates are hoping the jury will buy her insanity defense and sentence her to a mental institution for
reason of insanity to suffocating her 3-year-old son and her 3-month-old daughter. The judge bought it. Miss Feltman was put into a mental
She’s back home because the mental facility says that she got better. You buying that, Miss Merritt? JERALYN-MERRITT-C: Absolutely. And it's
not. But this Colorado Mental Health Institute says she’s better. Are you buying that? SILVERMAN: I don’t know the woman either. It would have
O’REILLY: Now it seems to me that this guy -- see I’m not buying the craziness because he -- you know, he evaded arrest for almost a year
: High-tailed it to the restaurant. O’REILLY: OK, so you’re not buying the fact that he was stunned and throwing up and all of that stuff?
. Get over yourself. Advice from just one of the folks. “ Not buying it, Ms. Moore. The folks don’t say, “ Get over yourself
I would argue that marijuana contributed to the death. STRoup: You truly have bought the reaper madness mentality. HANNITY: No, it’s not
n’t, Sean. HANNITY: You’re making my argument. STRoup: You buy the government’s line. There are millions of people who have smoked
think it’s justified, some Arab countries boycotting the United States? Do you buy into this? IBRAHIM-HOOPER-CO: Well, I think it’s a sad state
effectively discover and do anything with what he’s got there. And it would buy him probably another couple of years to do what he real

after Bush is pretty interesting, I think. SNOW: Juan, do you buy that? WILLIAMS: Yes, I think that’s exactly right. In fact

it does is it tears the veil off of coverage when everybody else is just buying into the spin. They challenge the spin. BURNS: Don’t we?

an obvious attempt at a new image, and if so, are the media buying in? HALL: Well, I think the media are buying in by continuing

are the media buying in? HALL: Well, I think the media are buying in by continuing to cover him. What if he went to church and stood

lot, that thes thats going to keep stocks like these going. Do you buy that? ! MOGLIA: I think that that’s part of it. 2004Fox_HC

s been here saying, you know, things are picking up. Do you buy that? ! RODGERS: Oh, absolutely. And its broad-based.

United States and they take it very, very seriously. I just do not buy the issue that John has been all over the place on issues. He has

think that is one of the... (CROSSTALK) ! CAVUTO: Do you buy anything this guy says? ! HYMOWITZ: Do I buy it?

Do you buy anything this guy says? ! HYMOWITZ: Do I buy it? It does not matter if I buy it or not. I think

! HYMOWITZ: Do I buy it? It does not matter if I buy it or not. I think the Federal Reserve is charged with two things.

! CAVUTO: Are you troubled that this investor class still does not buy your line? ! LEW: No. I think if you look

. Even a few tears shed for Scott Peterson this week. Is the jury buying it? Another search warrant for the “Gloved One.” More action at

money where their mouth is, get the technology, perfect it and America will buy into it. You won’t lose if you build a better mousetrap.

political witch hunt against this president and you have a double standard that you are buying in this particular case... SKINNER: Sean, Sean --

again to make that the fault of this president and the American people aren’t buying it. Which is why Republicans will win the election in the leadership, it’s men using abuse of power on women. I don’t buy it. You have to have respect. It goes both ways. How can

them jingle around and the next day go to combat patrol? I don’t buy it. "O’REILLY: All right. So you would not charge these people?

Yes. "O’REILLY: And he doesn’t care about what happens. Do you buy that? MORRIS: Well, his father kind of didn’t in the closing

not trying to get the Congress to pass a resolution. No, he was buying into what the administration said. He shouldn’t have done so, but he

into what the administration said. He shouldn’t have done so, but he bought into what the administration said. COLMES: This war is this

is broken. And we’ve got to fix that. COLMES: Do you buy the argument that these illegal immigrants, or undocumented workers, are good for

is real and that human activity is largely to blame. Senator, do you buy that? GRAHAM: Human activity is partially to blame. President Bush said

, the Fed just keeps hiking and hiking and hiking and hiking. Do you buy that? ! MARTIN: Yes, because, of course, the

, this is good. ! CAVUTO: Jonathan, you are not buying it. Why not? ! JONATHAN-HOENIG-P: I do not -- I

were that the city would be fully abandoned, evacuated by tomorrow. Do you buy that? ! CONNER: Neil, I think that what were seeing

! END-VIDEO-CLIP) ! SHAWN: Well, some congressmen weren’t completely buying his vows. Michigan Republican Thaddeus McCotter, for one, staff says his boss can clean up the scandal-plagued United Nations, but is Congress buying it? Will the Senate showdown turn into a Senate

of a contest they sponsored on the Internet site. Pat, I don’t buy that for a minute, but what do you think of that ad? HALPIN

ones who are supposed to be embracing this whole thing. So I won’t buy that at all. I will say as far as the stabilization of Iraq, seen Dean a lot. And there’s a huge -- some second thoughts, buyer’s remorse problem now, it turns out, with Howard Dean. He does

Well, the trend in the polls is really startling. And I don’t buy the argument, quite, about the ground game. Iowa voters know how to

to be older and they’d be less likely to go out. Do you buy that? YEPSEN: A little bit, but not a lot. I mean

. This takes it a step further, I think. GABLER: If you buy into this premise, here’s my concern: my concern is that there will
Bonds and some writers with "Sports Illustrated," but most of the media bought into the conspiracy because it made for good press.
much he has come up in the polls, but personally, I'm not buying the idea that his attack on Mormons was innocent. It smells planned to me
window shop today because of the weather. It may be time for Romney to buy into a much more aggressive Iowa strategy. The latest Rasmus
Smith couldn't afford probations fees, but could afford drugs? I'm not buying it. "I'm with you, Tami. Liz Petito, Parsippany,
and this, that and the other thing. And obviously, people didn't buy it. PAUL-BEGALA-CO-AU: You know what else he said, in fact? In
. I was involved with an accident. Details to come. I'm not buying Cheney saying well, we got to get it accurate. I just think that
inside her. She believed -- the jury had to believe. They had to buy the defense's explanation that she felt she was saving the children from hell
does have some good arguments to make the connection, but the public isn't buying it. They haven't been buying it for six to eight months.
the connection, but the public isn't buying it. They haven't been buying it for six to eight months. And the president is behind the curve on
Bush said his speech and his series of speeches are not political. Do you buy that? BARBARA-COMSTOCK:: Well, yes, I do, because the preside
in Iraq and they're... KASICH: But Barbara -- the people aren't buying it. But, Barbara -- but Barbara, the people aren't buying it
n't buying it. But, Barbara -- but Barbara, the people aren't buying it, the country. COMSTOCK: Well, you know, this is why
are disenchanted and want to bring down his movement. COLMES: You don't buy any of these charges? GREENBERG: I don't buy the charges
: You don't buy any of these charges? GREENBERG: I don't buy the charges because of who they're coming from. And I haven't seen
WILLIAMS: No, I do not buy his apology, Greta. I think it was disingenuous, this guy is trying
buy it. I think the American people are not
buy it. I think the American people are not
buying it. HUME: Wait, hold it. So if
terms of responding to the pleas from the Lebanese government, has said they'll buy it into a cease-fire if it's put in place. But I mean, you
n't see that we have a real resolution in sight that all the parties are buying into. What we have are people doing shuttle diplomacy from capital
me, is, you know, a related argument. Whether the public will buy that is also unclear. BUMLER: The interesting thing about that is that the
sort of like the Trojan horse. I mean, the American people wouldn't buy it if they talked about it. The Trojan horse -- you know, they
Jane did it here. The issue is. HALL: No, I said they bought into it. GABLER: I know. Yes, the idea is, will
. For the first two and a half years of the war, they virtually bought the Bush line, hook, line and sinker. And believe me, there
her husband says and does not say to the press. Neal, do you buy that? And if it's the case, isn't it a little earlier
I think people are - are not - I think people - commentators are not buying it. I think the American people are not buying it. NEAL-GABLER-M
people - commentators are not buying it. I think the American people are not buying it. NEAL-GABLER-MEDIA: In media terms, this was a disast
percent have been favorable to Republicans. First of all, Ellis, do you buy the numbers? HENICAN: I'm not quite sure how non-partisan Bob Lic
of the Democrats and yet proven yet again. BURNS: So, do you buy the numbers? HENICAN: No. I... BURNS: Do you buy the
a bomb on her. I CAVUTO: So, you are not buying the whole racist thing? I DELAY: He still -- he still
the electorate that want us to get out, get out now and aren't buying your approach, wait until the generals say it's OK? !
scam by lawyers to get people freed. Andrea Yates, the jury didn't buy it. Now this woman, obviously irresponsible, right? Would you agree?
sick, nauseated. Greta VAN-SUSTEREN, FOX NEWS HOST: Ted, do you buy his apology? WILLIAMS: No, I do not buy his apology, Greta
Ted, do you buy his apology? WILLIAMS: No, I do not buy his apology, Greta. I think it was disingenuous, this guy is trying
HANNITY: This week on HANNITY'S AMERICA. " Sicko. " Before you buy what Michael Moore is selling find out the truth about the
you all are smarter genetically than the rest of us. BETTY-NGUYEN-CNN: I don't buy that. ZAHN: And for just as many of those doctors, you hear
them at all. MILLER: Bill, there are two Americas. Those who buy Edwards and those who think he is a complete phony. I am in the
terrible that the Iraqi people haven't really stepped up. And I'm not buying this they all voted business. The mullahs told them to go vote. And
. It seems fairly harmless to me, but I don't know that I buy your theory that this is some anti-gay thing, and therefore, that's why
thing in general? DENISE-BROWN-NICO: It's horrible. I guess I don't buy it. I don't like it. I think the judge made a horrific
say, " With a shotgun? " O'REILLY: Yes, Oprah is not buying this at all. REIMAN: She's not. And you can tell this
usually smiling and empathetic. Oprah's going, " Hey, I'm not buying this. " REIMAN: It seems like a sarcastic smirk almost. O'REILLY:
nuanced as it gets off the cuff in New Hampshire. I just don't buy it. I think what it is, is she's trying to appeal to
care what Al Gore thinks. The real problem is that supposedly skeptical journalists have bought into this nonsense, and they also think that the.
a lot of reporters think. What they're saying is if you don't buy into the party line on global warming, that it's -- that it's
the earth has been going through for millions of years. If you don't buy the Al Gore version, then you are a moron just like anybody who denies
conservatives, frankly, on this issue. And even if you don't really buy into the entire idea, at least we all pretty much need to agree that
newspapers at well regarded institutions of higher learning indicate that not all young people are buying what the global warming alarmists
And in the course of that angering and infuriating a lot of the people who bought into this and who were planning on it. So he didn't go into
, probably. But for the sake of comedy at the moment he could have bought a little time. But he wants a victory, too. He wants to
? GOLDBERG: It might be somewhat effective because I think a lot of people buy into this. I think there's a lot of misunderstanding about what
may. I know that... HOROWITZ: I don't -- I don't buy those national polls. I don't understand the national poll. If 26 percent
come out of the woods and throw their support behind Barack Obama. Are you buying to that theory? BLACKBURN: Well, I think that's
? Plus, Paula Jones and Gennifer Flowers making headlines again. Are the media buying this time? Katie Couric and others say sexist media he
he's hawkish on immigration. I don't think the Republicans are going to buy it. COLMES: You know, John Kasich -- and welcome, all of
going to pay back every single penny of that. O'REILLY: I don't buy that, by the way. KELLY: Second of all, she didn't
John Edwards has taken a beating on " The Factor " because we don't buy his two Americas nonsense. Mr. Edwards has consistently demagogu
have to ask myself am I throwing good money after bad? I don't buy this silver medal theory. You can't keep -- in this race it's
cash in to get the surgery. O'REILLY: Yes, but they're not buying that. This looks to me like they set it up so that guys can
a prosecutor and just got tripped up here on this personal foibles. Do you buy that? HENNINGER: I don't buy it at all. I think Eliot
on this personal foibles. Do you buy that? HENNINGER: I don't buy it at all. I think Eliot Spitzer was a man who was simply unhinged
reaction to this Hillary Clinton note that she sent to her donors? Do you buy that it's just for the Senate race? DICK-MORRIS-FORME: It's the
you know what? It has worked pretty well with the media, because they buy into this thing. MARA-LIASSON-NATI: Look, race is never going to
and I think he was probably in 20 homes that day. I don't buy the idea that guilt-by-association should be any part of our politics. (END-VIDEO-
helps them avoid being silent for another 10 days. So I just don't buy this, that -- the Obama transition operation is resisting giving out this y
Chicago, you know, political player, that even if he did not necessarily buy into some of these schemes, if he is, you know, dropping expletives
going to be more tightly fisted when it comes to spending, I don't buy it. HANNITY: Well, they also have a $400 billion dollar tax increase
an all-white neighborhood abutting a golf course, I don't know if I'm buying his angst. Do you know what I'm talking about Miller? MILLER:
's because unions understand Obama stands for working men and change, and nobody is buying the inevitability anymore. INGRAHAM: What's this? LIMBAUGH: (shakes his head) I don't--

be true that he's ill with the kind of evil but I don't buy the idea that this is an accident. GUILFOYLE: All right. Ben Duerr--

New York City Police Headquarters. DAVIS: Well, I'm not going to buy into that premise that you can't be giving speeches. But I don't know

then he started having an affair with her. I don't think anyone is buying that line. COLMES: Yes. I like your line, Andrew, that

. Now you heard all five of the talk show hosts and you're not buying some of the stuff, huh? HANKIN: A bunch of weasels. O'REILLY

people's character that is completely off limits for public discussion. I don't buy that. O'REILLY: You have to frame the discussion in a responsib.

guy who wrote the new hit book on Obama, Jerome Corsi, is also buying the 9/11 conspiracy stuff so he is a pinhead too. Finally tonight the

help find the people who have kidnapped her child, but the police don't buy that. The police think that she's a big liar. They have caught

some of their commentators are blatantly dishonest and off the chart haters. Only extremists buy into that. By the way, at 8:00 p.m. last night,

's going to come down to what the American people want, and do they buy the change argument that Barack is using? Or do they say we don't

. You know, but the thing about the kidnapping, why I don't buy it is that I believe that that was his escape. He was going to

: Bugs on the windshield, right. BANDERAS: At what point do jurors buy all of this? JORDAN: They don't. I think that it's

was indeed including Barack Obama. KELLY: What about that, Monica? Do you buy that White House denial, that they meant Barack Obama?

the Democratic either, but for now and through November, it appear to be buying it. " HUME: That is it for the panel but stay tuned to

a minute, wait a minute... CICCONE: OK. HANNITY: I don't buy it. Now I don't know for sure, but it doesn't seem

-- 40 points, and it happens again in Kentucky, it will raise the buyer's remorse. A lot of Democrats are thinking are we actually going to nomina

explanation as to what happened. Mindy's mother says that she just doesn't buy any of it because the story has changed so many times from

you're unwilling to go out on a limb with Leonard on this that you buy this version of the baby-sitter, the kidnapping and the whole works, right?2008Fox_Susteren

south side of Chicago, he had to be a militant guy. Are you buying that? CARPENTER: Well, I don't have insight into his heart personally

that he has seen from a low of 4 or 5. CAVUTO: Do you buy that? CLARIDA: some as high as 20 percent. CAVUTO: That

Radio news, conservative (Limbaugh), buy

d try to come up with a better lie that fooled you so that you bought it the first time without having to ask me about

attention tonight specifically because we know you bought it. This guy's a salesman. He's out selling a plan,

of an economy about ready to collapse, and many people bought it, because they've been pummeled with it all

. (of-Lloyd-B Unidentified Voice: Those fools in the middle class buy that tax-cut line every time. LIMBAUGH: (quickly)

) LIMBAUGH: (shakes his head) I don't buy that. I don't think that's at all what this man's about

g your money the way they want to. Don't buy this investment garbage, folks. Investment is just another slick wor

Mrs-HILLARY-RODHAM: Really the important thing is what we're trying to buy with those numbers, you know, to give people

comes to -- to real estate, inflation and everything else. So don't buy this argument that lower interest rates are going to
He's happy. Pay no attention to what he says. Don't buy it this time, folks. Don't bite on it, don't go.

it's institutionalized and there's nothing we can do about it. We have bought the lies so long that now we have two generations wouldn't be on any list. The people of the country, though, buy it, and I've always focused on the audience. I've always focused "President BILL CLINTON": Hey, Hillary, can you believe they actually buy this health-care stuff? Oops, got to go.

Where did Mrs. Clinton go to trade cattle futures, Mr. McDougal? Would you buy a used car from him, by the way, folks? Instead, it's discounted because liberals don't buy into it. And since liberals don't, it's just not mainstream. And everybody bought into it thinking they were getting this new conservative, liberal guy. And here prove it. The press and activists simply bought it. Well, there's a movement in Washington now to -- to expand for his leadership. LIMBAUGH: Huh. OK, I'll buy it. What the hell? Now ta -- now Senator Moynihan, on "

else is in business, and the number of feminists that can buy and fit into this stuff is probably one or two. hm? I'm sorry. I don't -- I don't buy it. In fact, we, ladies and gentlemen, have stumbled States as more and more idiot Americans bought the notion this guy meant anything to world peace. I've seen my mail. Rush, you're just an absolute idiot. You really bought that? That's a hoax. in here, to protest alleged GOP efforts.' The press has just bought this, hook, line and sinker that. I don't support him. I don't know yet. I am not bought by this hype, though. I'll tell you that right away. I'm not going to make up my mind; I'm not going to buy the hype. But this does not mean going to wait. I'm not going to just sit around and try to buy the hype and go with the flow. Great Society war on poverty. What promise? Doesn't sound like he's bought into any promise. I want to

an animal. Sign language and so forth, I just -- I don't buy it. I'm skeptical of these kinds of things. , says, I didn't do it.' The fourth-graders in the jury bought it. There -- there -- there's no dispute here. said some things -- you -- not -- not even the members of the press bought what Daschle was saying.

OK. (End-of-excerpt) LIMBAUGH: Hey, that was a nice sight to see -- nobody buying what Daschle had to say. companies. LIMBAUGH: See? People -- look, people aren't going to buy that. This is a good cross section of America. Nobody's going to buy that tripe. Besides, the ordinary American doesn't earn th
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BRADLEY00  | NEG      | than substance. By Keith Moore .Has Bill Bradley bought the notion that Bill Clinton is indeed the "first night of the second debate, but nobody seemed to buy his excuse--particularly after Laura Bush, in a p record contributions. They know who is the better buy. Gore is hardly a tribune of the working man and hen Democratic primary voters there get a bit of buyer's remorse. Maybe they worry about Hillary's high sn't win the nomination, then the system they've bought into their entire working lives will have been buy care about most. But Cordell and Padgett aren't buying it. "If he lived down here and sent his kids to t use they share his opposition to the Iraq war and buy his argument that Bush will only be beaten by a c s in prison, he had gotten right with God. Voters bought it, and Mayor Barry reigned for another four year weeds" status. A likely scenario? Does Neel even buy this? Perhaps Kerry will succeed with the strateg take our Clintons and Carters, but we just ain't buying it. Kerrys and Deans." And that's a shame. Not just mpaign consultant Kenneth Baer put it, "Democrats buy into this high and mighty role that the press has ter's decisions worked out so well. But the time bought by Carter's energy reforms is running out. In 200 from a world steeped in Jesus. Even if they don't buy the theology themselves, they intuitively underst religious credentials, Democrats are implicitly buying into the right's phony charge that Democrats hate not all of Edwards' campaign advisors initially bought into the idea for the spots. "It took about a we Edwards is the most obvious beneficiary of any buyer's remorse. Hillary might provoke. Edwards is a wh e more complex than that." Turque is inclined to buy the more cynical view. But the simple facts he la epxed Republicans like to demonize. To avoid "buyer's remorse" later, Democrats might ask for clarifica f two rookie mistakes influenced by hubris: Kerry bought into front-runner-ism via fund-raising yardsticks doing whatever he can to induce a severe case of buyer's remorse among Democratic voters about Kerry. F r-ism via fund-raising yardsticks, and, worse, he bought into a presentation based mostly on himself, his k Edwards is the most obvious beneficiary of any buyer's remorse. Hillary might provoke. Edwards is a wh Gore is hardly a tribune of the working man. "Bill Clinton's blue sky," says Iowa Waterloo C fr's presentation based mostly on himself, his because his campaign (and, yes, many columnists) bought into the McCain campaign's demonization of thee to establish for himself. Whether or not voters buy the comparison, the result is to moot this yea sn't mean he's a wimp, but it does mean he can't buy into the Bush-Rove politics that McCain now esp policies better than any other candidate. "We all bought Bill Clinton's blue sky," says Iowa Waterloo C will respect the press (and the more voters will buy the McCain's team's assertion that Barack Obama is down a spokesman. Press critics like Sabato don't buy it; "isn't a fresh quote in reaction to a cleverl ne against the Clinton-Gore position.) And if you buy into this logic, as The Wall Street Journal's Al elped negotiate passage of the Maine law, doesn't buy it. He says he's not worried about the industry c
owing a seat at the table. I just don’t want them buying all the chairs.” And Edwards, in a pointed crit
de more hawkish than the others, but all three buy the trope of the “war on terror”—in August, O
al issue. Both men offered indications that they buy into much of the current consensus in Washington
ested from the grip of special interests.” Voters bought this anti-Washington message, but once the Repub
reportorial laziness. Too many credulous pundits buy the spin. But Reed also possesses an undeniable i
and prospects are poor, you are probably going to buy some of this Orwellian trash. You may be quite th

News magazines, liberal, buy

1 ona. He comes by his skepticism honestly. He once bought into a claim quite similar to Adovasio’s, back in
2 but people were too invested to admit that they’d bought into an illusion. The Holly Corporation promptly
3 re furious at how quickly their elected officials bought into CCA’s lavish promises, despite the company’s
4 by the GOP National Committee -- I automatically bought the line that the party that knew best. The ident
5 we could ask, apropos of Richard N: " Would you buy a used.? " CHEWED CANS MEAN SNOW # July 1977 # R
6 was to make sure that the utility industry would buy into aggressive multi-pollutant legislation. The
7 g disorder abroad and at home, Americans may well buy into Giuliani’s tale of new villains and morality
8 be reported to the state. # Ronnie Earle doesn’t buy it. The 62-year-old district attorney is approach
9 workers only in passing. By then, the base didn’t buy it. " The response was ‘why is he talking about
10 week. But many voters and journalists just didn’t buy that he was truly religious. (Jimmy Carter and Bi
11 the varieties he used to breed it. Ghosh did not buy the who me? defense - not from a prosperous entre
12 e men are likely to take even more risks. I don’t buy this argument for several reasons. First, while i
13 n left undisturbed. Many in Fort Chipewyan aren’t buying it. Last August the town saw its first antitar-sa
14 to ” talk the talk ” -- Americans still aren’t buying it. Only 29 percent of voters think the Democrati
15 more observers, especially conservatives, aren’t buying it. (“ This is a Religious War, “ screamed the he
16 uch reconciliation about by, in Gates’s words, “ buying the Iraqis time. ” But that’s the problem. The U
17 actual choices conservatives present, they aren’t buying. The reason is that conservatives have constructe
18 he problem. The United States is ever more dearly buying time, and Iraq is ever more freely spending it. A
19 read between the lines, we need to get out, that buys into the fundamental presumption of the redeploym
20 it to start cooperating. Meanwhile, Giuliani had bought two years of time. Criscitello had run into what
21 e times when they’re young, like consumers buying a product, tend to develop an allegiance that stays with
22 g Marlon Brando at Matteo’s was like spotting JFK buying ties on Fifty-seventh Street or Marilyn Monroe in
Cable TV (MSNBC), liberal, buy

1 Department are suggesting, well, we did nt really buy it. How does the public then make sense of it? RICK HAHN, RET
2 tell you where Hoffa is buried. And they bought into it hook, line, and sinker. ABRAMS: All right CARLO I do
3 and told police he had been kidnapped but no one bought his story GEIST You know what, Tucker, the media took a lot of
4 of staff's office, " You know what? They're never going to buy that, and they're going to kill us every day. " They in
5 of this picture. You said last night I was buying defense spin. But let's look at this objectively. This picture is problematic, do
6 CARLSON Yes MADDOW It was people totally buying into it. It was people talking about how virile he looked in that flight suit
7 that what happened was that the judge just did nt buy it the way -- because Joran went back and forth with his statements, and
8 t at a certain point in time, the judge did nt buy it COSBY Dave, go ahead. Is there a question you want to ask the
9 college student by accident, but the girls mother is not buying his story. (BEGIN VIDEO CLIP) JANET PELASARA,
10 you. Good luck with your book. I especially say to people, do nt necessarily buy it, but take a look at it and see if you like the wri
11 And some people take the whole left-wing menu and they will say, I will buy that whole act. Im for gay marriage. Im against
12 if Im in charge. OWENS: Right. MATTHEWS: And then somebody on the right buys the whole catechism of the right without
13 polls. First of all, they're flipping a little bit toward the president. Do you buy that as significant? MITCHELL: I do nt buy it as
14 Do you buy that as significant? MITCHELL: I do nt buy it as significant at this point, although I think
15 weve been saying all along, I do not think Americans are generally going to buy into a plan that is not spelled out and really risk
16 under control. Well be able to have an insurgency that has been quelled. Do you buy that? LAMBERT: Well, I think tha
17 think the president is right, but Kate, do you think the conservatives will buy what the president said last night, that he really
18 be 3 percent, 4 percent, some other percentage. MR RUSSELL Would you talking buy into lifting the cap? SEN NELSON Well, I 2005
19 empowered and able to compete in the world tomorrow. So I just don't buy that. I think we have -- we are now in a 2005
20 . All these things matter to me and I want more of it OLBERMANN I buy all those argument except the golf one. But
21 control of the situation, going through the list of the crimes, do you buy his argument, his assertion, that he stopped
22 the speech in Cleveland, to show that he could take it? Do you buy that? THOMAS: No, really. I think that he s spea
23 simple explanation " Im bipolar " but today her victims mother answered, Im not buying it. The informed analysis of a
24 about Paula Fortunato. MICHAEL MUSTO, " VILLAGE VOICE ": Oh, I'm buying it. hook, line, and stinker, I mean 2006
25 originated. Its my Bible, its my religion, its my Scientology. So Im totally buying it. Its totally true UNGER All right. Were going
26 Juries tend to go easy when the perpetrator is a woman, but will they buy an insanity defense? And was Dr. Alfred Kinsey a
27 BLOOM: We are talking about teachers and students, Larry. POZNER: Do nt buy into these statistics. But the next thing is, you
28 do with the fact that the peddlers of mass media and we the people who buy into it think that when you behave badly that yo
29 The real issue here is... (CROSSTALK) SCARBOROUGH: J.D., do you buy that? HAYWORTH: No, because. SWARTZ:
30 effect was too busy to check on the veracity of these documents? Do you buy that explanation? AV WESTIN, FORMER
31 to believe the Hollywood spin that somehow she was innocent? Im not ready to buy into it. SCARBOROUGH: You know,
32 an accounting of what happened that time where he s held accountable. How can Hollywood buy into an argument without
33 , stocks go down, earnings go up, earnings go down. But do you buy that argument that all of this just has to do with
Radio news, liberal (NPR), buy

1. ... was the claim there. ABRAMSON: Yeah. But the judge never bought that argument; never bought the idea that this man had there. ABRAMSON: Yeah. But the judge never bought that argument; never bought the idea that this man had been forced to know, dropped that. And, as I said, the jury didn't buy that argument, either. SIEGEL: Well, for nine counts of aiding al-Qaeda Supreme Court today, though, a majority of the justices did not seem to buy the notion that abortion laws can not be to the parental notification requirement puts teen-agers at grave risk. Justice Kennedy wasn't buying that argument, noting are not bound by that ruling. Several justices quickly bought the argument. Chief Justice Roberts: f There aren't any individual s a matter to be resolved by state-to-state protests? No justice seemed to buy the defense argument that because a defede

2. In the rarified community of constitution President Bush used in his approach to the war. President Bush used in his approach to the war. BRAND: And are voters buying that? I mean, its safe to say that the governor In the rarified community of constitutional scholars, though, few liberals or conservatives are buying that line. Most seem to tell me that we were such a generous country, and yet we only bought resentment sometimes from the countries we tried toward the jury she said, it's insulting to your intelligence. Don't buy it. There seemed to be no concern by the government that's confidence in their case against Jeff Skilling, and Weissmann says that prosecutors never bought into the theory that Ken Mr-SAMORE: Very often in the proliferation business, the best you can do is buy time. So I think we still have options, in the? What do you think is going on there? Mr-CHRISTIE: I don't buy it for a second, Farai. I think Oprah Winfrey is the most popular , but it wants to send a message about race and equality. Do you buy that, Trey? Mr-ELLIS: I mean, of course, it's explicitly processes in Arkansas. So where does all this experience coming from? People are buying into the fact that, yes, she does have been on the Tom Joyner show for 12 years I think, you don't buy that, Robert? Mr-REDDING: Yeah, well, I don't buy it n't buy that, Robert? Mr-REDDING: Yeah, well, I don't buy it. And Tom Joyner made Tavis Smiley who he is, essentially, I racially harmonious with everyone, can you socially engineer that if no one else has bought into your construct, if other people bill by June. What we don't yet know is who's going to buy it. I think the Democrats will probably oppose it in this form, and and abused by Bolton for not buying his theories about Cuba or Syria. This is not a strictly partisan debate nominee, and the Democrats are not going to buy that. We are going to probably face a floor battle over the filibuster.

3. To me -- and I have such respect for Alice Hoagland, but I can't buy into this logic of transcending hatred. This is the Even Johnny is amazed at how people have bought into this cupcake thing, and how many want to see his designs as more
Well, that's what people are saying. I'm not sure that I buy it, and I don't buy it for two reasons. The first one saying. I'm not sure that I buy it, and I don't buy it for two reasons. The first one is that we don't know.

nearby Fermi National Laboratory Jim Amundson, says he doesn't buy the library's assurances that the biometric system's cash, going to help quiet these conflicts? Mr-MELHEM: Well, it could buy the Hamas government some time. But really this is - 12,000 troops - to suppress the strike. And in order to sort of buy himself a little political capital he decided, okay, it's time to answer is that this is just what the American public wants. I don't buy it. I think there's a -- like you said, the bottom line is money or there's another agenda or the producers -- I just don't buy -- I hear over and over again in the American public t think there is anything wrong with that. In fact, I refuse to buy into the dumb or vulnerable doctor idea that doctors are to what extent people in Europe, some of our best allies, do not buy into the basic proposition that this war, and therefore, not buy into the basic proposition that this war, and therefore, do not buy into the notion that the laws of war appear obviously we'd be back down to 1.6 billion within a century. And that might buy us a lot of time on this planet to come up with some other external agency at the time of the Big Bang? You see I don't buy that because that is appealing to some creator being outside the case. PALCA: Well, what about that David Fischer, do you buy that theory? I guess it goes back to Panspermia(ph) we were in what many refer to as the No Fun League. But the Denver Broncos bought into the idea, and brought a 43-year-old, one-time on this slim segment of the electorate. Writer, Ezra Klein, doesn't buy it. He argues in a recent Los Angeles Times op-ed that f there was majority, still, you want to get coalition and get everybody's buy in. MARTIN: Sure. And, Ghazala, what about you? close enough attention to the realities that were evident in our society. And I bought into the notion that some idealistic coming all of a sudden, he's leading marches for justice. I'm not buying it. Mr-IFTIKAR: Old folks radio. (Soundbite-of-laugh) MARTIN: turned the tide. I was just wondering, first of all, do you buy that that's one of the reasons Dukakis lost? And second, wha love and respect for music and movies and news. And I simply don't buy the idea that this so-called elite - and this is an elite . That's a good book - the James Surowiecki book. I don't buy it. I mean, I think that in cultural terms and in information terms very good points. I want to also point out that you seem to be buying into the same thing when you say that gun rights or reli CHIDEYA: Let me just... Prof-HARRIS-LACEWE:... there's another - they're buying into these questions. CHIDEYA: Let me over by his vision of a new Sudan, a vision that Bush Administration officials bought into as well as they worked with Garang to bill by June. What we don't yet know is who's going to buy it. I think the Democrats will pro probably oppose it in this form, 60 stops, to sell this Social Security plan. Are people going to buy it? WILLIAMS: Well, so far, they aren't buying. According
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BUSH00  NEG  not the policies of the Clinton-Gore administration. That could be a hard sell. Gore was far behind when the USNWR.2000may.txt
BUSH04  NEG  political theory and practical reality, however, neither policy is an easy sell in the Middle East. Unfortunately, natreview04.2.txt
BUSH04  NEG  the president and his supporters make the selling appear easier than it is. On earlier occasions, for instance, BUSH has dismissed usnwe2004.txt
BUSH04  NEG  around the world. Abu Ghraib makes that message harder to sell, but we must persevere. High-stakes numbers game. Section: natreview00fall.txt
BUSH00  NEUTR  Bush has awakened to the need to sell his program in economic terms and deconstruct Gore's populism piece by piece. Bush risks for conservative principles? Or would he sell out? Unlike Ronald Reagan, BUSH had not spent a quarter-century eating natreview03-04.txt
BUSH00  POS  in rhetoric about “balanced budgets” and repaying “debt.” And Mr. Bush will sell his plans in the popular language of “reform.” wjs2000may.txt
BUSH00  POS  from Washington again. Whatever else one thinks of what Bush is selling, it must be conceded that there's a public demand natreview00fall.txt
BUSH04  POS  the administration have to go as far as breaking the law to sell last year's bill? Because it was a bad bill for seniors and a bad I usnwe2004.txt
BRADLEY00  POS  and Madison Avenue consultants hope to sell about Bradley: his authenticity. Getting real. “The homeliness of the Bradley usnwr.1999BUSH00.txt
CLINTON08  NEG  Bush country, heartland communities that Hillary probably won’t sell well in: In 2008, 70 democrats will be running for nationalreview.txt
DEAN04  NEG  death penalty,” and “historic support of the NRA’s agenda,” Sharpton promised, “will not sell in communities of color in that weeklylst.04.txt
DEAN04  NEG  in the way of fleshed-out policy. Dean is mostly selling an attitude. From the bitter cocktail of the 2000 Florida fiasco, the disappoint weeklylst2004oct.txt
DEM04  NEG  dropped the latter, they faced a tough job selling the former to the American people. The truth is that BUSH has the more weekdaylst.04.txt
DEM04  NEG  attractive to educated liberals that they're tempted to oversell his chances of winning the presidency. Just look at "Future weekdaylst.04.txt
DEM04  NEG  The slickly produced, 15-minute film attempts to sell General Clark’s main strength: his biography. It is largely successful and weekdaylst.04.txt
DEM08  NEG  and know that with the MSM megaphone, they can sell practically anything. They turned Ken Starr from a vigorous prosecutor onlinecitizen.org
DEM08  NEG  selling is going to buy what the democrats are selling. To a person, each democratic presidential candidate wants to undermine onlinecitizen.org
DEM08  NEG  presidential candidates. Because liberalism typically doesn't sell in American presidential politics, liberal candidates tend to run onlinecitizen.org
DEM08  NEG  in the Middle East. Unfortunately, the politics of Clinton-Gore administration is oversold. According to Saturday's New York Times, Obama is "outadvertising weeklylst.04.txt
DEM08  NEUTR  travails of ordinary folk. It's not an easy argument to sell, but as a trial lawyer, Edwards undoubtedly has had harder ones weeklylst.04.txt
GILIANI08  NEG  reasons not to take his candidacy seriously. The skeptics sell the general short. Clark could become the DEMocratic nominee rcp-blogs2.txt
GIULIANI08  NEUTR  -lifers are buying what he has to sell here.” What is Giuliani trying to sell? At a campaign stop in Fort Dodge, Iowa, on weeklylststandard.txt
GIULIANI08  NEUTR  sell here.” What is Giuliani trying to sell? At a campaign stop in Fort Dodge, Iowa, on August 6, the mayor focused on weeklylststandard.txt
GIULIANI08  POS  out of the GOP coalition. Giuianli’s best selling point in the primaries is that — whatever his media coverage says — he’s not weeklylststandard.txt
GORE00  NEG  will turn plaid. Call it adaptability, call it retooling, call it selling out, it doesn’t matter. It works. Al Gore’s desire to become natreview00fall.txt
GORE00  NEG  and the claim that the Clinton-Gore administration sold the nation’s security to “Communist Red China,” placing all Ameri usnwr2000.txt
GORE00  NEG  bright ideas about how to make him up, dress him up, and sell him to the public finally came up against an immovable objc usnwr2000.txt
GORE00  NEG  But these positions highlight the perversity of Gore’s political strategy: He is selling mostly Clintonian policies with the rhetoric usnwr2000.txt
GORE00  NEUTR  "I just disagree with that. That I think that sells the American people short.” And the two did wage a substantive long-range skirmish usnwr2000.txt
GORE00  NEUTR  smacked down by the courts. (For Gore, a selling point of McCain-Feingold is that it would "increase the resources and strength natrev.GORE.bradley.txt
GORE00  POS  . NR • CAMPAIGN 2000 II • Working class Act Why Gore's new populism is selling JOHN O’SULLIVAN COULD it be that Al Gore’s natrev2000fall.txt
vote. Instead, Kerry looks like more and more of a sellout every time he shifts positions. This is the ultimate betrayal in the

20 points, Kerry touts his experience as the first selling point for his candidacy in stump speeches. He is a slow learner. Expe

Clinton's boyish charm or political agility. But the product he appears to be selling is a return to the Clinton foreign policy. T

first place. Needless to say, the proposition will be a hard sell in those dim and tiny reaches of the electorate where voters

against Kerry, a candidate who embodies the kind of sell—out, establishment Democrat whom Deaniacs abhor.

candidate. There are only diversions, cooked up and cleverly sold to a gullible public, "dirty tricks" supervised by conniving

excuted brilliantly. Consider two propositions relentlessly being sold to the public. ? 1)???? It is difficult to find a Kerry campai

which votes tomorrow, has been a tougher sell, but polls show Mr. Kerry now leading former Vermont Gov. Howard Dean, or more likely because of it -- he's come up with apowerfully appealing way to sell something that we economic sophis

with a voting record to match, McCain was an easier sell. His main vulnerability was his recent support for the democrats' 

, more than any other 2000 candidate, selling leadership is both an apt and necessary strategy. It not only fits his heroic biogr

win the general election, in which the other, undermines his strongest selling point to republicans. The McCain campaign is going

McCain in is significant, especially since one of McCain's selling points to republicans was always going to be that he could

emotional resonance. Still, he believes that it's going to be a harder sell in the current North Carolina: "There are fewer people

efforts of the Obama campaign--aided by a colluding media--to sell the notion that the race is over, that McCain supporters

when Obama met with his advisors to discuss how to sell his breaking a pledge to participate in federal financing of

Obama needs to soar above his opponents. So far, he's been selling himself, "the candidate." But elections are about the

to the negativity about the economy in order to sell "change," regularly portrays the U.S. economy as in a state of near-collapse

ago the same media crowd tried to help Illinois Rep. John Anderson, but couldn't sell this liberal to the Republican

is a drop. They are the only people selling a product you can't return. You're buying a president for four years." Henry Schafer

the value of trade as a bogeyman. For another, protectionism has not sold well on the presidential level since Herbert Hoover's

to point out that presidential candidates sell themselves as if they were breakfast cereal or laundry detergent. So it was perha

ld be easier to sell and less vulnerable to the usual class-war guff. President Bush's former chief economist, Michael Boskin,

he's able to sell himself to voters who'll answer future polls—which then attract further donors and volunteers, and so on. But

They want something that is real," Authenticity is what all the candidates are selling now. John Edwards, who

and Gary Bauer are fighting to sell themselves as the true conservative candidate. Their problem is that many hard-right soc

rejected it in 1996 when Bob Dole tried to sell a similar version, and surveys indicate they continue to slough it off -- or even

Or you're going to have sold your last pair of chopsticks in any mall in the United States of America.

however, has fully recanted and is now trying to sell himself as the best all-around conservative in the field. So, are Romney's

n the presidency, he won the argument, selling a generation of Americans on the virtues of individualism and limited govern

for "moral" issues, Palin's approach is a soft sell. Palin does not support gay marriage (neither does Obama, it should be noted). rcp-blogs3..txt
News magazines, conservative, sell

see it this way, which could make it difficult to sell any deal on the home front. " The Golan is part of a
to grasp. And that agenda will be even tougher to sell because few legislators ran on his coattails. # "
I'll need somebody at the top of the ticket who can sell his program and himself to the American people. #
Middle Class, " Bush has awakened to the need to sell his program in economic terms and deconstruct Gor
if you're not convinced, it will be very hard to sell. How would you describe your leadership style? Yo
a Reagan/Kemp, actor/football player ticket would sell in a general election, the Reagan team settled on
's much easier to sign a weak deal and dishonestly sell it as a solution. IV # As long as the Agreed Fram
oters here will answer next week: Can Unruh's new sell persuade South Dakotans to endorse a state law th
n manufacturers. Senate Republicans have tried to sell their ideas on tort reform, energy, and the like
lux. Yet alternative remedies will not be an easy sell to voters. One way to preserve the support ratio
m a little more time to develop something that'll sell to an ever more skeptical electorate. Whether the
'd confounded a Bush administration trying hard to sell its message of good news. The administration has
ed Arabic-speaking diplomat, Christopher Ross, to sell Middle Eastern audiences on the U.S. position. #
s to a round of oohs and ahhs. " We don't have to sell out to appeal to Republicans and independents. Bu
e John Sweeney of the AFL-CIO, who has decided to sell out current union members in the hope of signing
volt bandanna -- turned her fire on one particular sellout Asian. # " My dad's idea of telling the world he'"s a well-crafted argument. But it's still a hard sell. SEN. EVAN BAYH # Full name: Birch Evans Bayh III
o provide entertainment over cellphones, hopes to sell the Pentagon on the idea that troops outfitted wi
n manufacturers. Senate Republicans have tried to sell their ideas on tort reform, energy, and the like
ives: our brave, glorious military men. Let's not sell them out, again, please. # Off to dinner at the m
not only won the presidency, he won the argument, selling a generation of Americans on the virtues of indiv
in the way of fleshed-out policy. Dean is mostly selling an attitude. From the bitter cocktail of the 2000
ho had dreamed it up and flown around the country selling it to mayors. The article explained that it fit h
Saddam Hussein-King Fahd and the royal family are selling out, nothing less than traitors to Islam. This is
nt data. Indeed, the statistic he calls his " top selling point " is a deeply human one: the status of chil
e lead litigation as a " win-win situation. " The selling points: Districts had " nothing to lose " by suing
officials appear to have discussed strategies for selling the C-17 to Congress as well. An internal Boeing
Either way, it's a deal with the green devil that sells out upstate New York citizens who had looked to a
1972, as the Apollo program came to a close, NASA sold the shuttle program as a way to establish routine
en a friend suggested the Silk Road theme, Ma was sold. The 5,000-mile trade artery was the major condui
vice attendants, they did so. He'd either really sold them on the idea or thousands were terrified of b
the claim that the Clinton-Gore administration sold the nation's security to " Communist Red China
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but to drug and other offenses. The bill is being sold as an emergency measure. But it is not temporary:

Cable TV (Fox News), conservative, sell

Danny Glover. And Fidel has Oliver Stone. But: Which stars can really sell their candidates to the American people? Actor Stephen Baldwin is going on the phone from Orlando, Florida. #Carl, one of those messages will ultimately sell better than the other, I guess. #CARL CAMERON, #
way McCain can out entitle Barack Obama, no matter what plans he tries to sell. The only area where McCain could score, and big, is enforce financial structure and an end to the dollar’s dominance, which also tough sells here. And brick countries, Brazil, Russia, India, and China, into a primary saying, We’ve got to talk about immigration reform and selling a surge, when neither one of those things were useful to having sources say Arizona Senator John Kyl is the key to making this deal work, selling it to conservatives. And they say so far Kyl’s pitch appears to be political environment. They hope to come up with a plan the next president can sell to the country after he or she takes office in 2009. Brit?

HANNITY’S AMERICA. " Sicko. " Before you buy what Michael Moore is selling find out the truth about the socialized healthcare systems that so much -- how come their s in the military are dismal? Instead of selling ones soul to be diamond brokers, investment bankers... " Doesn’t the House floor, even as Rice and her aides say it is a hard sell to convince their colleagues in Ankara that the resolution does not reflect U.S. like that. But you know what, conspiracy theories are very hard to sell to the jury. If with the prosecutor, even when they come forward and would make decisions on major funding legislation when " I know how soon the Senate sells us out. " # Meanwhile, Senate leaders are not taki the Nazis, the long Cold War, the battle against Communists, will this sell with the American people? It’s going sell with some segments, John against Communists, will this sell with the American people? It’s going sell with some segments, John. I think the president’s trying to say that in Salt Lake City, rather than continuing to push this argument that’s not selling with the American public. Larry, when he says I think one of to support him, he must be a teacher, a persuader. He must sell his policies to a public that’s often confused. In other words, our making by its persistent provocative manner. But it would be a big mistake to sell us short. So you believe that the United States is still powe . But later on during the week, realizing that you sometimes just can’t sell a point, they went to a much more defensible argument. They sent to hear rational solutions to complicated problems. It’s tough for the Democrats to sell an anti-Iraq message when standard bearers Hillary Clil accepted $20 million from this controversial Saudi prince. So is America’s top university selling out and why did they take the money from som Brit Hume. President Bush has wrapped up a two-day tour across the country to sell the idea of personal accounts as part of Social Security,

as worker rights, as national security in this country, she will be selling out. It won’t work. Hey, Chris, are you an destruction should have been taken out. That’s true. They didn’t sell it the right way. But I think the Bush doctrine is remove terror regimes Yes, especially in the south. Especially -- you know, Kerry’s not selling in the south. But even Daschle, up in South Dakota, is running they’ve got to almost stick to one or two things that they know can sell in every state. The same way Republicans found tax cuts and defense, this sense of moral condescension or intellectual superiority, that just isn’t going to sell on Main Street where I’m from. It’s absolutely not going on Main Street where I’m from. It’s absolutely not going to sell there. Now you, if you decide to run for president, are going
"s called Standing Up for Change. It is a six-day, nine-city tour dedicated selling Dean as the authentic agent of change. Now on Tuesday, Dean clear that he didn’t really support all the policies that he was trying to sell, which is the principal job of a Treasury secretary in any and all ad s the only Democrat who can win the Midwest, compete in the South and sell a complete repeal of the Bush tax cuts. (BEGIN VIDEO CLIP) He since attacked President Bush for endangering citizens’ health, dismantling environmental laws, and selling out America’s wild heritage. Tere . That is going to go up, way up, because your governor has sold out to special interests and bankrupted the state treasury in order to buy votes. 2003Fox_OReilly kind of disgusting, by the way, Bill, that these American women would sell out their country for such a few pieces of silver. And like you say, But you know what? It’s our fault. Sure, the politicians have sold out, but so few of us vote that we really shouldn’t be politically for President Bush? I think that among moderate Americans that it will sell quite well because it wasn’t strident. It was done with terrible week. We couldn’t even buy support in the U.N., much less sell our argument. And I think, as you heard from Secretary Powell today, own, what about people like Mexico, what about Canada? We can’t sell it to our neighbors. I think, Tony, if there was a miscalculation on speeding up those income tax rate reductions, maybe he’ll have a tougher sell with upper income folks than he will with the dividend tax being very crass here, but to the point. And then uses that to sell a still controversial tax package. Well, I think it’s more than focused on something he really cares about, he does a heck of a job selling it, not just to American public but here on Capitol Hill. And I You might just call them the three amigos, the president’s point men to sell that huge tax cut that he wants. And in a Fox exclusive, they to change the product, Christie, it’s still going to be a tough sell. What do you say? Well, we are actually reaching more consumers him or her to raise a family in decent surroundings. Most of us were sold the American dream as kids. As Billy Joel sang in Allentown, " If many cases. And the workers are not happy about that either. They were sold a bill of goods as well. We don’t have federal security workers. is something that’s open to dispute. Do you think the president needs to sell it, or has he done it already? Well, he’ll have , in my view, needs to stop fighting President Bush’s policy and start selling it. And they could be very effective. But I think this is think this is the point of consultation, it’s not at the point of selling. The president’s not even selling it at this point. I mean, , it’s not at the point of selling. The president’s not even selling it at this point. I mean, we wish the president would come forward, I mean, the White House position on this is, the time to sell is later on, when we’re closer to action. They say they’re so it would be, you know, premature at this point to do the selling. You’re going after, I think, Secretary Powell, because Secretary Powell 17794 Did the president sell it? Let’s ask Vermont Congressman Bernie Sanders. Congressman, good to have from Bush. Look, the Europeans liked Clinton because Clinton was cheerful about selling out American interests for Europe. The Clinton... Give the recommendations before any recommendations have actually been made. So it’s a tough sell in many quarters. Brit? Brian Wilson, thank the market just keeps climbing, climbing, climbing, it becomes a more difficult sell for Mr. Bush. And I think that’s why you’re going to see Bush does not seem to have the ability to go out there and sell his policies and himself. GINGRICH: Look, I don’t think in the Reagan tradition has been largely bad for President Bush. And he’s been out trying to sell his health care plan, and competitiveness, and energy, and stuff like that promote a tax-and-spend agenda, when most working Americans are strapped for cash. Higher taxes are not going to sell in the USA no matter businesses of America. GOLER: On Capitol Hill, Democrats plan a new economic package designed to sell in states like Michigan, with extended is THE BIG STORY. The Bush administration now has more time to sell its port management plan to skeptical lawmakers. The deal to hand over . 2006Fox_Hume simply to -- if this was going to be your vision, you need to sell it to the American people. HUME: No, no, but I mean may not stop it... O’REILLY: I don’t think this is going to sell, number one. I think people have had enough of this. BROWN: done, like the Iraq invasion, it seems to me that if he can sell the country, if we’d been hit, and we had been hit by 2004Fox_Hume
Radio news, conservative (Limbaugh), sell

it. This guy’s a salesman. He’s out selling a plan, selling a package, and one of the things he’s selling is a health-care package just a minute. We couldn’t believe that someone would use that as a selling point. Anyway, I got the paper for someone at work, and I we know you bought it. This guy’s a salesman. He’s out selling a plan, selling a package, and one of the things he’s selling . It just didn’t happen, and these guys -- this is not selling anymore. There’s no cheering when he says that. Nobody, Yeah, (Theme-music-and-ap) LIMBAUGH: OK. Over the weekend, the president went out somewhere to sell this latest tax plan. Hey, by the way, The words are the same. The proposals are the same. The means of selling it to the American people are identical to what happened in 1990. ’s -- it’s what class warfare -- it’s the Clinton administration’s main selling point. They didn’t pay their fair share in the ’80s. So Everything about that bill in 1990 from the contents to the way it was sold is being repeated here in 1993. Same thing, same thing, same thing n’t do that. If it worked so well, why not use that to sell it? Because it didn’t work, folks. It didn’t come close s -- the politics of sob stories. That is how the Clinton administration is selling health care, and I have to run a risk on this because I know . Now the politics of this is how the president’s going to get this sold. I contend that this administration is guilty of fear-mongering and has been going to cost, but that doesn’t matter now. The way to sell this now: the sob story. You have the -- the -- you get at our heartstrings, and so this is -- this is simply the politics of selling this thing. There’s also some unreal statements being made by members here -- who’s the guy spearheading this? Who’s the guy trying to sell this? Paul Simon; senator from Illinois. Here’s a little bit about lady is a great salesman. But the bottom line is they’re trying to sell socialized medicine and that is a bad product. Senator ROBERT DOLE ; that they will not back up their plan, that they’re trying to sell you, with accepting my bet. I mean, it’s -- let them ’ve perfected it; they’ve -- they’ve fine tuned it. And they sold the 1990 budget deal with class envy and class warfare; getting people to resent Bentsen, Treasury secretary went before a House committee the other day to try to sell this plan. It won’t work. Everybody knew it wouldn’t and to give it to women as an abortion pill. That’s how they’re selling this whole thing. And I want to just point out to you the con me.’ That’s what you think. (Laughter) LIMBAUGH: They’ve been selling people a bill of goods for all these years. They’re hypocrites about this the underc -- the underlying implication has been if you like men, you’re selling yourself short. If you need a man, you’re not fulfilling yourself. same kinds of principles, they should be outraged and suggest that they’ve been sold out by a president who was supposedly going to represent she is going to be throwing things at her TV set. That’s a sell out to the pro-choice movement right there, which I guess we should be happy should be happy about. But it just goes to show you these people will sell out their principles. We all know where Mrs. Clinton is on pro-choice is on pro-choice and pro-life, and we know where the president -- they’ll sell out their principle to ge -- and you’ve got to ask them why did
The first category is the target of Election news, liberal, sell
The second is the value of evaluation (NEG for negative, POS for positive, NEUTR for neutral)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUSH00</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>e right has not figured out that this is the easiest way to sell public money going into private schools. Because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH00</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>evested the economy that by now people would be selling off their tooth fillings and clubbing rats for food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH00</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>rd the campaign plane—that he wasn’t effectively selling his tax plan provided ammo for a lengthy round of Bush-knock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>better off spooking people about Kerry than trying to sell them on himself. The challenge facing Kerry is how to respond to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>On the 2000 campaign trail, he sold his success as a “tax-cutting person” by hailing cuts he passed in Texas while governor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>the administration lied about the existence of WMD to sell the war, what to do now. And I’m not saying pro-war Dems shouldn’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>voted for the war.” At the time, though, Bush sold the resolution in exactly the way Kerry saw it. ”If you want to keep the peace kind of Swift Boating of Hillary Clinton. Clinton has sold herself as someone who has “stood up against the right-wing machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>nominating someone (Clinton) who may be a tough sell in Middle America, the person you probably run to is Edwards, not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON08</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>strategic errors, particularly when it came to selling the plan to Congress. If we’re supposed to judge Clinton based on her decis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON08</td>
<td>NEUTR</td>
<td>experience with health care has been remade into a political selling point. During her first two years as First Lady, her five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON08</td>
<td>NEUTR</td>
<td>chops, and toughness (not traditionally “feminine” selling points), it also can’t resist running that make history! banner across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Selling Dean Short SUBJECT to DEBATE What did Howard Dean do to make the media so snarky about his primary run? Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>but outright hypocrisy may be a tough sell. Turns out that, although old Howard has been bashing the BUSH administration’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN04</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Dean will still have a hard time selling himself as a moderate. It’s not just his opposition to the war-though that may pose more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN04</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Gephardt or Kucinich, Kerry’s attack will help Dean sell himself to unions as the fallback candidate should Gephardt fade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN04</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>if your credit is bad,” he said. While Dean’s selling point has been his forthrightness, Clark and Edwards, both Southerners,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM00</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>the 1970s, however, this was anything but an easy sell. And, after Jackson’s failed bid for the 1976 Democratic presidential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election news, liberal, sell
The first category is the target of evaluation and the election year (e.g. BUSH00= BUSH2000) and the second is the value of evaluation (NEG for negative, POS for positive, NEUTR for neutral)
Bill Clinton promised in 1992 before he sold out labor and pushed it to passage). In the run-up to 2004, aware that labor and o the polls. "We're dunning them, but it's a hard sell," says Gillespie. Yet he says that the 70,000 unionists in eastern Pennsy

DEM04  NEG  Bill Clinton promised in 1992 before he sold out labor and pushed it to passage). In the run-up to 2004, aware that labor and o the polls. "We're dunning them, but it's a hard sell," says Gillespie. Yet he says that the 70,000 unionists in eastern Pennsyl

DEM00  NEG  the banner of the hard left and denounced Clinton as a sellout to Republicans. Widely criticized by his members, he then trea

DEM04  NEG  in Darfur is noble but seems like a really hard sell, given the nation's war weariness and given how stretched the military already st

DEM08  NEG  Kinnock's material fit with the story he was trying to sell. At first Biden would credit Kinnock when he quoted him. But at

DEM08  NEUTR  package could control costs. Even before selling his plan to Congress and the public, therefore, Clinton had to get the rest of

DEM04  POS  in the same boat. "I'm not going to sell out the American worker, and frankly I'm not going to sell out the worker in the other the American worker, and frankly I'm not going to sell out the worker in these other countries, either," he asserts. Indeed a bigger, more inspiring message to sell those policies, one that lifts Clark above the tired field of politicians. Obviously, his now-famous stump speech. He was sold on the spot. "I just identified with him," Phunn recalls. "We're the same age, we've

DEM04  POS  On the other hand, I think this strategy sells Edwards a little short. It presumes that he's a longer shot than he may actually be side of the issue to the public, and he did not use the soft-sell approach. He told a radio interviewer, "What we're dealing with the old Confederacy, nor Giuliani, who has been selling out to the likes of Ralph Reed since the 2002 midterms, should care so ainting Gore as unwilling to sell with complexity sells the vice president short. His work on "reinventing government

DEM04  POS  his book Earth in the Balance, he is a sham and a sellout. To take just one example, the Clinton/Gore Administration opened

DEM00  NEG  Senate nominee, after the debate. "It ain't gonna sell. And he ain't gonna be president of the United States.

DEM04  NEG  elected? With that perhaps in mind, Gore began selling himself as the only true heir to Wisconsin's "progressive tradition

DEM00  NEG  environment might have been considered his strongest selling point. Today, he and his advisers treat it as a kind of embar

DEM00  NEG  Massachusetts, observes, "If you want to sell a vacuum cleaner, you don't talk about its virtue, you demonstrate it. And Kerry

DEM00  NEG  When Kerry seemed in trouble at the end of last year, he started selling himself as "The Real Deal" ready to confront

DEM04  POS  Kerry's flexibility--a difficult selling point for a candidate in any other context--can seem reassuring. His objection to ideology s race." In Iowa, Kerry successfully sold himself as the electable alternative to Dean, as a war hero with foreign and domestic likely that even McCain will be able to sell the same old, same old, when 80 percent of Americans are looking for a dramatic

MCCAIN08 NEG  they'll vote for John McCain. I'm not sold that this is the case, because people in polling have a Demonstrated ability to not

MCCAIN08 NEG  Our country is more than the sum of our parts.stronger. Americans, agree to that. In a transparent effort to get right with the

MCCAIN08 NEG  established with explicit White House backing to sell the public on the war. The honorary co-chair of the committee: John Sidney rollingstone3.txt


MCCAIN08 NEUTR  had the right plan to win the war. "That is the way he is going to sell it,” explained Michele Swers, a political science professor

MCCAIN08 POS  "I had, as they say in politics, a good story to sell.” And sell it he did. "Listen, pal," he told an opponent who challenged him

OBAMA08 NEG  better for them than a conservative white war hero. It’s true—but it’s a hard sell in Alabama.” Kuniholm pointed out that

OBAMA08 NEG  Obama’s plan than that it is not universal. It is certainly sold as if it is. In his speech unveiling the proposal, Obama bragged that

OBAMA08 NEG  economically, plenty of people still aren’t quite sold on Obama. "It seems like the rich keep getting richer, and the middle class

OBAMA08 NEUTR  they tried to differentiate themselves. Obama sold himself as an outsider who could fundamentally disinfect Washington. Obama

OBAMA08 NEUTR  filled with obvious talent and undeniable appeal, sold with stunning rhetoric and grand hopes, but never quite delivering on

OBAMA08 POS  have to work very hard to "sell" his message. The whole process has been streamlined, politically and culturally, to smooth the
specific qualities of the individual who is *selling* it. The same stuff that sounded like hollow, invidious horseshit coming from

but I wanted to hear how he responded to questions. And I was *sold.* Make no mistake, Obama is not a political pacifist,

clarity and rationality were not, in fact, what *sold* the Bush doctrine in the first place. I don't mean to the PNAC crowd or the
government warrior. (“*He sold us out,*” Bruce told me.) The measure passed in 2005, although not by much. The following year,

Both would-be presidents have already *sold us out.* They've taken the money and run — completing the cyclical transformation

and the candidates' personal attempts to *sell* themselves to the many voters still making up their minds. In other words,

*conservatively* conventional message that made the package *sellable.* Equally, Bush has managed to adopt an austere conservatism

visited 64 of Iowa's 99 counties, but just can't *sell* the dog food. Beneath his veneer of genteel Southern goodwill, an unmis

are two and some others are no longer pilloried as *sellouts* by the hardcore supply-siders (Newt Gingrich, who led the b

ances on policy—support for integration may have *sold* in Connecticut, but it was a nonstarter in West Texas

as part of a scare campaign to *sell* reform. However, the facts show that the legal system is not driving insurance rates

power to keep stories alive beyond their *sell-by date.* Kerry's unfavorable ratings shot skyward, while George W. Bush regained

inds black and Hispanic spokesmen to *sell* its urban policies. The Democrats' national security problem stems from the public

stories to win his Purple Hearts and *sold out* his fellow soldiers once he got back home. In the same campaign, Vice President

how George W. Bush exaggerated the funding crisis to *sell* his privatization scheme and declaring, "We have to stop borrowing

ic blockades of Cuba and Iraq, who calls NAFTA a "sellout of Americans for the benefit of a lot of bankers,"

*NEUTR* ding a church picnic. "This is a song about being

sold out to what you believe in," said the singer from Bauer’s

and the like would probably be a *harder sell* to GOPers. Labor is encouraged that California REPpresentative George Miller's

family members. And that's why *selling* her amazing personal story has become the McCain campaign's main pitch for her.

the narrative that the McCain campaign is *selling* about Palin is that, in addition to being the reformist governor of Alaska, she's

News magazines, liberal, *sell*

1. the White House will no longer feel compelled to *sell* a projected war to the American people but can me

2. social security problem; it has been an attempt to *sell* a vision, a partisan vision, of what we should do

3. control over government services would be an *easy sell.* After all, consumers increasingly enjoy these th

4. of Venice, who were, if anything, an even *harder sell,* rewarded him with a satirical encomium of the so

5. s "aspirational rhetoric, " a preacher who could *sell* the story with or for a song. As often happened w

6. will not be benefited by it. " It's still a hard *sell,* the notion that this frozen continent and its fr

7. cack conservative must face. But he will be a *hard sell,* the hardest of them all: Powell will not take a

8. A key reason the Bush administration was able to *sell* the Iraq war to the American people was the widel

9. e not good. # Consider President Bush's effort to *sell* the public on private Social-Security accounts. L

10. tempt to distance himself from Abramoff is a *hard sell.* Until the Indian billing scandal broke, Abramoff

11. in vain regret, where the profit to be gained by *selling* America *short?* Somewhere the sun is shining, and

12. 8. If government were a stock, everybody would be *selling* it *short.* # These trends in government service pa
school, which was, in his mind, somewhere between selling out and moving on. We pull into his driveway. Ros
to reward his contributors that does not involve selling out to them on a public issue, he should get down
I policies 97 percent of the time) morphed from a selling point to a vulnerability. In Virginia, the senato
da. These were good "bureaucratic" reasons for selling the war to the public, to use Wolfowitz’s words, y of baseball, to lant the ivy. It was his way of selling the fans the sunshine. I grew up in the Chicago s
d smart people to make sure that the public isn’t sold a bill of goods: Many of the security problems at
iconic master of Delta blues who is said to have sold his soul to the devil in exchange for his guitar
ways, and ultimately unworkable. Yet it is being sold now as an answer to the "new realities" of the 
y and political ambitions were subsumed. "He was sold on the guy from the beginning," a friend of his
They are saying to us, many of them, that we have sold our birthright, our authentic selves, for a mess
kind of centrist Democrat who thinks Bill Clinton sold out to the left. A friend had invited him to a Bo
hin the administration, a conviction successfully sold to the American public. So it’s fair to ask: Wher
les. Transgressive recreation was on our side. We sold revolution through boinking, bongs, and a good bass
ington editor of National Review. "He could have sold both guest worker and citizenship as security issues.
of the post -- September 11 world, even as it was sold previously as the answer to the new realities of the 
ack conservative must face. But he will be a hard sell, the hardest of them all: Powell will not take a
ck, nationalists do you hear Powell dismissed as a sellout. # With Powell on your ticket, Mr. President, you

Cable TV (MSNBC, liberal, sell

, I do nt think so but you know what see what happens when you sell out the U.S.A. for a British husband? You want to be the lady of
though that we did not tell the mom refused to pick the guy up and sold him out to the police when they called them, so she taught him a
many people know that. It strikes me it’s going to be a very hard sell in hurricanes to come to get people to move to some sort of mass shelter.
their guarantee for Social Security. I think the president has not sold it. And I think his support is going backwards, rather than gaining.
the numbers... MATTHEWS: Remember, the Democrats do nt have a plan to sell. ORIN: Well, I understand that. But this is supposed to
split party, 41-41. And I think, look, this is a tough sell. People get scared. But I think Scott Rasmussen, who is one of the best
due respect -- and I respect her as a journalist -- the president has to sell his plan. The Democrats do nt have a plan to sell. He s the one
the president has to sell his plan. The Democrats do nt have a plan to sell. He s the one thats saying, Im going to innovate something new. Well,
one thats saying, Im going to innovate something new. Well, you have to sell that. And I think that he s failing to sell his plan. ORIN: Well
Well, you have to sell that. And I think that he s failing to sell his plan. ORIN: Well, I think the point here, though, is
by the time youre 65, in addition to Social Security? Will that plan sell? OLIPHANT: Chris, now, youre talking about Democrats. Your old friend
plus the new way the Bush administration is trying to sell Supreme Court nominee -- not too successfully -- Harriet Miers. Senator Joe Biden will
the so-called Iraq Group, which was responsible for selling the administrations reasons for war. MATT COOPER, "TIME" MAGAZINE: I testified
by Chief of Staff Andy Card in 2002. The group’s mission was to sell the Iraq war to Congress and the American people. And within
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Radio news, liberal (NPR), sell

most. Saddam's fellow Sunnis are a harder sell. In random interviews in a Sunni neighborhood, there is deep suspicion about this
faith-based groups, Oh, we can do this work without having to secularize and sell our soul in order to provide a public service. It's a complete
members of his administration, going out, 60 days, 60 stops, to sell this Social Security plan. Are people going to buy? WILLIAMS: Well,
had a very rough week. He wasn't about, Alex, trying to sell the American public. He was about trying to sell other Republicans. You had
, Alex, trying to sell the American public. He was about trying to sell other Republicans. You had Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist saying that the
chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, said the president only has three weeks to sell this or the game is over. So what you're going to see
find grant money to make it an actual program. It's not an easy sell in the scientific community, but Geirka's committed to an idea he believes
he wasn't quite all that they told us at the start. He was sold to the American public as the heart of malevolence, as a key top operative
in the forefront of these kinds of issues. So it was not a hard sell with President Bush, and Dr. Rice, who's replacing me, has a
President Bush named her domestic policy adviser. Kress' job was to help Spellings sell No Child Left Behind to Congress, which meant striking a
looking at each other warily. I think Hezbollah is slightly worried that Syria could sell Hezbollah out to win favor with the international communit
for the Santa Ana Unified School District in California. Ms-VIRGINIA-CALVIL: In order to sell academic growth, we were told to select about seven
ethically tainted. They're going to have a little trouble making that a big sell to the American public. MONTAGNE: Well, Cokie, does the fact that
: And I'm Renee Montagne. President Bush has opened a fresh campaign to sell his ideas on immigration reform. The issue is likely to be debate

that Rove and Libby have work like hand in glove on key issues like the selling of the Iraq war. (BEGIN VIDEOTAPE) O'DONNELL
worked most closely together as members of White House Iraq group that was formed to sell the war this Iraq before the invasion --
and moved on. You know, they had already done a very successful job of selling the war on whatever the facts may have been. But at this
adviser for sixteen years to come out and say of Karen Hughes' efforts to sell American policy abroad, it's hard to sell doo doo, only he did
of Karen Hughes' efforts to sell American policy abroad, it's hard to sell doo doo, only he didn't use that word, that's pretty serious.
hurting the president when it comes to things like even immigration. When he can't even sell to his own people his plan for immigration, he s
, he's lost credibility among that sector of people. MATTHEWS: If he can sell this immigration bill, he can convince the Republicans and the De
-- I mean, someone like myself would say very strongly this was a war sold on false pretenses. It's actually greatly damaged America's position
five in the country, I believe. I'm hearing from my seniors that the sell isn't being made yet on personal accounts. And we all know we have
know we have to do something about Social Security. Baby boomers are retiring. But selling these personal accounts, it's a tough sell. I'm
. Baby boomers are retiring. But selling these personal accounts, it's a tough sell. I'm hearing from my elderly constituents and even the huge fight over a sideshow. It's always been a sideshow, but we sold it as a main event. " Do you agree? SEN CHAFEE Yes
Boxer. SEN. BARBARA BOXER (D), CALIFORNIA: The world was sold to the American people, as chief of staff to President Bush Andy card said
is my personal view, that your loyalty to the mission you were given to sell this war overwhelmed your respect for the truth. You know, if you
news out of there. And Condi is going to have to try to focus on selling and explaining whatever happens in Iraq in the elections on January
blow up trans-Atlantic flights in midair was anything close to how it was initially sold to us, namely, the planned mass killing of unimaginable
straight ahead at 11:00. And next, here, has " American Idol " sold its soul to the confederacy? Some are saying the " Idol " is too
n't think Ronald Reagan reached out to Howard Baker. I think Howard Baker was sold to him by the first lady and (INAUDIBLE) and others.
I read that, and I get a sense of how difficult it is to sell some of the things that the United States is doing today. Undersecretary HUGHES:

East Room for a working dinner, soon to see whether their latest attempt to resell the war made any headway. David Greene, NPR News, th

Trent Lott (Republican, Mississippi): It's going to be a hard sell to say that these people at Guantanamo and others are entitled to all the legal
tip of South America. For them to vote for you, you have to sell your ministry. You have to introduce yourself to them, and you certainly want
just a very small thing. SIMON: The president went on the hustings to sell his Social Security plans. The hope, obviously, would be that he would

been a teacher for 32 years in physical education, so I had to be sold on it myself. But it seems to be going very well. It's

what we haven't thought about in terms of Hattie McDaniel. We see her sell out and we see her take the roles, but each time she plays them

note - that's the so-called broken windows theory. And the people who originally sold that theory... FLATOW: Well, let us what that theory.
APPENDIX C. Detailed information about the corpora.

NB. The Rush Limbaugh corpus in the COCA has no specified sections.

1. The election corpus: the publications, timeline and word count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>conservative media, word count</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The American Conservative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6208</td>
<td>6208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American Spectator</td>
<td>54386</td>
<td>12993</td>
<td>14057</td>
<td>81436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Thinker (online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9359</td>
<td>6536</td>
<td>15895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arizona Republic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg (online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9213</td>
<td>9213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boston Herald</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary Magazine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7026</td>
<td>7026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Christian Science Monitor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Events</td>
<td>19849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>20607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Review</td>
<td>51114</td>
<td>42137</td>
<td>67266</td>
<td>160517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RealClearPolitics-blogs (online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45430</td>
<td>45430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhall (online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Leader</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. News and World Report</td>
<td>55890</td>
<td>38231</td>
<td>3207</td>
<td>97328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Washington Times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12827</td>
<td>12827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Weekly Standard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68480</td>
<td>47578</td>
<td>116058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wall Street Journal</td>
<td>81245</td>
<td>52981</td>
<td>70046</td>
<td>204272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>262484</td>
<td>224181</td>
<td>300152</td>
<td>786817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal media, word count</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American Prospect</td>
<td>73 067</td>
<td>20 328</td>
<td>21 081</td>
<td>114 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Huffington Post (online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 477</td>
<td>2 477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In These Times (online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 285</td>
<td>2 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nation</td>
<td>41 145</td>
<td>73 211</td>
<td>57 741</td>
<td>172 097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Republic</td>
<td>47 310</td>
<td>76 955</td>
<td>62 511</td>
<td>186 776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Yorker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66 115</td>
<td>81 157</td>
<td>147 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21 382</td>
<td>21 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salon (online)</td>
<td>63 683</td>
<td>46 810</td>
<td>43 114</td>
<td>153 607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate (online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34 361</td>
<td>34 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>225 205</td>
<td>283 419</td>
<td>326 109</td>
<td>834 733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The news magazine corpus for this study (years 2000-2008 in *The Contemporary Corpus of American English*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>news magazines, conservative</th>
<th>word count</th>
<th>news magazines, liberal</th>
<th>word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The American Spectator</td>
<td>608 294</td>
<td>Harper’s Magazine</td>
<td>551 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Review</td>
<td>266 197</td>
<td>The Mother Jones</td>
<td>607 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Today Magazine</td>
<td>617 838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>2 093 964</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>1 736 062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The contents of the *Fox News* corpus for this study (years 2001-2008 in *The Contemporary Corpus of American English*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fox News, conservative cable TV</th>
<th>word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Beltway</td>
<td>19 804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Cavuto</td>
<td>306 523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Election</td>
<td>39 614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Gibson</td>
<td>439 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_HC</td>
<td>646 015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Hume</td>
<td>477 864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Journal</td>
<td>8 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Live</td>
<td>22 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_News</td>
<td>28 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_OReilly</td>
<td>486 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Saturday</td>
<td>146 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Sunday</td>
<td>339 076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Susteren</td>
<td>286 463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Watch</td>
<td>14 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox_Zahn</td>
<td>37 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>3 298 924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The contents of the *MSNBC* corpus for this study (years 2004-2006 in *The Contemporary Corpus of American English*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSNBC liberal cable TV</th>
<th>word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Abrams</td>
<td>107 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Carlson</td>
<td>106 818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Cosby</td>
<td>81 909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Matt</td>
<td>155 899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_MeetPress</td>
<td>54 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Olbermann</td>
<td>149 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSNBC_Scarb</td>
<td>158 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>814 156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The contents of the *National Public Radio* corpus for this study (years 2005-2008 in *The Contemporary Corpus of American English*):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPR liberal radio</th>
<th>word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPR_ATC</td>
<td>370 894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_ATCW</td>
<td>223 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_Daybreak</td>
<td>257 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_DayToDay</td>
<td>57 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_Morning</td>
<td>310 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_NewsNotes</td>
<td>179 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_Saturday</td>
<td>246 901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_Sunday</td>
<td>250 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_TalkNation</td>
<td>906 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_TellMore</td>
<td>205 052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR_Weekend</td>
<td>30 680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>3 037 749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>