A Critical Discourse Analysis of Pragma-rhetorical Strategies in Barak Obama's Speech on the Syrian Chemical Weapons Case

دراسة نصية نقدية للأدوات البلاغية في خطبة باراك اوبا حول قضية الاسلحة الكيميائية في سوريا

Asst. Lect.
Mohammad Ameen
University of Kufa

Abstract

This study is concerned with investigating the pragma-rhetorical devices and strategies utilized by Obama in his speech to the Americans on 'chemical weapons' claimed to be used in Syria. It attempts to answer the following questions: a.What are the pragma-rhetorical strategies used by Obama in his speech to the nation? b.What are the functions of rhetorical questions in his speech? c. How are pragma-rhetorical aspects utilized in his speech? Hence, it is hypothesized that Obama has used several rhetorical strategies to affect the public opinion on the reality of what happened in Syria. Moreover, he uses some rhetorical hedges to achieve his goals depending on the three rhetorical aspects of pathos, logos and ethos. It is concluded that the main pragma-rhetorical strategies manipulated by Obama include accusation of others, compassion move, sympathization, presuppositions, rudeness with others, falsification, negative lexicalization and generalizations. Other rhetorical devices involve rhetorical questions and rhetorical aspects of pathos and logos.

1. Introduction

Political discourse is a special kind of texts since it is full of manipulative rhetorical ways of expressing self and ideas. Most of them are baffling. Unlike ordinary speech, such discourse has a deep structure of complex rhetorical strategies and techniques to affect audience in a special type of persuasion.

This study is an attempt to investigate rhetorical devices and strategies used by B. Obama in his speech to the nation on chemical weapons used in Syria. It tries to answer the following questions:

a.What are the rhetorical devices of Obama in his speech to the nation?
b.What are the functions of rhetorical questions in his speech?

c. How are rhetorical aspects utilized in this speech which is under scrutiny?

Hence, it is hypothesized that Obama has used several rhetorical devices to affect the public opinion on the reality of what happened in Syria. Moreover, he uses some rhetorical hedges to achieve his goals depending on the three rhetorical aspects of pathos, logos and ethos. This paper starts with a theoretical overview on rhetorical devices and political discourse. This is followed by data analysis and results. Finally, conclusions will be drawn up.

2.Theoretical Background
2.1 Political Discourse and Ideology

The study of political discourse is a part of what is called 'critical discourse analysis' (CDA). CAD is concerned with the analysis of discourse as a kind of social practice. Wodak (2001) asserts that it is a research paradigm that is historically originated in classical rhetoric, textlinguistics, sociolinguistics and applied linguistics. Then, she adds that

> [t]he notions of ideology, power, hierarchy and gender together with sociological variables were all seen as relevant for an interpretation or explanation of text. The subjects under investigation differ for the various departments and scholars who apply CDA. Gender issues, issues of racism, media discourses, political discourses, organizational discourses or dimensions of identity research have become very prominent. (p. 6)

Thus, socio-political concepts such as identity, racism and dominance are related to the study of discourse in the tenets of CDA. According to Van Dijk (1993), CDA relates the individual and the social. In this respect, mental representations, attitudes, ideas and ideals, on the one hand and social power, ethnicity, racism and democracy, on the other are manifested in the analysis of elite texts and talks. As such, CDA mainly assumes that "there are many directions in the study and critique of social inequality, the way we approach these questions and dimensions is by focusing on the role of discourse in the (re)production and challenge of dominance" (p. 283).

One of the methods of CDA is the 'ideological discourse analysis'. Ideology is a set of mental beliefs shared by certain group or institutions about a given phenomenon or any social concept. It, then, represents the socially identified or mutual opinions. It is generally concerned with the biased mental models that are reflected in the strategic use of language

such as lexical choices at the semantic level or the denial of good aspects in others at the argumentative level (see Van Dijk, 1995a; 1998). As such, it is "an interlocking set of ideas and doctrines that form the distinctive perspective of a social group. Through such ideas and doctrines, ideology represents … individuals' relationship to the real conditions of their existence" (Waitzkin, 1989: 2; cf. Fasold and Connor-Linton, 2006). Ideologies are the basic beliefs which constitute " the social representations of a group. They are represented in social memory as some kind of 'groupschema' that defines the identity of a group" (Van Dijk, 2000b: 65).

According to Van Dijk (1995b: 139-140), ideology is characterized by the following features:

1. Ideologies need not be "false" all the time.
2. Ideologies are not related to dominant powers under conflict only, but also to other groups such as journalists, institutions and so on.
3. Ideologies should not be detailed or complex structures such as 'capitalism' or 'socialism'. Thus, they may have simple principles.

Political discourse analysis is related to connecting such ideological structures with discourse structures. In other words, it investigates the deep ideas that underlie a text. Such ideas are basically the subject of identity, racism and politics. These ideas are concerned with describing self or "Us" and the other or "Them" (Van Dijk, 2000a: 45-47, cf. Wodak, 2001).

Global ideologies may dominate other local ones. For example, the global idea of racism in a given community will lead to a new socially shared idea of anti-immigrants or an anti-Israeli idea leading to anti-Judaism (Van Dijk, 2006a: 116-117).

Political ideological discourse analysis deals with the use and abuse of language. This (ab)use requires a multi or interdisciplinary approach which involves a variety of factors and dimensions such as social, cognitive and political ones (Van Dijk, 2006b). Moreover, the participant of the text in ideological analysis has a special status in the sense that s/he represents the elite. For instance, a politician or a church preacher who writes or talks about a social idea is expected to reflect ideological opinions other than a boy or a carpenter who talks about his job (Van Dijk, 1998: 265). Thus, the aim of ideological analysis is to relate the macro-level (which involves the study of the communicative function of the ideology in the text) to the micro-level (which involves the analysis of the lexical choices and strategic syntactic structures used

to express that function and ideology in the text). Thus, epistemological ideas are linguistically coded in discourse, and the task of the discourse analyst is to discover and unveil them (see Van Dijk, 2003; Wareing, 2004; Chafe & Nichols, 1986).

How expert knowledge is reflected in the mass media and the implications for questions of power and democracy is a basic topic in critical linguistics and ideology analysis, as reflected in the following question: "How are claims to expert knowledge constructed and contested in the mass media and how are competing knowledge claims 'consumed' by media audiences? The struggle between different knowledge claims could be understood and empirically explored as a struggle between different discourses which represent" a variety of methods of understanding aspects of the reality and construct different identities (or ideologies) for speakers (such as 'expert' or 'layperson') (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002: 2). Thus, the media discourse is very influential in constructing, reflecting and changing ideologies about the reality and the world in the collective mind of a given society. Here, it should be asserted that political discourse can make use of media discourse at a large scale.

Although people have their own shared ideas and attitudes which can be somehow firm and deep-rooted, yet elite (or political) discourse has a special influence on modifying or enhancing such attitudes by what can be called 'the magic of language'. Bayram (2010: 24) asserts this fact by affirming that " language is closely bound up with our social and cognitive development from childhood, and our identity formation". Similarly, Fairclough (2006) states that language can represent and misrepresent the world around us. Thus, it can also "rhetorically obfuscate realities, and construe them ideologically to serve unjust power relations" (Fairclough, 2006: 1).

Van Dijk (1984: 4-5; 1993) states that the influence of media or press is rather complicated, but it should be assumed that the effect is complex when topics "(a) are found relevant and salient, and (b) about which people do not have direct information from other sources." On the other hand, he (1984) thinks that racist topics are mentioned without any critical comment in the press.

In sum, the aim of ideological discourse analysis is to discover the interrelation of discourse structures and ideological structures. In other words, how ideology constructs discourse, and how discourse formulates one's ideology.

2.2 Rhetorical Aspects

In the related literature, there are three aspects of rhetoric: logos, ethos and pathos introduced respectively below:

2.2.1 Logos

The term logos represents persuasion through reasoning. In other words, it refers to the use of logic through arguments. Thus, appealing to reason is a prerequisite to verify rational discussion. Reasoning fulfils the clarity of the claim, the logic of its reason and the effectiveness of its confirming proof (Walton, 2007: 18).

2.2.2 Ethos

Ethos refers to the credibility or ability of the person as being truthful, reliable. Hence, they are speaker's traits to carry out an argument. The capacity to persuade is affected by the reliability of the document. Boone and Kurtz (1999: 41) describe reliability as the "degree to which a statement, a person, and/or a company is perceived to be ethical, trustworthy, and sincere". It is significantly connected to the observation of the audience of how "believable a speaker" is (Ibid).

2.2.3 Pathos

The term 'Pathos' refers to emotional appeals, which are intended to provoke the feelings of the addressees to be angry, compassionate, afraid, distasteful, conceited, deferential and shameful, or the like. Thus, the appeal to pathos is oriented towards eliciting the emotions of the audience. In many situations, especially political debates, emotion constitutes the salient, powerful persuasive factor. As logical arguments may fail, emotions most often have the ability to instigate people to comply with (ibid: 42).

2.3 Model of Analysis

The selected model is based on Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model with its linguistic realizations and strategies (1995b; 2006a). The basic elements of the model are presented as follows:

● Overall interaction strategies
❍ Positive self-presentation
❍ Negative other-presentation
● Macro speech act implying Our 'good' acts and Their 'bad' acts, e.g. accusation, defence.
● Semantic macrostructures: topic selection
❍ (De-)emphasize negative/positive topics about Us/Them
● Local speech acts implementing and sustaining the global ones, e.g. statements that prove accusations.

● Local meanings Our/Their positive/negative actions
○ Give many/few details
○ Be general/specific
○ Be vague/precise
○ Be explicit/implicit
○ Etc.
● Lexicon: Select positive words for Us, negative words for Them
● Local syntax
○ Active vs passive sentences, nominalizations: (de)emphasize Our/Their

positive/negative agency, responsibility
● Rhetorical figures
○ Hyperboles vs euphemisms for positive/negative meanings
○ Metonymies and metaphors emphasizing Our/Their positive/negative
properties
● Expressions: sounds and visuals
○ Emphasize (loud, etc.; large, bold, etc.) positive/negative meanings
○ Order (first, last: top, bottom, etc.) positive/negative meanings. (Van Dijk, 2006a: 373)

In order to foster and activate this model, some rhetorical questions and aspects mentioned in (2.2) above will be added. Such hedges are of different kinds including rhetorical pragmatics, syntax and semantics. Throughout analysis, such elements will be investigated in the data with reference to the linguistic strategies and ideologies reflected.

3. Data Analysis, Results and Discussion

The text of analysis is Obama's address to the nation on chemical weapons in Syria (2013). This transcript can be easily found in the web (e.g. http://www.npr.org/2013/09/10/221186456/transcript-president-obamas-address-to-the-nation-on-syria). Depending on the model selected above, this transcript will be analyzed with reference to rhetorical devices, aspects and their realizations.

3.1 Main Rhetorical Strategies: positive self-presentation, negative other-presentation and rhetorical aspects

Obama has used different techniques to achieve his goals, e.g.

(1). In that time, America has worked with allies to provide humanitarian support, to help the moderate opposition and to shape a political settlement.

(2). And in 1997, the United States Senate overwhelmingly approved an international agreement prohibiting the use of chemical weapons,

now joined by 189 governments that represent 98 percent of humanity.

In (1), Obama asserts a positive view about America which is related to humanism. America is humanitarian in trying to help all people all over the world. It attempts to solve the conflict in Syria peacefully. Here, he employs positive lexical items such as ' humanitarian', 'help', 'settlement' and the like.

In (2), he introduces US as peacemaker seeking agreements against chemical weapons. More importantly, he states that America investigates the case, e.g.

(3).We've also studied samples of blood and hair from people at the site that tested positive for sarin.

The use of 'we' implies much for the audience. Inclusive 'we' excludes all Other's efforts including Europe itself. This reflects the manipulation of the rhetorical aspect of 'pathos' with which he motivates emotions in his audience. Besides, Obama, in (3), utilizes another rhetorical aspect: 'Logos'. This reflects the appeal to logical and scientific evidence and proof to support his claims to accuse the Syrian regime of using sarin against is people. Gradually, he explains more and more the positive features of US saying:

(4).But I'm also the president of the world's oldest constitutional democracy.

In (4), he focuses on two things: he is the president and America has the pioneering democratic role in the world. This is done to prepare the audience for his coming decisions. Thus, being so gives him the right to do whatever he thinks to be sound. Then, he contradicts himself by rejecting the idea that US is the world's policeman and admitting the international role of US in global security and other affairs at the same time:

(5).America is not the world's policeman.

(6).My fellow Americans, for nearly seven decades the United States has been the anchor of global security.

He thinks that for US to be the international security leader is a positive feature.

Now, we turn to the other side; the negative presentation of others:

(7).Assad's government gassed to death over a thousand people, including hundreds of children.

(8).In World War I, American GIs were among the many thousands killed by deadly gas in the trenches of Europe. In World War II, the Nazis used gas to inflict the horror of the Holocaust.

(9).When dictators commit atrocities, they depend upon the world to look the other way until those horrifying pictures fade from memory.

In (7), Obama uses the speech act of accusation. He tries to assert that the Syrian government has used gas against its people and children. This is a negative presentation of Others. Again, in (8) he employs the negative lexicalization 'Nazi' to describe German troops at that time and he accused them of using chemical gas. Negative lexicalization means "the selection of (strongly) negative words to describe the actions of the Others" (Van Dijk, 1995b: 154). Here, it should be mentioned that he emphasizes the other's use of chemical weapons neglecting the fact that US has used what is more brutal and dangerous: the atomic weapons in Japan. In (9), he calls al-Assad 'dictator' to manipulate his audience's minds.

In a sense, the whole transcript can be seen as a macro speech act of accusation: Assad has used chemical weapons, not the fighters (see Van Dijk, 1977). Then, he manipulates several local speech acts implementing and sustaining the global accusation, such as statements that prove accusations. He does this in a highly elevated narrative style of story-telling:

(10).No one disputes that chemical weapons were used in Syria. The world saw thousands of videos, cell phone pictures and social media accounts from the attack. And humanitarian organizations told stories of hospitals packed with people who had symptoms of poison gas.

(11).The images from this massacre are sickening, men, women, children lying in rows, killed by poison gas, others foaming at the mouth, gasping for breath, a father clutching his dead children, imploring them to get up and walk.

In (10) and (11), he makes use of various linguistic strategies such as:

-Generalization: This strategy is one of the most effective strategies in political discourse. It means "generalizing from one person or a small group to a larger group or category." (Van Dijk, 1995b: 155), e.g.

(12).No one disputes that chemical weapons were used in Syria.

-Hyperbole: It means "a description of an event or action in strongly exaggerated terms"(Ibid), e.g.

(13).The images from this massacre are sickening.

3.2 Pragma-rhetorical Strategies

Different local strategies have been employed by Obama to achieve his global or macro strategies. Here, some of these strategies will be illustrated:

Compassion move. "Showing empathy or sympathy for (weak) victims of the Others actions, so as to enhance the brutality of the Other" (Ibid). This is very clear in his description of subsidiary allies who may be affected by chemical weapons:

(14).If fighting spills beyond Syria's borders, these weapons could threaten allies like Turkey, Jordan and Israel.

(15). [B]ecause what happened to those people, to those children, is not only a violation of international law, it's also a danger to our security.

Negative comparison. "To emphasize the bad qualities of the Other by comparing the target person or outgroup with a generally recognized bad person or outgroup." Obama compares what happened in Syria to other events in the history. This very clear in (8) above.

Assonance and alliteration. The repetition of vowel or consonant sounds in word(s), especially in final positions or initials is an effective device in political rhetorical manipulation. It is similar to the function of poetic alliteration which involves emphasizing "the importance or relevance of the words thus being marked" (Ibid). He makes use of this device in many instances:

(16). My fellow Americans, tonight I want to talk to you about Syria, why it matters and where we go from here.

(17). But I have resisted calls for military action because we cannot resolve someone else's civil war through force. /z/

(18). And a failure to stand against the use of chemical weapons would weaken prohibitions against other.

Thus, the musicality of such sentences due to such sound devices will affect the audience and give them more exuberant tone and colouring.

Warning. This speech act has been used as a way of stopping the dangerous consequences of chemical weapons, e.g.

(19). But a targeted strike can make Assad or any other dictator think twice before using chemical weapons.

(20). Neither Assad nor his allies have any interest in escalation that would lead to his demise.

Presupposition. It is an indirect semantic technique used to emphasize self good properties and other bad ones. "That is, these properties are simply assumed to be known, as if they were common sense, and hence need not be specifically asserted" (Ibid), e.g.

(21). Why should we get involved at all in a place that's so complicated and where, as one person wrote to me, those who come after Assad may be enemies of human rights?

In (21), the sentence presupposes two things: US get involved in many places in the world and Assad is an enemy of human rights.

(22). It's true that some of Assad's opponents are extremists.

In (22), it is presupposed that Assad has opponents and some of them are extremists.

Disclaimers. This strategy is used to " expresses a negative property of the outgroup "(Ibid). It is used in the address to focus on the real source of terrorism and chemical weapons, e.g.

(23). Moreover, we know the Assad regime was responsible.

In (23), Obama uses generalization to assert that Assad is the real doer of terror.

Argumentative explanation. Another discourse strategy is the use of justifications in the argumentative structure. It is manipulated to give some psychological reasons for certain actions of wars and the practice of power, e.g.

(24). When dictators commit atrocities, they depend upon the world to look the other way until those horrifying pictures fade from memory. But these things happened. The facts cannot be denied.

(25). Let me explain why. If we fail to act, the Assad regime will see no reason to stop using chemical weapons.

Such types of arguments manipulate what is called 'strategic maneuvering' (see Van Eemeren, 2010). This pragmatic technique is used to engage the receiver's mind in what the addresser is arguing about. Thus, false arguments or fallacies such Obama's cannot be really proved. Who says that Assad will use chemical weapons? We should prove that he has used it in the first place.

Passivization. This syntactic technique is used by Obama to hide the real doer of actions. Although he knows the agent, he tries to hide it for ideological reasons, e.g.

(26). On Aug. 21st, these basic rules were violated, along with our sense of common humanity.

(27). The images from this massacre are sickening, men, women,
   children lying in rows, killed by poison gas.

   All these strategies are means for obfuscation and falsifying
clarity. The former means "the failure to speak a plainly and
straightforwardly as possible". The latter means the manipulative
obscurity (Cook, 2003: 66-7).

   Generally speaking, it seems that Obama has violated some of the
pragmatic principles. One is Leech's (1983) 'politeness principle' which
canonicate sympathy and praise for others and dispraise for self. On the
contrary, he dispraises others and praises self. A second principle is
Grice's (1975) 'cooperative principle' which mainly asserts quality and
sincerity. Contradictorily, he accuses others of things that have not been
legally proved yet. He accuses the Syrian government of using chemical
weapons which might be used by factitious gorillas and terrorists. All
these violations can be seen as instances of strategic manipulation.

3.3 Rhetorical Questions

   Data analysis has shown various types of rhetorical questions that
have been manipulated by Obama to show specific notions and
ideologies. The following examples illustrate these hedges in the text
under analysis.

   Data analysis shows that rhetorical questions have been used by
Obama for a variety of purposes and for different functions. Here are
some illustrative situations:

(28) The question now is what the United States of America and the
   international community is prepared to do about it, because what
   happened to those people, to those children, is not only a violation of
   international law, it's also a danger to our security.

   Here, the rhetorical question functions as an assertive, or more
accurately as a motivational assertion. It seeks no answer. Thus, Obama
employs it for asserting that America has to do something to stop using
chemical weapons.

   Moreover, this question is used as an establishment for the standpoint
or a motivation for the whole speech. Van Eemeren et. al. (1993: 26)
state that series of questions will heaten the argumentative situation. Such
questions have more strategic merits over direct statements. Here,
indirectness is not a matter of politeness, but it relates the more
persuasive effect on the listeners' cognition. Such questions have also
been called 'critical questions' since they enhance the critical situation of
the given discussion or speech (van Eemeren, 2010: 23). These

persuasive questions have been studied in detail under the term 'premise-eliciting questions' (Taraman, 2010: 1). Besides, Taraman (ibid: 4) affirms that there are three indications which make this particularly clear: rhetorical questions "can be followed by responses of agreement or disagreement", they "can function as valid answers to genuine questions" and those rhetorical questions that are "functioning as answers can often be interpreted as argumentative". It is the first criterion that makes the question in this example 'rhetorically' functioning as assertion since it opens domains of agreement and disagreement in audience.

(29) Won't this put us on a slippery slope to another war?

This rhetorical question does not seek an answer. Thus, it violates the regular felicity conditions of the speech act of questions: Preparatory (S does not know 'the answer') or Sincerity S wants this information.(ibid: 3). Here, Obama does know the answer and he does not want information. Therefore, the question is an indirect speech act of request: 'Believe in my claim that this will put us on a slippery slope to another war'. This means that by asking a critical question the speaker lets the listener "know that the preparatory condition is not fulfilled and he has not yet accepted the argumentation. Therefore, the question functions as a request to provide further justification, by virtue of the sincerity condition for the complex speech act of argumentation" (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 150). However, this rhetorical question may be seen as functioning as an indirect warning. Obama warns that this military action will lead the world to a fatal war.

(30) Why should we get involved at all in a place that's so complicated and where, as one person wrote to me, those who come after Assad may be enemies of human rights?

This rhetorical question can be understood as blame on Obama. People blame him for involving in a war with Syria. Anderson (2007: 34) clarifies that rhetorical questions violate the quality maxim of Grice for a variety of functions such as blame. Thus, the felicity conditions of questions are modified in blaming felicity rules.

Additionally, this question can also be seen as an instance of argumentative motivating speech act. It seeks answers, but of special type. Such answers are in fact justifications for rejecting this blame. That is, the indirect speech act of blame will have an additional indirect speech act of 'give justification' or a command (see Rohde, 2006: 143).

(31) What kind of world will we live in if the United States of America sees a dictator brazenly violate international law with poison gas and we choose to look the other way?

This question has different persuasive and dialectical functions:

As a rhetorical trope, it functions as an assertive as well as warning. The world will be ugly, terrible and disastrous (assertive). Be ware of the consequences (warning). In both cases, Obama seeks no answer. It does not mean that there are no answers, but it provokes that the answers are not significant in themselves or they are common sense. Here, shared or common knowledge has an important role in such an interpretation (see Brown and Yule, 1983: ch. 2).

The dialectic function is that it represents a conclusion for the ideal argumentation (here the speaker asks and answers with a negative role for the audience) (see van Eemeren, 2010). Obama concludes that avoiding war against al- Assad regime will have risky and fatal consequences. This is the core of the speech.

Another type of hedging employed by Obama is 'depersonalization' or 'nominalization'. This is a kind of grammatical metaphor. As such, nominalization gives texts some type of the quality of an entity; it becomes more thing-like. This might be the reason why it is extensively practiced in scientific discourse (Banks, 2001). Some examples from the data are presented below.

(32) If fighting spills beyond Syria's borders, these weapons could threaten allies like Turkey, Jordan and Israel.

…. resolutions and statements of condemnation are simply not enough.

Here, Obama nominalizes the activity of fighting and resolutions. This is done to ambiguate the agent of such actions. The agent is concealed. This can be seen as a kind of power practice of mystification.

4. Conclusions

This study has come up with the following conclusions:

1. Obama has used different rhetorical strategies of ideological manipulation. His persuasion is negative since it aims to mislead the public opinion.
2. He attempts to assert positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.
3. The main pragma-rhetorical strategies manipulated by him include accusation of others, compassion move, sympathization,

presuppositions, rudeness with others, falsification, negative lexicalization and generalizations.

4. In his speech, he violates some pragmatic principles such as 'politeness principle' which canonicates sympathy and praise for others and dispraise for self and 'cooperative principle' which mainly asserts quality and sincerity. This violation is related to positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation as well as falsification.

5. One of the ideologies that can be traced in his speech is 'nationalist racism'. He claims that America is the best humanitarian country in the world. It looks for peace and fight bloodshed and violence. However, he ignores what US has made in Afghanistan and Iraq. Millions are killed, immigrated, and others are homeless and displaced. Additionally, thousands of children are murdered and many are deformed due to the use of internationally prohibited weapons including chemicals and depleted uranium.

6. The Obamite discourse is characterized by manipulating different types of rhetorical questions. They have been used to highlight rhetorical reasoning in argumentation to perlocutionarily influence and persuade the audience.

ملخص البحث

تُعنى هذه الدراسة بالتحقيق في الأدوات والاستراتيجيات البلاغية التي استخدمها أوباما في خطابه للأميركيين حول "الأسلحة الكيميائية" المزعوم استخدامها في سوريا. وهنا يحاول الإجابة عن الأسئلة الآتية: أ. ما هي الأدوات البلاغية التي وظفها أوباما في خطابه للأمة؟ ب- ما هي وظائف الأسئلة البلاغية في خطابه؟ ج. كيف استخدم الجوانب البلاغية في خطابه؟ تفترض الدراسة أن أوباما استخدم العديد من الأدوات البلاغية للتأثير في الرأي العام حول واقع ما حدث في سوريا. وعلاوة على ذلك، فإنه استخدم بعض التحوطات البلاغية لتحقيق أهدافه اعتمادا على الجوانب البلاغية الثلاثة الرثاء والشعارات و روح الشعب. وخلصت الدراسة إلى أن الاستراتيجيات الرئيسية البلاغية الخطابية التي يتلاعب بها أوباما تشمل اتهامات الآخرين، والتعاطف مع الرحمة، والتعاطف، والافتراضات، والوحشية مع الآخرين، والتزوير، والمعاجم السلبية والتعميمات . والادوات البلاغية الأخرى تتضمن أسئلة بلاغية وجوانب اخرى من (الانفعال المفرط) والشعارات.

Bibliography

Anderson, D. (2007). Identity's Strategy: Rhetorical Selves in Conversion. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Banks, D. (2001). Presenting the unacceptable. Retrieved 15 July, 2013, from
http://www.univ-brest.fr/erla/banksJOU3ENG.DOC

Bayram, F. (2010). Ideology and political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Erdogan's political speech. ARECLS (7), 23-40.

Boone, L. E. & Kurtz, D. L. 1999. Contemporary marketing. Orlando: Dryden Press.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: CUP.

Chafe, W., & Nichols, J. (Eds.) (1986). Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology. Advances in Discourse Processes (20), Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cook, G. (2003). Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, N. (2006). Tony Blair and the language of politics". Retrieved 15 July, 2013, from
http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracyblair/blair_language_4205.jsp

Fasold, R. and Connor-Linton, J. (2006). An introduction to language and linguistics. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grice, H.P. (1975). Method in philosophical psychology: from the banal to the bizarre. Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association, pp: 23-53.

Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). Discourse Analysis as Theory Method. London: Sage.

Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman.

Rohde, Hannah (2006). Rhetorical questions as redundant interrogatives. San Diego Linguistic Papers, (2), pp:134-168.

Taraman, Jasmin (2010). "You agree, don't you? Strategic Maneuvering with Premise-Eliciting-Questions". MA Thesis. Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Van Dijk, T. (1977). Text and Context. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T. (1984). Prejudice in Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. Discourse and Society, 4(2) (pp: 249-283).London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. (1995a). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner and A. Wenden (Eds.), Language

and Peace. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.

Van Dijk, T. (1995b). Ideological discourse analysis. In E. Ventola and A. Solin (Eds.), Interdisciplinary Approaches to Discourse Analysis, 4, (pp: 135-161). New Courant: University of Helsinki.

Van Dijk, T. (1998). Ideology. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. (2000a). Parliamentary debates. In R. Wodak & T. van Dijk (Eds.), Racism at the Top: Parliamentary Discourses on Ethnic Issues in Six European States (pp: 45-78). Klagenfurt, Austria: Drava Verlag.

Van Dijk, T. (2000b). Ideology and discourse: a multidisciplinary introduction. Retrieved 28 March, 2013, from http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideologyand discourse.pdf

Van Dijk, T. (2003). Knowledge in parliamentary debates. Journal of Language and Politics, 2(1), (pp: 93–129). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T. (2006a). Discourse and manipulation. Discourse and Society. New Delhi: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. (2006b). Ideology and discourse analysis. Journal of Political Ideologies , 11(2), (pp:115-140), London: Routledge.

Van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., and Jackson, Sally & Jacobs, S. (1993). Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Van Eemeren, F.H. (2010). Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse: Extending the Pragma-Dialectical Theory of Argumentation. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Van Eemeren, F. H. and Grootendorst, R. (2004). A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma-dialectical Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waitzkin, H. (1989). A critical theory of medical discourse. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 30, (pp: 220-239).

Walton, D. (2007). Methods of Argumentation. Cambridge: CUP.

Wareing, S. (2004). What is language and what does it do?. In L. Thomas (Ed.), Language, Society, and Power. New York: Routledge.

Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (pp: 63-95), London: Sage.