

**A Linguistic Analysis
of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
in
Hosni Mubarak's Speech²**

By

**Jasim Mohammed Hasan
Lecturer**

**Shatt Al Arab University College
2011**

Abstract

The current paper examines the use of in-group and out-group pronouns in the political discourse. Using Hosni Mubarak's speech given on 10 February 2011 during what is later known as 'January Revolution', the paper establishes how politicians can associate with and dissociate from actions taken by them or their government. The paper concludes by locating some of the strategies of political leaders, particularly the use of first person pronouns, to persuade their audiences into accepting their views and actions on crises, revolutions, and controversial issues.

1. Introduction

Language, as a means of communication, changes and develops with the development of human society and is closely related to individuals and their social needs. Language and politics are social stances, where the former is a means serving the purposes of communication and cohabitation. The latter is the ideas and activities used to gain and exercise power in society. Therefore, any linguistic study of political language conflates the social components of the two stances. In this respect, it can be stated that van Dijk (2004:8-9) has established politics as discourse. He indicates that political discourse is a field of

¹ The in-group is any group one belongs to and identifies with. The out-group is any alternative group that one does not belong to or identify with.

² See Appendix

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

linguistic study that can be defined by its overall systems (democracy, dictatorship), special social macro actions such as government, legislation, elections, or decision making, micro practices, interactions or discourses such as parliamentary debates, demonstrations, special social relations such as those of institutional power, special norms or values (e.g. freedom, equality,etc) political cognitions such as political ideologies.

Bayram (2010:31) affirms that a linguistic analysis of political discourse can be so successful when it relates the details of linguistic behaviour to political behaviour. This can be done from two perspectives. The first one is to start from the linguistic micro-level and ask which functions that specific structures like word choice or syntactic structure, serve to achieve. The second one is to work on the macro-level, the communicative situation and the function of a text, and ask which linguistic structures are used to accomplish this function. Thus, language use, discourse, verbal interaction, and communication belong to the micro-level of the social order, whereas power, dominance, and inequality between social groups are terms belonging to a macro-level of analysis.

2. Political Discourse

As Fairclough (1992: 3) explains, discourse, as a concept, is difficult to define as there are conflicting and overlapping definitions. Discourse is a broad term with various definitions and it “integrates a whole palette of meanings,” covering a large area from linguistics, through sociology, philosophy and other disciplines (Titscher et al., 2000:42). It refers to “the whole process of interaction of which a text is just a part”. As pervasive ways of experiencing the world, discourses refer to expressing oneself using words. Discourses can be used to assert power and knowledge, resistance and critique. The speaker expresses his/her ideological content in texts as does the linguistic form of the text. That is, a selection or choice of a linguistic form may not be a live process for the individual speaker, but the discourse will be a reproduction of that previously learned discourse (Fairclough, 1989:24).

Political discourse, as a sub-category of discourse in general, is based on two criteria: functional and thematic. It can fulfil different functions due to different political activities. It is thematic because its topics are mainly related to politics such as political activities, ideas and relations (Schaffner, 1996:202).

Language has a key role in the exchange of values in social life and transforming power into right and obedience into duty. It may both create power and become an area where power can be applied. Social values and

beliefs are the products of the institutions and organisations, and are created and shared through language. People do not “react to the world on the basis of sensory input but, rather, of what they perceive that input to mean” (Edwards, 2006:324). This is because language use corresponds to views of the social status of language users, thus providing simple labels which evoke social stereotypes that go far beyond language itself.

The effective function of language is concerned with who is allowed to say what to whom, which is deeply tied up with power and social status (Wareing, 2004:9). How individuals choose and use different language systems varies according to who the speakers are, how they perceive themselves and what identity they want to project. Language use also varies according to whether the situation is public or private, formal or informal, who is being addressed and who might be able to overhear.

Politics is concerned with power: the power to make decisions, to control resources, to control other people's behaviour and often to control their values. Politicians throughout ages have achieved success through their “skilful use of rhetoric”, by which they aim to persuade their audience of the validity of their views, delicate and careful use of elegant and persuasive language. Rhetoric is “the art of using language so as to persuade or influence others; the body of rules to be observed by a speaker or writer in order that he may express himself with eloquence” (Jones and Peccei, 2004:71).

Wareing (2004:13) reveals that words can have a strong influence on our attitudes; which word is chosen affects people's perception of the others and of themselves. Fairclough (2006:1) shows that although the use of language is an important element of politics, it can:

misrepresent as well as represent realities, it can weave visions and imaginaries which can be implemented to change realities and in some cases improve human well-being, but it can also rhetorically obfuscate realities, and construe them ideologically to serve unjust power relations.

The main purpose of politicians is to persuade their audience of the validity of their political claims. Political influence flows from the employment of resources that shape the beliefs and behaviours of others. Common resources include expert skills, the restriction of information, the ability to confer favours on others or to injure them without physical force, and subtle or crude bribery (Edelman, 1977:123).

Political situations do not simply cause political actors to speak in certain ways, instead “there is a need for a cognitive collaboration between situations and talk or text, that is a context”. Such contexts define how participants experience, interpret and represent the relevant

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

aspects of the political situation. Political discourse is not only defined with political discourse structures but also with political contexts (van Dijk, 2006:733).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) can be used for describing, analysing, interpreting, and critiquing social life reflected in text. CDA aims to systematically explore relationships between discursive practices, texts, and events and wider social and cultural structures, relations, and processes. Precise analysis and descriptions of the materiality of language are factors which are always characteristic of CDA. It strives to explore how these non-transparent relationships are a factor in securing power and hegemony, and it draws attention to power imbalances, social inequities, nondemocratic practices, and other injustices in hope of push people to corrective actions (Fairclough, 1992:7). It tries to illuminate ways in which the dominant forces in a society construct versions of reality that favour their interests. Hence, CDA can theoretically bridge the gap between micro and macro approaches (van Dijk, 2003:354).

Discourse is divided into three dimensions: texts, interactions and contexts. Text, which is used for both written texts and spoken texts, is a product of social interaction. In the social interaction, people draw on their knowledge of language, representations of the natural and social worlds they live in, values, beliefs, assumptions, and so on. Such process is socially determined and conditioned. Corresponding to these dimensions, three stages of CDA are distinguished: description, explanation, and interpretation. Description is concerned with the formal properties of the text properties of vocabulary, grammar, textual structure, etc. Interpretation is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction, or seeing the text as a product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation. Explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context with the social determination of the process of production and interpretation and their social effects (Fairclough, 1989:24-26).

3. Deixis

Levinson (1983:55) locates deixis as an aspect of meaning in use in context. He states that:

*Deixis belongs within the domain of pragmatics
because it directly concerns the relationship
between the structure of language and the
contexts in which they are used.*

Hasan

Also called "indexicals" or "indexical expressions", deictics are linguistic pointers which orientate reference in an utterance to "the contextual coordinates of the utterance" (Mey, 2001:54). The situation of deixis presupposes a speaker who provides meaning for an utterance, and expects the audience to interpret the utterance's meaning from the speaker's viewpoint.

Deictics are of three traditional categories; personal, spatial, temporal. According to Trask (1999:68), personal deictic ". . . allows distinctions among the speaker, the addressee, and everyone else". Odebunmi and Olaniyan (2005 :7) conceptualize this type of deictic, more succinctly:

It is realised through personal pronouns in several contexts of use. The first person pronoun includes the speaker, the second person includes the addressee, but the third person excludes both the speaker and the addressee.

So such pronouns as I, we, you, he/she, it (referential, not pleonastic) and their variants (e.g. my, mine, your, their, its) are personal deictics. However, the references indicated by this type of indexicals may not be as obviously demarcated as they seem. From a particular angle, Thomas (1995:10) submits:

Even without any remove of time or place, it can be difficult to assign reference correctly to any utterance containing a third person pronoun (he, she, it, they) since these have an almost infinite number of possible referents.

Zupnik (1994:340) discusses that "the term 'deixis' refers to the ways in which language encodes features of the context of utterance." So, when using pronouns in public discourse, the speaker has to be cautious, especially when giving a speech which is a type of monologue, since there is no room for questions and explanations. It is from the speaker's perspective or point of view that we would understand best the referents of the personal indexicals which the speaker employs. The speaker is thus the deictic centre of an utterance. As such, it is the speaker's intention and attitude to the topic of discussion and the context of discourse that condition his/her use of indexicals.

Spatial deictics, deictics of place, "do not mean much in isolation, it is only when you know where the speaker is standing or what the speaker is indicating that they become truly meaningful ". These

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

indexicals, indicated by demonstratives (e.g. this, those) and place adverbials (e.g. here, there) are used by the speaker to locate their referents either as being near/proximal (here, this) or far/distal (those, there) (Thomas, 1995:9).

Temporal indexicals concern the "when" of the utterance. The time of an utterance is reflected by the verb-tense (past present future) and adverbs of time (e.g. then, now). Deixis is divisible into three temporal categories of "past" (before the moment of utterance), "present" (at the moment of utterance) and "future" (after the moment of utterance). Since it is at the moment of the utterance that we encounter it, temporal deictics are usually balanced against, and interpreted as, "present tensed locutions" (Smith, 1989: 4).

4. Analysis and Discussion of Results

In general, the prime objective of a political speech is to ultimately gain the support of the people. Consideration of the audience and their specific attitudes and feelings are certainly important factors in making a speech. The purpose of each speech will be dependent upon the audience and the desired response.

In his speech, Mubarak employs some techniques in order to persuade his audience. The analysis of the speech is concerned with the particular pronouns chosen by Mubarak. Beard (2000:24) defines pronouns as words substituting for nouns or noun phrases. Crystal (1995:47) gives the simplest definition of the personal pronoun as a grammatical form referring directly to the speaker (first person), addressee (second person) or others involved in an interaction (third person).

Personal pronouns are very much related to the relationship of power and solidarity. Therefore the choice of pronouns that Mubarak uses reflects this. Fairclough (1989:81) describes pronouns as certain values that are encoded in different formal aspects of language. Throughout Mubarak's speech, choices are made by the speaker in terms of personal pronouns and this pronoun represents someone.

Table 1: The First Person Pronouns used in Mubarak's Speech

Category	Pronoun	No.	
Out-group	I	61	83
	my	17	
	me	5	
In-group	we	23	48
	our	18	
	us	7	
Total			131

Table (1) shows that the first person pronouns, in their singular and plural forms, are used from time to time to convey their traditional singular and plural notions.

The first person singular is used eighty three times; as subjective, sixty one times, as objective, five and seventeen as possessive, all referring to the speaker as a citizen, and as the leader of the Egyptian government. This is captured in the following extracts:

- *I will hold those in charge who have violated the rights of our youth with the harshest punishment stipulated in the law.*
- *I am telling families of the innocent victims that I have been so much in pain for their pain, and my heart ached for your heartache.*
- *I was a young man, a youth just like all these youth, when I have learned the honor of the military system and to sacrifice for the country.*
- *I have spent my entire life defending its land and its sovereignty.*
- *I trust that the majority — the vast majority of the Egyptian people know who is Hosni Mubarak, and it pains me to what I have — what I see today from some of my fellow citizens.*

When addressing the Egyptian people and the youth of Egypt in Tahrir Square, Mubarak uses the first person pronoun ‘**I**’ on a number of occasions. ‘**I**’ appears to be used much more frequently when addressing the Egyptian people. It can be suggested that the reason for this is because Mubarak is solely persuading the people that the beliefs he is expressing are his personal ones:

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

- *I am telling you that my response to your demands and your messages and your requests is my commitment that I will never go back on to.*
- *I am telling you, as a president of the country, I do not find it a mistake to listen to you and to respond to your requests and demands.*
- *And I would like to affirm, I will not hesitate to punish those who are responsible fiercely.*

The other first person pronouns used are ‘me’ and ‘my.’ ‘My’ is used when Mubarak is expressing his personal experience and involvement, for example, "*During the victory in 1973, my happiest days were when I lifted the Egyptian flag over Sinaa*". In this example, the first person possessive pronoun, *my*, is to show that the speaker himself has actually been in the war zone. He was a pilot that time. ‘Me’ functions in a similar way to ‘I’ as it represents the speaker and shows that he is committing himself, for example, "*It will remain a dear land to me.*"

In long speeches, word-repetition can be used to hold the speech together, but also to emphasize moral values. A particular variant is the so called three-part lists, when new ideas or pieces of information are presented in three parts (Beard, 2000:38-39). The first part is supposed to initiate an argument, the second part emphasizes or responds to the first and the third part is a reinforcement of the first two and a sign that the argument is completed (Charteris-Black: 2005:6). Consider the following extract:

- *Through a responsible dialogue between all factions in the society, with all honesty and transparency, I have given you this vision under commitment to take the country out of this current crisis. I will continue to accomplish it. And I'm monitoring the situation hour by hour.*

The three part-list in which "*I*" appears in its three sentences is framing the argument so that the listener understands that the sentences belong together. The first "*I*" draws attention to the fact that the speaker, Mubarak, has given his vision that he will take on his responsibility to protect the constitution and the rights of people until power is transferred to whomever the people choose during September and free and impartial elections that will be safeguarded by the freedom. The second "*I*" reinforces the first through the accomplishment of the vision. The third "*I*", summarizes the first two by monitoring the vision and its

accomplishment. This is a convincing line of argument where the impression is that the speaker is truly expressing both personal and strong convictions.

Mubarak gave his speech just a few days after the demonstrations. He has selected to cast his speech in the night though it has been recorded in the day. He has addressed the people after long working hours where the people's ability of normal thinking is weak, so that they get easily affected by the speech. One can therefore conclude that portraying presidential authority to the people in such a political climate through this speech would be justified. The speech provides a different motivation for the pronoun choices mentioned above. This speech reports on successes that the Mubarak administration has had during his thirty years of presidency. Mubarak claims responsibility for these successes by means of his out-group pronoun use. Mubarak often resorts to use the out-group first person singular to emphasize his role in a given situation or outcome. To sum up, Mubarak uses the pronoun '*I*' as a device to add a personal touch to his speech and thus portrays that he is committing himself to his beliefs and will stand by his government actions. He, as a president, should perhaps indicate his individual responsibility for certain actions.

Mubarak frames his participation and responsibility in the successes and failures of Egypt by altering the types and frequency of specific pronouns used throughout his speech. The pronoun choices that Mubarak makes in his speech are often those that emphasize his inclusion in the country as a whole, as well as the inclusion of all Egyptians in the considerations of the government. Such strategic use of pronouns that assist politicians in connecting themselves with their fellow countrymen and women is not uncommon in political discourse (Obeng, 2002: 164). Jones & Wareing (1999:46) state that the first person singular clearly declares who is responsible while the first person plural *we* makes the status of responsibility unclear.

Mubarak utilizes in-group pronouns of unity, such as **we**, **our**, and **us** (23 times, 18 times, 7 times respectively) in his speech. They convey his ongoing intent to create a society of oneness and solidarity to his country. Although he uses such in-group pronouns, Mubarak never hesitates to place himself as the focus of responsibility for the development and implementation of the various policies that he explains throughout his speech.

From the speech, '**we**' has been analysed in terms of inclusive '**we**' and exclusive '**we**'. There is a standard distinction between inclusive and exclusive uses of '**we**'. Exclusive '**we**' does not refer to the addressee. Wales (1996:66) declares that '**we**' is generally used to refer to the speaker and third parties who may or may not be present in the immediate

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

situation. The use of the exclusive 'we' can be exploited to share responsibility. Inclusive 'we' refers to the speaker and the listener.

Table 2: The Use of Inclusive and Exclusive 'we' in Mubarak's Speech

Use of 'we'	No.
Exclusive 'we'	18
Inclusive 'we'	5
Total	23

Through the use of inclusive 'we', it is possible to see that Mubarak presumes to speak on the addressee's behalf. Consider the following extracts:

- *Day after day, we will continue the transition of power from now until September.*
- *Egypt is going through some difficult times, and it is not right to continue in this discourse because it has affected our economy and we have lost day after day*
- *All Egyptians are in the same spot now, and we have to continue our national dialogue that we have started in the spirit of one team and away from disagreements and fighting so that we can take Egypt to the next step and to regain confidence in our economy and to let people feel secure and to stabilize the Egyptian street so that people can resume their daily life.*
- *We will stand as Egyptians and we will prove our power and our resolve to overcome this through national dialogue. We will prove that we are not followers or puppets of anybody, nor we are receiving orders or dictations from anybody*

Mubarak uses inclusive 'we' a number of times to refer to himself and the people of Egypt and thus encourage solidarity. It is used most frequently to persuade the audience to work as a team as it were by producing apparent collective utterances, for example "we will".

There are some referents of 'we'. Mubarak uses them with the double inference and presumption that he is not only speaking on behalf of the party or Government (Exclusive) but also on behalf of the audience

(inclusive.) Its precise interpretation is dependent on the particular context of use and the inferences to be drawn on the basis of the mutual knowledge of the speaker and interpreter. Fairclough (1989:127) notes “the rhetorical implication is that the audience must share the Government’s views as being the only correct ones.” All in all this is the aim of the Mubarak's speech. Both the inclusive/exclusive references of ‘we’ simply show that the speaker implies that the audience have the same view. Table(3) shows the references of ‘we.’

Table 3: The References of ‘we’ in Mubarak's Speech

The References of ‘we’	No. Of Occurrences
'We' the Egyptian Government	5
'We' the Egyptian People	7
'We' Egyptian Government and People	11
Total	23

‘We’ is used on a number of occasions to refer to the Egyptian Government, the Egyptian people, and the Egyptian Government and people. Consider the following extracts in which “we” refers to Egyptian Government and people in the first one, to the Egyptian Government in the second, and to the Egyptian people in the third:

1. *We will stand as Egyptians and we will prove our power and our resolve to overcome this through national dialogue. We will prove that we are not followers or puppets of anybody, nor we are receiving orders or dictations from anybody — any entity, and no one is making the decision for us*
2. *And anyway, I am completely aware of what we are facing and I am convinced that Egypt is going through a historical moment that necessitates we should look into the higher and superior aspirations of the nation over any other goal or interest.*
3. *That spirit will live in us as long as the Egyptian people - as long as the Egyptian people remain, that spirit will remain in us. It will live amongst all of our people, farmers, intellectuals, workers. It will remain in the hearts of our senior citizens, our women, our children, Christians and Muslims alike, and in the hearts and minds of all those who are not born yet.*

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

From table (3), 'We' referring to the Egyptian government and people is used most (11 times). It may include both the speaker and the listener into the same arena, and thus make the audience feel close to the speaker and his points.

One of the reasons for the use of the pronoun 'we' is that politicians may not be certain that the decisions they make will necessarily be viewed in a positive way. Therefore, the use of 'we' spreads the responsibility. 'We' can be manipulated for political effect and is used in this speech to establish a sense of group unity.

The first person plural pronouns 'our' and 'us' are used in a similar way to 'we', for example, "*Our priority now is to facilitate free election ...*" and "*And this dialogue resulted in harmony, and preliminary harmony in opinions that has placed us on the beginning of the road to transfer to a better future that we have agreed on.*". This use promotes unity and belonging.

5. Conclusion

Politics is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. Language, in this process, plays a crucial role for every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. This paper analyses discourse of political speech, namely by the Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak on 10 February 2011 during what is later known as 'January Revolution.'

Discourse analysis has shown that Mubarak uses the two groups. The out-group pronouns are used more frequently than the in-group ones. They refer to Mubarak as a citizen, and as the leader of the Egyptian government. 'I' appears to be used more when Mubarak addresses the Egyptian people to persuade them that the beliefs, experience, and involvement he is expressing are his personal ones.

To convey his intent to create a society of oneness and solidarity to his country, Mubarak uses in-group pronouns in his speech. The in-group pronouns function both inclusively and exclusively. There are some references of this group of pronouns. Mubarak uses them with the double inference and presumption that he is not only speaking on behalf of the party or Government (Exclusive) but also on behalf of the audience (inclusive.) This use is to shorten the distance between the speaker and the audience. It may include both the speaker and the listener into the same arena, and thus make the audience feel close to the speaker and his points and to persuade them to work as a team.

References

- Bayram, Fatih (2010). Ideology and Political Discourse: A critical Discourse Analysis of Erdogan's Political Speech. ARECLS, vol.7, pp.23-40.
- Beard, A. (2000). The language of Politics. London: Routledge.
- Charterir-Black, J. (2005). Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Crystal, D. (1995). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duszak, A. (2002). Us and Others: An Introduction. Us and Others: Social Identities across Languages, Discourses and Cultures, ed. A. Duszak, 1-28. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Edelman, M. J. (1977). Political Language : Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail. New York: Academic Press.
- Edwards, J. (2006). 'Language Attitudes', in Brown, K.(ed). The Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics. Vol. 6 Oxford ; New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 324-331.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and Power. London: Longman.
- (1992). Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2006). Tony Blair and the Language of Politics. Available at: http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracyblair/blair_language_4205.jsp.
- Jones, J. & S. Wareing. (1999). Language and Politics. In Thomas, L. et. al. (eds), Language, Society, and Power. London: Routledge.
- Jones, J. and Peccei, J. S. (2004). 'Language and Politics', in Thomas, L.(ed), Language, Society, and Power. New York: Routledge.
- Levinson, S. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. (2001). Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Obeng, S. G. (2002). The Language of Politics. In S. G. Obeng & B. Hartford (Eds.), Surviving through obliqueness: Language of Politics in Emerging Democracies. Hauppauge: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Odebunmi, A. and K. Olaniyan (2005). Perspectivization in Fiction: A Deictic Study of Wole Soyinka's Ake. Mimeo.
- Schaffner, C. (1996). Editorial: Political Speeches and Discourse Analysis", Current Issues in Language & Society, 3, (3).
- Smith, Q. (1989). The Multiple Uses of Indexicals. Available at <http://www.qsmith.wmu.com>.
- Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Titscher, S.; M. Meyer; R. Wodak; & E. Vetter (2000). Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

- Trask, R.L. (1999). Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics. London: Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. (2004). Politics, Ideology and Discourse. In Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics (Wodak, R. (ed.) "Language and Politics. (2003). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., Hamilton, H.E. (ed), The handbook of discourse analysis. Oxford: Blackwell.
- ~~-(2006). Politics, Ideology, and Discourse'. In Brown, K.(ed), The Encyclopaedia of language and linguistics. Vol. 9 Oxford ; New York: Pergamon Press.~~
- Wales, K. (1996). Personal Pronouns In Present Day English. Cambridge University Press.
- Wareing, S. (2004). "What is language and what does it do?". In Thomas, L.(ed), Language, Society, and Power. New York: Routledge.
- Zupnik, Yael J. (1994). A Pragmatic Analysis of the Use of Person Deixis in Political Discourse'. Published in Journal of Pragmatics. 2.

Appendix

Full Text of Hosni Mubarak's Speech

Hasan

10 February 2011

The following text is a transcript of President Mubarak's speech translated from Arabic by US Federal Document Clearing House and published in several US media outlets, including Washington-post, and Politics-daily.

In the name of Allah, the merciful, the compassionate, dear fellow citizens, my sons, the youth of Egypt, and daughters, I am addressing you tonight to the youth of Egypt in Tahrir Square, with all of its diversity.

I am addressing all of you from the heart, a speech from the father to his sons and daughters. I am telling you that I am very grateful and am so proud of you for being a symbolic generation that is calling for change to the better, that is dreaming for a better future, and is making the future.

I am telling you before anything, that the blood of the martyrs and the injured will not go in vain. And I would like to affirm, I will not hesitate to punish those who are responsible fiercely. I will hold those in charge who have violated the rights of our youth with the harshest punishment stipulated in the law.

I am telling families of the innocent victims that I have been so much in pain for their pain, and my heart ached for your heartache.

I am telling you that my response to your demands and your messages and your requests is my commitment that I will never go back on to. I am determined to fulfill what I have promised you in all honesty, and I'm determined to execute and carry out what I have promised without going back to the past.

This commitment is out of my conviction of your honesty and your movement and that your demands are the demands – legitimate and just demands. Any regime could make mistakes in any country, but what is more important is to acknowledge these mistakes and reform and correct them in a timely manner, and to hold those responsible for it accountable.

I am telling you, as a president of the country, I do not find it a mistake to listen to you and to respond to your requests and demands. But it is shameful and I will not, nor will ever accept to hear foreign dictations, whatever the source might be or whatever the context it came in.

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

My sons and daughters, the youth of Egypt, dear fellow citizens, I have announced, without any doubt, that I will not run for the next presidential elections and have said that I have given the country and served the country for 60 years in public service, during wartime and during peacetime.

I have told you my determination that I will hold steadfast to continue to take on my responsibility to protect the constitution and the rights of people until power is transferred to whomever the people choose during September, the upcoming September, and free and impartial elections that will be safeguarded by the freedom – the call for freedom.

This is the oath that I have taken before God and before you. And I will protect it and keep it until we reach – we take Egypt to the safety and security.

I have given you my vision to get out of this current situation, to accomplish what the youth and the people called for, within the respect for the legitimacy and the constitution in a way that will accomplish security, and security for our future and the demands of our people, and at the same time will guarantee a framework of peaceful transition of power. Through a responsible dialogue between all factions in the society, with all honesty and transparency, I have given you this vision under commitment to take the country out of this current crisis, and I will continue to accomplish it. And I'm monitoring the situation hour by hour.

I'm looking forward to the support of all those who are careful about the security and want a secure Egypt, within a tangible time, with the harmony of the broad base of all Egyptians that will stay watchful to guard Egypt and under the command of its military forces.

We have started a national dialogue, a constructive one, that included the youth who have called for change and reform, and also with all the factions of opposition and of society. And this dialogue resulted in harmony, and preliminary harmony in opinions that has placed us on the beginning of the road to transfer to a better future that we have agreed on.

We also have agreed on a road map – a road map with a timetable. Day after day, we will continue the transition of power from now until September. This national dialogue has — has met and was formed under a constitutional committee that have looked into the constitution and what

Hasan

was required - and looked into what is required, and the constitution reforms that is demanded [inaudible].

We will also monitor the execution – the honest execution of what I have promised my people. I was careful that both committees that were formed - to be formed from Egyptians who are honorable and who are independent and impartial, and who are well-versed in law and constitution.

In addition to that, in reference to the loss of many Egyptians during these sad situations that have pained the hearts of all of us and have ached the conscience of all Egyptians. I have also requested to expedite investigations and to refer all investigations to the attorney general to take the necessary measures and steps – decisive steps.

I also received the first reports yesterday about the required constitutional reform – reforms that was suggested by the constitutional and law experts regarding the legislative reforms that were requested. I am also responding to what the committee has suggested. And based on the powers given to me according to the constitution, I have presented today a request asking the amendment of six constitutional articles, which is 76, 77, 88, 93 and 187, in addition to abolishing article number 79 in the constitution, with the affirmation and conviction that later on we can also amend the other articles that would be suggested by that constitutional committee, according to what it sees right.

Our priority now is to facilitate free election – free presidential elections and to stipulate a number of terms in the constitution and to guarantee a supervision of the upcoming elections to make sure it will be conducted in a free manner.

We – I have also looked into the provisions and the steps to look into the parliamentary elections, but those who have suggested to abolish article number 179 in the constitution will guarantee the balance between the constitution and between our security and the threat of terror, which will open the door to stopping the martial law, as soon as we regain stability and security and as soon as these circumstances — circumstances assure the stability.

Our priority now is to regain confidence between citizens among themselves and to regain confidence in the international arena and to regain confidence about the reforms that we have pledged.

Egypt is going through some difficult times, and it is not right to continue in this discourse because it has affected our economy and we have lost

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

day after day, and it is in danger — it is putting Egypt through a situation where people who have called for reform will be the first ones to be affected by it.

This time is not about me. It's not about Hosni Mubarak. But the situation now is about Egypt and its present and the future of its citizens. All Egyptians are in the same spot now, and we have to continue our national dialogue that we have started in the spirit of one team and away from disagreements and fighting so that we can take Egypt to the next step and to regain confidence in our economy and to let people feel secure and to stabilize the Egyptian street so that people can resume their daily life.

I was a young man, a youth just like all these youth, when I have learned the honor of the military system and to sacrifice for the country. I have spent my entire life defending its land and its sovereignty. I have witnessed and attended its wars with all its defeats and victories. I have lived during defeat and victory.

During the victory in 1973, my happiest days were when I lifted the Egyptian flag over Sinaa'. I have faced death several times when I was a pilot. I also faced it in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and elsewhere. I did not submit nor yield to foreign dictations or others. I have kept the peace. I worked towards the Egyptian stability and security. I have worked to the revival in Egypt and the prosperity.

I did not seek authority. I trust that the majority — the vast majority of the Egyptian people know who is Hosni Mubarak, and it pains me to what I have — what I see today from some of my fellow citizens. And anyway, I am completely aware of the — what we are facing and I am convinced that Egypt is going through a historical — a historical moment that necessitates we should look into the higher and superior aspirations of the nation over any other goal or interest.

I have delegated to the vice president some of the power; the powers of the president according to the constitution. I am aware, fully aware, that Egypt will overcome the crisis and the resolve of its people will not be deflected and will [inaudible] again because of the — and will deflect the arrows of the enemies and those who [inaudible] against Egypt.

We will stand as Egyptians and we will prove our power and our resolve to overcome this through national dialogue. We will prove that we are

Hasan

not followers or puppets of anybody, nor we are receiving orders or dictations from anybody or any entity, and no one is making the decision for us except for the Egyptian.

We will prove that with the spirit and the resolve of the Egyptian people, and with the unity and steadfastness of its people and with our resolve and to our glory and pride.

These are the main foundations of our civilization that have started over 7,000 years ago. That spirit will live in us as long as the Egyptian people as long as the Egyptian people remain, that spirit will remain in us.

It will live amongst all of our people, farmers, intellectuals, workers. It will remain in the hearts of our senior citizens, our women, our children, Christians and Muslims alike, and in the hearts and minds of all those who are not born yet.

Let me say again that I have lived for this nation. I have kept my responsibilities. And Egypt will remain, above all, and above any individuals. Egypt will remain until I deliver and surrender it to others. This will be the land of my living and my death. It will remain a dear land to me. I will not leave it nor depart it until I am buried in the ground. Its people will remain in my heart, and it will remain its people will remain upright and lifting up their heads.

May God keep Egypt secure and may God defend its people. And peace be upon you.

**A Linguistic Analysis of
In-group and out-group¹ Pronouns
In Hosni Mubarak's Speech¹**

تتناول الدراسة الحالية استخدام ضمائر الانتماء للمجموعة وضمائر الانفراد في الخطاب السياسي. اعتماداً على خطاب الرئيس حسني مبارك والذي ألقاه في العاشر من شباط عام 2011، خلال ما سمي لاحقاً "ثورة يناير"، تبين الدراسة الكيفية التي من خلالها يتبنى السياسيون أو يتصلون عن أفعال قاموا بها هم أو حكوماتهم. وانتهت الدراسة إلى تبيان بعض الإستراتيجيات التي يعتمدها القادة السياسيون، وخصوصاً استخدام ضمائر الشخص المتكلم، لإقناع الجماهير بقبول رؤاهم وأفعالهم في أوقات الأزمات والثورات والقضايا محل النزاع .