Obama's Speech in Cairo "New Beginning ":
A Critical Discourse Analysis study

Assist. Prof.
Ali A. Al-Ridha Obaid

Assist. Lecturer
Ahmed K. Fahad

خلاصة:

هذا البحث هو دراسة لغوية للخطاب التاريخي للرئيس الأميركي اوباما في القاهرة ٢٠٠٩ وهدفها بيان كيف تم توظيف اللغة بشكل رئيسي لمحاولة الرئيس خلق موقف وهوية جديدة الى اميركا في المجتمع الدولي بشكل عام والعالم الأسلامي بشكل خاص واستخدام الخطاب كاستراتيجية اساسية منسجمة مع الشعار الجديد (التغيير) في حملته الأنتخابية. يمكن ملاحظة ان ادارة اوباما اتت بخطاب جديد يدعو الى السلام والتسامح وهو خطاب مختلف عن الخطابات في الأدارة السابق بسنواتها الثمان.

يعتبر حقل تحليل الخطاب النقدي احدى الأدوات التي تدرس العناصر الأجتماعية والتي تلعب دورا اساسيا في تحديد معنى ونوايا الأفراد عند استخدامهم للغة. هذا يعني ان العناصر الأجتماعية المختلفة اصبحت جزءا من انتاج، اعادة انتاج، تفسير وتحليل الخطاب . يعتبر "نورمان فيركلوف" احدى الشخصيات البارزة التي ساهمت في تطوير حقل تحليل الخطاب النقدي، وهو يعتقد بان اللغة جزءا لا يتجزا من الحياة الأجتماعية حيث تمثل اللغة العلاقة اللهجوية بين اللغة والحقيقة الأجتماعية والتي يمكن تمييزها من خلال الأحداث الأجتماعية (النص)، الممارسة الأجتماعية (ترتيب الخطاب)، والتركيب الأجتماعي.

الهدف الرئيسي لهذا البحث هو لأكتشاف كيفية اسغلال اوباوما للغة من اجل تقديم ايديلوجيته الجديدة المرتبط باستراتيجيته "التغيير" التي اتى بها لخلق موقع جديدل اميركا حيث ان هذه الأستراتيجية الجديدة بالأظافة الى افتراضاته الأخرى وقيمه هي في اغلب الأحيان مخفية خلف الصياغة، التركيب والأستعارة المستخدمة غي كلامه.

تم اعتماد نموذج "نورمان فيركلوف" كاداه لتحليل هذا النص حيث يشتمل هذا النموذج على نضرية " النص–التفاعل–السياق" المقدمة في كتاب "فيركلوف" " اللغو والسلطة (٢٠٠١) والتي تتعامل مع النص بمستويات مختلفة. اشتملت نضرية فيركلوف ضمن مستوى النص على نموذج سماه "نموذج العشرة اسئلة" لبيان المميزات التركيبية للنص والتي يفترض بان تتضمن ايديلوجيات المتكلم وقيمه. هناك سببان رئيسان وراء اعتماد هذا النموذج التحليلي : التنظيم التركيبي العالي وشمولية التحليل. وبما ان هدف هذه الدراسة هو التركيز على المعنى الضمني ، فقد تم اعتماد الأسئلة السبعة الأولى من هذا النموذج اما الأسئلة الثلاث المتبقية (٨،٩،١٠) فهي غير ذات صلة وذلك لتركيزها على الجوانب النحوية . الأسئلة (١و٢,٣) تركز على القيم المسماة "الخبرات، الصلة، والتعبير" للصفات النحوية للنص.

تم استنتاج ان اوباما قد قام وبشكل كبير استغلال لغته لتحقيق اهدافه من الخطاب وبيان نواياه السلمية الواضحة نحو كل القضايا الدولية والأسلامية فمن خلال خطابه الشخصي وظف اوباما العديد من الوسائل مستخدما فهمه و" خبراته" لطرح ايديلوجيته الجديدة التي تتضمن المبادئ المشتركة لل "للشراكة: في العلاقات بين البلدان وافتراضه لبناء "عالم السلم" حيث يكون لأميركا موقعها ووضيفة كونه "شريك لا "وصي" على العالم وبمساعدة صانعي السلام والذي يعتبر العالم الإسلامي احدى عناصرها الأساسية.

<u>ABSTRACT</u>

   The paper is a linguistic study for president Obama's "historical" speech in Cairo (2009) to mainly find out how language is used as part of the president's attempt to draw a new position and identity for America in the global community in general and in the Islamic community in particular , as one of the strategies that goes in conformity with the well-known slogan of "change" in his presidential election campaign. It can be noticed that Obama administration came to power with a different discourse to the whole global community to supposedly start a new era of "peace" and "consent" expressed through

different use of language ,away of the discourse of "coercion" during the eight years of the former administration.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the field where the social factor plays an essential role in determining the individual's meanings and intentions when using a language . This means that different social and individual elements have become part of producing ,reproducing , interpreting and/or analyzing any discourse and , thus , of CDA studies . Norman Fairclough is one of the prominent figures who has contributed to the CDA field most significantly ; he believes that the language is an irreducible part of social life and refers to a dialectic relation between language and social reality , which can be realized through social events (texts), social practices (orders of discourse) and social structures .

The main aim of the paper is to discover how Obama utilized the language to present his new ideology associated with his strategy of "change" in order to draw a new position for America in relation to the global community , and the Islamic community in particular . This ideology as well as his new assumptions and values are , in most cases , hidden behind the wording , structure and metaphor used in the speech.

The procedure followed for the analysis of the speech is Norman Fairclough's model part of the "text – interaction – context" approach introduced in his book *Language and power* (2001) which is an interdisciplinary approach that deals with the text on different levels . On the "textual" level only, Fairclough provided a model of ten questions to find out the text's formal properties which are supposed to imply the speaker's ideologies and values *, inter alia* . Two main reasons for choosing this model are its being highly structured and analytically so comprehensive . For the purpose of this study as the implied meanings are essentially concentrated on , only the first seven questions are applicable and considered most relevant ; the last three questions (8 , 9 , 10) are seen to be irrelevant due to their focus more on the grammatical relations "cohesion" than on the meanings behind . Questions (1 , 2 , 3) concern the experiential , relational , and expressive values of the lexical features of the text respectively ; question 4 is designed to deal with metaphor only ; whereas questions (5, 6, 7) concern the experiential , relational , and expressive values of the grammatical features of the text respectively .

It is concluded that language has generally been greatly utilized to achieve Obama's targets of which a crucial and most important is to show his "clear" and "plain" intentions of peace towards all the global communities and the Islamic one in particular . Through this personal discourse the president employed a lot of devices including both his own "experiential" understandings so as to supposedly set a new ideology in the world and a new "expressive" comprehension for the human reality . This ideology suggests new shared principles of "partnership" in the relations among countries . The new "relational" values are assumed to be newly-modeled on the basis of building a world full of peace , where America has its new position functioning as a "partner" rather than a "patron" with the other peace-makers of whom the Islamic community is to be an essential part**.**

"What is 'said' in a text is always said against
the background of what is 'unsaid'"
(Fiarclough, 2003 : 17)

Introduction :

This paper is a linguistic study for president Obama's "historical" speech in Cairo (2009) to mainly find out how the language is used as part of the president's attempt to draw a new position and identity for America in the global community in general and in the Islamic community in particular , as one of the strategies that goes in conformity with the well-known slogan of "change" in his presidential election campaign. It is obvious that Obama administration came to power with a different discourse to the whole global community including the Arab and Islamic communities . Through this speech , Obama was stressing the values of understanding and cooperation rather than that of conflict and clash. The speech can certainly be considered as an attempt to lessen the extent of tension that the relations between America and the Islamic world have reached with the use of military force and a discourse of "coercion" during the eight years of the former administration, and probably to start a new era of "peace" and "consent" expressed alternatively through different discourse.

Critical Discourse Analysis is the field that follows the line founded in sociolinguistics where the social factor plays an essential role in determining the meanings and intentions a piece of discourse may imply . This means that elements like attitudes, beliefs, ideologies, culture and historical backgrounds, societal systems, education …etc have become part of producing ,reproducing , interpreting and/or analyzing any discourse and , thus , of CDA studies . Fairclough is one of the prominent figures who has contributed to the field of the Critical Discourse Analysis most significantly ; he believes that the language is an irreducible part of social life and refers to a dialectic relation between language and social reality , which can be realized through social events (texts), social practices (orders of discourse) and social structures. In his book Language and power (2001) Fairclough explained his CDA tri-dimensional interdisciplinary approach "text-interaction-context" , part of which a ten-question model presented to analyze the formal properties of a text to find out the "hidden agenda" implied in the language used . The lexical , grammatical , cohesive , and text structure features of any text (which is a communicative or social event) are only representations behind which lurk a lot of ideologies and values . The first seven questions of the ten-question model of analysis deal with uncovering the experiential , relational , and expressive values of the

wordings , metaphors and grammatical structures of the text whereas the last three questions are related to cohesion and text structure . Only the first seven questions are , thus ,used for the purpose of this study since it is principally concerned with unfolding the meanings , ideologies and values of the overt words and grammatical structures of the text , namely Obama's "New beginning" speech in Cairo 2009 .

Key words: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) , Norman Fairclough , power , ideology .

Research question :

The main research question can be :

How did Obama utilize language to present his new ideology associated with his strategy of "change" so as to draw a new position for America on the map of both the global community as a whole , and the Islamic community in particular?

Through the textual analysis of the speech, two more sub-questions can be answered meanwhile :

- How can the ideologies behind the language used be discovered ?
- How well did the president's language foster his new assumptions and values to assign a new position to America ?

Procedure :

President Obama's address is tackled as a text to be formally analyzed with a critical discourse analysis framework which is part of Norman Fairclough's "text – interaction – context" approach introduced in his book Language and power (2001) . This approach is interdisciplinary as it deals with the text on different levels . On the "textual" level only, Fairclough provided a model of ten questions (see Appendix) to find out the text's formal properties which are supposed to imply the speaker's ideologies and values , inter alia . Two main reasons for choosing this model are its being highly structured and analytically so comprehensive that a limitation is necessarily needed for the purpose of this study , therefore , since the implied meanings are essentially concentrated on , only the first seven questions are applicable and considered most relevant ; the last three questions (8 , 9 , 10) are seen to be irrelevant due to their focus more on the grammatical relations "cohesion" than on the meanings behind . Questions (1 , 2 , 3) concern the experiential , relational , and expressive values of the lexical features of the text respectively ; question 4 is designed only to deal with metaphor ; whereas questions (5, 6, 7) concern the experiential ,

relational , and expressive values of the grammatical features of the text respectively .

Theoretical Reflections

The term Critical Linguistics emerged along with the prevalence of the critical theory and was then developed to be mainly based on Halliday's systemic – functional linguistics which exceeded the limits of the formal descriptions of a piece of language into its context or the situation in which it is used in the society . After this term has widely been elaborated in theory and practice , a new term is then alternatively used "critical discourse analysis" in which the social experience can   imply struggle of a social power , inequality , dominance and hegemony .

The term discourse can be understood form   Wodak and Meyer's definition of   CDA as simply language in use whereas CDA is "fundamentally concerned with analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, and legitimized, and so on by language use (or in discourse)" (2001:2) . All the dimensions for the use of the word 'critical' analysis of the discourse seem to be revolving around one main issue i.e the critique of the social practice ; as Bloom and Bloom show that the major part of discourse analysis of the twentieth century was in principle "non – critical" since it confines itself to the three purposes : identifying and describing how language is used for communication , developing methods of analysis to highlight its features , and ultimately building theories about how communication is to take place (2007 : 12) . On the contrary , CDA can address all types of problems ranging from international events "macro issues" to individual cases "micro issues" to briefly cover the three objectives : "to analyze discourse practices that reflect or construct social problems , to investigate how ideologies can become frozen in language and find ways to break the ice , to increase awareness on how to apply these objectives to specific cases of injustice ,prejudice, and misuse of power" (loc.cit).

CDA is then the study of the relationship between the use of the language and the social context . It has become an approach rather than a sole method for language study . This can be clearly noticed in the different perspectives adopted by the key figures in the field . Van Dijk sees that CDA is the study of " the way social power abuse , dominance , and inequality are enacted , reproduced , and resisted by text and talk " (2001 : 352) . Fairclough believes that language is irreducible part of the social life while CDA explores the "opaque" relationships between both the discursive

practice and the wider social and cultural environment in which it occurs (1995 : 132 – 3) . Hodge and Kress (1993) focus on the dichotomous categories : "euphemism" and "derogatory" as the cornerstone for explaining a discourse as these terms lead to different presentations of reality and ultimately ideology. But Van Leeuwen (1996) is concerned with social factors' knowledge and positioning in the community as they can be included or excluded from the centers of power. Also, Scollon defines CDA as a "program" for critically analyzing language in use " as a means of addressing social change". (2001 : 140).

Fairclough CDA Approach

Fairclough sees "language as discourse and as social practice" (2001:.21) and any text , whether spoken or written , is a communicative event (Fairclough 1995 b : 56) . Accordingly , his CDA approach concentrates on three components in every communicative event: the text, discourse practices (e.g. levels of production and consumption), and socio-cultural practice (e.g. the social and cultural structures which govern the communicative event). (ibid : 12). These three dimensions are interrelated with three processes of analysis which are : text analysis (description), processing analysis (interpretation), and social analysis (explanation).

As concerned the terminologies Fairclough prefers using terms like wording , lexicalization , and significance instead of vocabulary which is insufficient to cover the fluency of the various meanings of words of a language when used in different spheres , situations , space , and time . (1992:76). Then , on the grammatical level , the basic unit of grammar for Fairclough is the clause which can be understood as the simple sentence . The clause may be constituted by a phrase or a group of phrases and show different functions . Clauses combine to make complex sentence structures . These concepts are mainly dependent on Halliday's three types of meanings : ideational, interpersonal and textual (see Halliday, 2004) as Fairclogh points out that people consciously or unconsciously construct their language in a text to show their personality, knowledge, beliefs and identity i.e. the term ideational meaning refers to the language constructs of knowledge, belief and ideology whereas the term interpersonal meaning refers to the constructs of social relations, power and identity.(Fairclough, 1995 a :17)

According to Fairclough, critical language study (CLS) is mainly concerned with the social aspects of language as it conceptualizes language as a kind of social practice. Discourse as an actual talk or writing "is language as a form of social practice" (Fairclough 2001:18) and is also defined as practice which is discoursal . These interrelations within

discourse and practice are termed as orders of discourse and orders of practice (ibid:34-35).

The orders of discourse are social orders realized through a discoursal perspective as both , the discoursal and social orders , and can take various structures and types according to different factors as situation , place and context . These orders of discourse are controlled by "power" at certain levels such as social institutions or the society as a whole , and are changeable within the course of time to ultimately structure a discourse that fits its embedded " ideology" . (ibid : 23-26). In a more comprehensive presentation Fairclough defines the term order of discourse as constituted by different discursive practices to be a social structuring of semiotic differences implying a particular social ordering of relationships among different ways of making meaning like different discourses, genres and styles (Fairclough, 2003 : 220).

The term social order is used to refer to a structuring of a certain ´space´ in different
domains associated with various types of practice. Society and the different social institutions in which we find ourselves are structured in different spheres for different types of action, situation or context and each of these have their own kind of practice.

power is an ongoing process that takes place under conditions of social struggle and is always a matter of struggle that is exercised through "coercion" or "consent" ; it can be "won, exercised, sustained, and lost in the course of social struggle" (Fairclough 2001:57).

Subject positions refers to linguistic actions in terms of investigating what people do because "occupying a subject position is essentially a matter of doing (or not doing) certain things, in line with the discoursal rights and obligations" (ibid : 31) . It is a term used to embrace particular social positions , such as a student and a teacher , which imply a set of ideals and requirements that must be followed to conform to a certain situation or context . This term is related to another which is , the interactional routines when a particular type of discourse is used representing routine and conventional ways of interaction by the members of a society according to subject positions, such as one following the routine conventional way of interactions with a doctor . Also , in relation to subject positions there is another term "common-sense assumptions" signifying the ideas and ideologies that are commonly agreed-upon and embedded in society . These "commonsensical" ideologies and understandings are , thus , part of the discourse structure and are taken for granted , as shared by all members , in connection to power and the social struggle . This struggle is apparent not

only in the language of a text, but in all types of discourse. This consciousness use of language is an essential feature of the critical language study (CLS) (ibid :71- 81).

In the two processes of text production and text interpretation , people of a community employ their shared pre-existing commonsense assumptions and expectations ; theses are called members resources (MR) which are :

> " what people have in their heads and draw upon when they produce
> and interpret texts – including their knowledge of language,
> representations of the natural and social worlds they inhabit, values,
> beliefs, assumptions and so on"

(ibid : 20)

As mentioned above , in order to unfold the values and idiologies in the speech understudy , as its "hidden agenda", with the use of the ten-question model , three types of values are to be drawn upon : experiential , relational and expressive for both words and grammatical structures , in addition to metaphor . All need necessarily be more elaborated on :

1. *Experiential values* :

Any " formal feature" can carry an experiential value when it shows "a trace of and a cue to the way in which the text producer's experience of the natural or social world is represented. Experiential value is to do with contents, knowledge and beliefs." (ibid :93) .

On the lexical level , this will lead the text producer to automatically choose the word(s) that reflects his/her own worldview. In the ten-question model these values are covered by question no. 1. and can be analyzed through the following , among others :

A. the choice *wordings* and rewordings . as words are in many cases , consciously or subconsciously , ideologically contested , and the occurrence of particular words can imply certain understandings.

B. *Over wording* which is a high degree of wording lurking an ideology . It can be revealed through the use of meaning relations like *synonymy, hyponymy* and *antonymy.*

C. *Classification scheme* which is a certain way followed to divide up some aspects of reality depending upon the ideological implications shared by some words.

Whereas on the grammatical level , They are covered by question no. 5 , and performed through the use of the different grammatical forms and categories of a language , including mainly the selection of simple sentence forms . Simple sentences consist of a subject (S), followed by a verb (V); which may be followed by an object (O), a complement (C) or an adjunct

(A). These components can be combined in three sentence forms SVO, SV and SVC.

These three combinations of components of the simple sentence express three main types of process: actions (SVO), events (SV) and attributions (SVC). Actions involve two participants, an agent as a dominant and a patient as being dominated . The patients are not always animate, while the agents are always animate. The second combination (SV) can , though not always , function as events which include only one animate or inanimate participant. The third combination   (SVC) can express an attribution which involves one participant with either a possessive attribute if the verb is a form of "have" or a non-possessive attribute with other verbs or sometimes with adjectives and nouns. (ibid :100-102) . Nominalization , activization and passivization , and negation in the sentences forms can also show certain ideologies and values

   2. ***Relational values*** :

    The formal feature is said to be possessing a relational value when it shows "a trace of and a cue to the social relationships which are enacted via the text in the discourse." (ibid : 93) . Relational values have to do with the social relations of the participants in any social interaction through a communicative event.

   On the lexical level , these relational values are covered by question 2 ,and reflect the idea of how the text producer as part of a particular group chooses his / her words depending on , and finally creating , social relationships between the members of that group . The producer may avoid the negative values of words in order not to , consciously or unconsciously , harm the social relations. (ibid : 97-98) . ; this can be done through the use of *euphemism* .

   On the grammatical level these relations are covered by question 6 . The grammatical features within a text are *modes* of sentence, *modality* and *pronouns*, among others. There are three main modes : *declaratives*, *imperatives and grammatical questions*. Modality is expressed with modal auxiliary verbs like *may, must, should, can* , ought to … etc. and also with adverbs and tense . It has two dimensions. The first is *relational modality*, which has to do with the authority of one participant in relation to others. The second is *expressive modality* which is a matter of the speaker or writer's evaluation of truth. Relational modality is ideological since it carries implicit power relations and explicit authority claims (ibid : 105-106) .

    Pronouns such as *we* and *you* have relational values. The editorial use of *you* is inclusive referring to the reader and writer, as opposed to the exclusive *we*, which refers to the writer and one more, but does not include

the addressee. *we* and *you* in a text usually create an ideology of unity , intimacy and imply a solidarity relation. (ibid :106-107) .

3. ***Expressive values*** :

the expressive value of a certain formal feature can be shown through "a trace of and a cue to the producer's evaluation (in the widest sense) of the bit of the reality it relates to" (ibid : 93) .

On the lexical level these are covered by question no. 3. and are very much connected to the experiential values in which the producer presents his / her knowledge and ideas through wordings . These judgments and evaluations can , for example , clearly expressed through *classification schemes* and their implied ideologies (ibid : 98-99) .

On the grammatical level they are covered in question 7 . The text producer's understanding and representation of reality can be revealed through different grammatical structures . Expressive Modality is one of these possible structures as being " a matter of the speaker or writer's authority with respect to the truth or probability of a representation of reality" (ibid :105). Or , they can be referred to without a need to any "sort of intermediate modalities" (ibid :107) as facts and truths may be expressed .

4. ***Metaphor*** :

A metaphor means the use of figures of speech in connection with certain persons , objects or actions . This can also be attached to ideologies and values . Metaphors for Fairclough are of special value since they can , in most cases , express different meanings e.g . *ideological* and/or *political* and show difficulties on the level of text interpretation (1992 : 77) . This is covered in one question which is question No. 5 .

Description :

An overview of the speech shows that it was delivered in Cairo , Egypt (2009) in 55 minutes , was commonly titled "A new beginning" , the expression that had been quoted from the address itself : "I have come here to seek a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world" . It started with greeting the audience with the Islamic traditional greeting "*al-salamu 'alaykum*" (peace be upon you) and can obviously be divided into three parts : an the opening , the issues of concern, and the closing.

In the opening , the US President first addressed his audience (domestic and international) with praising Islam as a faith upraising the " principles of justice and progress; tolerance and the dignity of all human beings" , the Islamic civilization which " carried the light of learning through so many centuries" , and the American Muslims being "part of America's story" who

"have enriched the United States" .This praise is enhanced with an overt criticism to the old policy of tensions that led to the Western colonialism, and later to the Cold War .For him, 'violent extremists' have exploited these tensions to picture Islam as an opponent not only to America and the western countries but also to human rights. Therefore , there is a need to start a new relationship based on respect and mutual interest . Then , the president drew upon his personal history of multi-religion background and awareness including Islam , as an American who had been given the opportunity to become a president in the land of fulfilling the dreams and of freedom particularly the religious freedom , America , where Muslims and Islam , as a faith and civilization , played a positive role , and where currently the immigrants are well hosted under a law that guarantees an ideal relationship between the citizen and the alien.

Also , the president reminded the addressees of one of the 21st century realities and values that all should bear the responsibility "to one another as human beings" sharing the world as they would all be at risk when a danger appears in any place . Cases as such are when a flue infects one human being , when a nation persue a nuclear weapon , when violent extremists operate in a stretch of mountains , when innocents are slaughtered , or when , on the economic level , a financial system weakens in one country all humanity will certainly suffer. The world shares a lot in common and faces the same challenges.

The second part of the speech consists of issues of concern or "sources of tension" for both America and the world including the Islamic countries . There are six of them starting with "violent extremism" in Afghanistan where the violent extremists "determined to kill as many Americans as they can" and where America does not want to keep troops or bases in ; the situation in Iraq is also issued where the war was "a war of choice" , but Iraq will be left to Iraqis to "forge a better future". The second issue is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict ; he first talked about the American commitment to both Israel security and existence which had been threatened throughout history . As for the Palestinians , he referred to their suffering " in pursuit of a homeland" as intolerable. The third issue is the nuclear weapons which Obama admitted it as a source of tension with the Islamic Republic of Iran and which can encourage a nuclear arms race leading the world to " a hugely dangerous path". The fourth issue is democracy ; America bears respect to the governments that "govern with respect for all their people". The next fifth issues is religious freedom in the world implying tolerance of the human beings to one another . The sixth issue is women's right particularly to wear what they choose . Then , the seventh issue is the

economic development and opportunities among all the states in this era of globalization. This part was summarized by Obama himself to draw a new picture for the world as follows :

> The issues that I have described will not be easy to address. But we have a responsibility to join together on behalf of the world we seek - a world where extremists no longer threaten our people , and American troops have come home; a world where Israelis and Palestinians are each secure in a state of their own, and nuclear energy is used for peaceful purposes ; a world where governments serve their citizens , and the rights of all God's children are respected . Those are mutual interests . That is the world we seek. But we can only achieve it together.

The third part of the speech is the closing one in which Obama tried to remove the   doubts in the hearts and minds which believe that this call for a change and for starting a "new beginning" is impossible as it can be achieved "only if we have the courage to make a new beginning" with new rules of partnership and understanding of the world as "if we choose to be bound by the past, we will never move forward" . This call is also reminded of as religiously-legitimatized and Nature-supported in "what has been written" part of the "God's vision" therefore Obama concluded with three citations from the Holy Quran , the Talmud , and the Holy Bible , all stressing peace among Mankind . And , with peace Obama far welled his audience using the Islamic greeting " And may God's peace be upon you".

Analysis :

Accordingly , the analysis will take the three parts of the speech respectively . Throughout the analysis , there are two points that are worth mentioning : focus will be laid on the sub-parts that are magnificently ideologically-loaded , and   though the speech does entail several other discourse elements but only the experiential, relational and expressive fall within the limitation of the study .

   1. **The Opening** :

In the opening paragraph of the speech there was an apparent expressive value represented in the occurrences of over wording terms. Obama's ideology is to urge greater mutuality between the United States and Islam. He insists on breaking the stereotypes about Islam. The expressive values are seen in using terms like " coexistence" and " cooperation" and then he uses antonyms as counterparts to other wording such as "conflict" and "religious wars" . Obama follows this wording so as to indicate that there is an ideological struggle in the meaning of "coexistence" and "cooperation". He clearly indicates that this is the way that Islam and the west are to be viewed. Seen within the ideology of normal society or , in this context , within the viewing audience, "coexistence" and "cooperation" are not the

case of how Islam and the west are nowadays. According to the normal society, it could be the other two concepts or antonyms "conflict" and "religious wars" as what is normally seen for the relationship between Islam and the west. Obama's ability of using this over wording shows his rejection of the negative concepts about Islam and the West .

In his introductory paragraph, the president has conveyed relational values through over wording in addition to the expressive values above , because "coexistence", "cooperation", "conflict" and "religious wars" have become commonsensical , therefore, will be easily identified by the audience and , accordingly , set solid ground for what comes next in the speech.

Several pronouns such as "we", "I" and "our" are to indicate Obama's intention and his ideology, as well as the ideology of the west, are now shared by all (including the audience) . All are supposed to be now one community built on shared grounds and similar , if not identical , ideals.

The key phrase here and for the whole speech is a "new beginning" with "mutual interest and mutual trust" added for good effect. The relational values were very vivid when Obama quotes from the Koran "be conscious of God and always speak the truth". He quotes from the Koran before he quotes from the bible to put himself in the same line with the audience , or , in CDA words , in the same group with the audience. The effect of the relational values were skillfully manipulated in this part to create a senses of shared experiences.

In this part of the speech, Obama used expressive values when he depicted Al Qaeda not overtly but by addressing them as "violent extremists" because it could otherwise add respect to Al Qaeda.   This , also , reveals his hierarchical scheme because it implies that Al Qaeda is merely among a "small but potent minority of Muslims" , he draws the limits in order to break the "cycle of suspicion" .

Relational value is also clear when Obama described his own family connection to Islam. This stands him in a good position to the audience. He emphasizes the peaceful characteristics of Islam "dignity and peace in their Muslims faith" and linked Islam to America " Muslims have enriched America" and "Islam is part of America). These statements are an SVO sentence and can be classified as a factual information leaving no room for interpretation.

At this point he was successful in stressing his ideology through his choice of words which are positive to the description of Islam. Relational values through the use of personal pronouns and choice of words besides the expressive values all collaborated to Obama's point expressed as " we must

finally confront together". After achieving this, Obama went on talking about some issues in the world .

2. The Issues of Concern

   The first issue is " violent extremists'. Obama, here, utterd several declarative statements and an attribution where he separated the extremists who claim to speak in Islam's name from the ordinary " people of all faiths" who reject "the killing of innocent men, women and children". The experiential values lies in how Obama attributed the negative qualities of 'killing innocent men , women, and children".

   The relational values is clear by the statements as declaratives with the use of the unquestionable verb "BE" : "Islam is part of America". And "America is not and never be at war with Islam". Obama separates America and the majority of Muslims from the "small but potent" ……affiliates" of Al Qaeda through the relational values of his speech. By ensuring this unity of America and Islam, it is now easy for him to reject claims that are widely circulating in the Muslim world that America is fighting Islam. The views are ideologically contested. He urges Muslims to reject extremists " none of us should tolerate these extremists" . The pronouns 'us' here carries a relational value as America and Is,am are one group , and the word "extremists" carries an expressive value to mean that Al Qaeda has nothing to do with Islam.

    When tackling Iraq issue which is a big issue in the time of the speech , Obama uses apparent expressive values to his choice of words. Obama does not criticize his predecessor president George W. Bush, but does say that this was a "war of choice", meaning it was not his choice to go to this war. But, yet, he closed his sentence with "Iraq's people are ultimately better off". He presented his own foreign policy approach by contrast : "Diplomacy and international consensus". This is Obama's ultimate aim to highlight – a switch from interventionism to a more detached but determined effort at persuasion. " We will a secure and united Iraq as a partner, and never as a patron". The pair antonyms (partner, patron) have expressive values to stress Obama's own scheme of foreign policy.

   The relational values are also clear in how Obama promised the audience and confirmed that once extremists are " isolated and unwelcome in Muslim communities", we will be safer. Here Obama linked together the destiny of himself, the Americans and the majority of Muslims in fighting those extremists.

    The second issue was that of Israel and Palestine which was a core issue. The relational values in this segment was very obvious when Obama

presents his intentions to revive peace talks and he distances himself from the Israeli settlement policy calling for an absolute freeze.

Obama displays experiential values through setting his position as a third party and talks about " six million Jews were killed….. denying that fact is baseless, ignorant and hateful". This is a very expressive effect as it could never be stronger than these: the adjectives of "baseless, ignorant and hateful"

Besides his support to Israel. Obama balanced this with his sympathy and support to Palestinians. He emphasized how the Palestinian people "have suffered in pursuit of a homeland" and are under "occupation" with "daily humiliation".

The President seeks to reaffirm the two-state solution "The aspiration of both peoples must be met "through two states". The relational value is embedded in the noun "Peoples". Obama separated himself from siding with a party over another, which is commonsensical as it is clear that US usually sides with Israel. Through the choice of words here, Obama set himself aside and introduced himself again as a third party or moderator, a party that seeks to make peace. Both sides have responsibilities "Palestinians must abandon violence and Israelis must acknowledge Palestine and its right to exist". He repeats his opposition to "continued Israeli settlements" and states firmly: "It is time for these settlements to stop" . He ends quite a long section by calling on Arab states to help and he finishes by making the expected reference in such speeches - calling for peace for "all of the children of Abraham" which, again entails a relational value that achieved an intimacy between Obama and the audience here.

All the values : relational, experiential or expressive are clearly implied in Obamas approach to this section. The relational value is in the case when Obama presented himself not as a supporters to Israel and focused on the two-state solution with no reference to any party. He balanced between the "violence" from the Palestinian side, and " Settlement" from the Israeli side putting himself as a peacemaker or moderator. Expressive values come when Obama introduces a simile here directing the Palestinians to see how the Black African American regained their rights not by violence but by peaceful means. Obama wanted to stress that violence is not a valid way to regain rights.

Obama, then, dealt with Iran and its nuclear activities. he had already offered talks with Iran but had not heard back yet. Here he continues to try to encourage Iran into such contacts and again promises that "my country is prepared to move forward" . He says that he is willing to move "without preconditions". He hints that he, like many Israelis, is afraid of Iran's

intentions, saying that this is "about preventing a nuclear arms race in the Middle East". Here, again there is an ideologically contested conceptions considering that the people in the region know that Israel do have Nuclear arm in a bigger rate than Iran. Iran insists it has no ambitions to become a nuclear-armed state but wants nuclear power.

Expressive values highlighted the tone of the whole speech which is a "new beginning" and peacemaking. This was clear where there was an absence of any threat against Iran - no mention of 'all options on the table' (meaning the military one) or even a tightening of sanctions. This is in line with the President's policy of avoiding threats against Iran (at least for the moment). Here Obama, in line with the expressive value, even refers to the country as " the Islamic republic of Iran" in an attempt to further show his respect to Islam part of his "new beginning". The use of the pronoun "my country" is carrying both relational and expressive value. Obama wanted to confirm that what is spoken here is not his personal ideology but his country's one, and also to stress that he is in line with the audience in seeking new beginning.

The next issue Obama tacks in his speech is that of Democracy and Islam. Many Muslim countries are not full democracies. President Bush was vigorous in promoting democracy as the solution to the Middle East's problems (even justifying the war in Iraq that way). Here, Obama intend to rephrase this and exclude himself from the old ideology that had been condemned by the region before. Again here, an ideologically contested concepts can be felt. To the normal society, or commonsensical in Fairclaug's word, Islam is far away from Democracy. Through a relational value, Obama wanted to relate Democracy to Islam. He carefully states up front, not wanting to offend friendly governments (including Egypt , the host), that "no system of government can or should be imposed upon one nation by any other". Then he favors those governments "that reflect the will of the people". This section is quite a short section, especially when compared to the whole speeches that George W. Bush devoted on different occasions. This is because Obama did not want to speak about an issue that his predecessor had been highlighting and for which hatred aroused against America. This goes with obama's interest, through relational value, to relate himself, and his country to the audience listening to him and behind them to the Muslim world in addition to his domestic American audience . Expressive values are presented when Obama basically contents himself with the quote "government of the people and by the people".

In the section on religious freedom, Obama takes the audience back to thinking about Islam. He praises Islam – "Islam has a proud tradition of

tolerance" - but, again reaffirms his theme that there have to be improvements on both sides, he is also critical: "Among some Muslims there is a disturbing tendency to measure one's own faith by the rejection of another's". Obama's rhetoric is here achieved through expressive and relational values. The use of the vocabularies " proud, and Tolerance" was expressive in highlighting positive peculiarities of Islam. Yet this is parallel to the use of the words (some, disturbing tendency, and rejection) to be attributed to, again, "minor, but potent" Muslims highlighting his theme that all, Obama , the west and the majority of Musilms are not like those small minority of Muslims through the relational value of the statement. The introduction and main theme of the speech was about political tolerance. This part is about religious tolerance and he again appeals to the sensitivity of his audience by urging Western countries not to impede Muslims in their worship - or their address.

The Sixth issue is devoted women's rights, which is as delicate an issue in some Muslim societies as reference to democracy. It is a short section but quite hard-hitting. His basic point is that women should have the "choice" about whether to live their lives in "traditional roles". He is strongly declared the need for women's education, a challenge to the Taliban. The word "choice" here is expressively attributed to the way women would behave without imposing any ideologies. From the experiential value, Obama presented himself not as a lecturer, but he does state with a personal touch when he says "Our daughters can contribute just as much to society as our sons". As elsewhere in this speech, he is careful to balance a call for action by Muslims by a call to understanding in the West,; a call from one side should not wrongly thought of by the other . In women freedom case , he says , that a woman who chooses to cover her hair is not less equal.

The last issue was a relieving section about economic co-operation and development. It seeks to balance the heavy political messages with an affirmation that modernity can but does not have to lead to corruption. "Change can bring fear", he says. But he adds that "There need not be contradiction between development and tradition". The key theme here is "cooperation" and Obama expressively introduces it with passages from the Holy Koran "O mankind! We have created you male and a female; and we have made you into nations and tribes so that you may know one another.", then switches to The Talmud: "The whole of the Torah is for the purpose of promoting peace." And closes with The Holy Bible: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.". The expressive value is very high and can be felt with the noise of the audience Applause. The relational values is apparent here in introducing the Holy Koran quotation

first. Obama wanted to maintain the intimacy that he had already created with his different kinds of audience .

3. **The Closing** :

Obama concluded with a final flourishing section as he masterfully summed up his speech with an apparent rhetoric – "Choose the right path, not just the easy path". He repeats this key phrase "new beginning" and echoes the references to the need for change that brought him to power: "We have the power to make the world we seek, but only if we have the courage to make a new beginning…"

He lays out what he hopes will be the results of his policies - "a world where extremists no longer threaten our people" and "American troops have come home" where "Israelis and Palestinians are each secure in a state of their own" and where "nuclear energy is used for peaceful purposes. (This last phrase carries a reference to Iran).

All these statements are heavily loaded with expressive values and highlighting Obama's new beginning of a policy . He ends up by quoting from the Koran, the Talmud and The Bible then said : "The people of the world can live together in peace. We know that is God's vision. Now, that must be our work here on Earth. Thank you. And may God's peace be upon you. (Applause.) Thank you very much. Thank you.

More apparently expressive is when Obama Closes his speech with a synonymy to the words with which he starts : the Islamic greeting " Asalam Alaykum" .

Conclusion :

After the President Obama's speech has been criticaly investigated , it is obvious that language has generally been greatly utilized to achieve the speaker's targets of which a crucial and most important is to show his "clear" and "plain" intentions of peace towards the global communities and the Islamic one in particular . Through this personal discourse the president employed a lot of devices including both his own "experiential" understandings so as to supposedly set a new ideology in the world and a new "expressive" comprehension for the human reality . This ideology suggests new shared principles of "partnership" in the relations among countries . These new "relational" values are assumed to be newly-modeled on the basis of building a world full of peace , where America has its new position functioning as a "partner" rather than a "patron" with the other peace-makers including the Islamic community in the globe.

References:

Bloor , M. and Bloor, Thomas. (2007) . <u>The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis : An</u>

        <u>Introduction</u> . London : Hodder Arnold .

Fairclough, N. (1992) : <u>Discourse and Social Change</u>. London: Polity.

Fairclough, N. L. (1995. a) . <u>Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language</u>.

        : Longman .

Fairclough , N.(1995. b) . <u>Media Discourse</u>. London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2001) . <u>Language & Power</u>, second edition, Longman – Pearson education.

Fairclough, N. (2003) 'Political Correctness': The politics of culture and language. <u>Discourse and Society</u>. 14(1).

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) . <u>Introduction to Functional Grammar</u>. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). <u>Introduction to functional grammar</u> . (3rd edition). London: Arnold.

Hodge, R., and G. Kress.(1993). <u>Language as ideology</u> . London: Routledge.

Scollon, R. (2001). <u>Mediated discourse as social interaction</u> . London: Longman.

Van Dijk, T. (2001) . Multidisciplinary CDA. In Wodak, R., and M. Meyer. <u>Methods of</u>

        <u>critical discourse analysis </u>. SAGE Publications, Great Britain.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (2001): "Critical Discourse Analysis". In: Tannen, D./ Schiffrin, D./

        Hamilton, H. (eds.) : <u>Handbook of Discourse Analysis</u>. Oxford: Blackwell.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1996) . The representation of social actors in discourse. In Caldas-

        Coulthard, C. R., & Coulthard, M. (Eds.), <u>Texts and practices :Readings in</u>

        <u>critical discourse analysis</u>. London: Routledge.

Wodak, R., and M. Meyer.(2001). <u>Methods of critical discourse analysis</u>. Great Britain:

        SAGE Publications.

Appendix :

The 10 question model
(Fairclough, 2001: 92-93)

Vocabulary:

Question 1

What *experiential* values do words have?

- What classification schemes are drawn upon?

- Are there words which are ideologically contested?

- Is there *rewording* or *overwording*?

- What ideological significant meaning relations (*synonymy, hyponomy, antonomy*) are there between words?

Question 2

What *relational* values do words have?

- Are there euphemistic expressions?

- Are there markedly formal or informal words?

Question 3

What *expressive* values do words have?

Metaphor :

Question 4

What metaphors are used?

Grammar:

Question 5

What experiential values do grammatical features have?

- What types of *process* and *participants* dominate?

- Is agency unclear?

- Are processes what they seem?

- Are *nominalizations* used?

- Are sentences active or passive?

- Are sentences positive or negative?

Question 6

What *relational* values do grammatical features have?

- What *modes* (*declarative grammatical question imperative*) are used?

- Are there important features *of relational modality*?

- Are the pronouns *we* and *you* used and if so how?

Question 7

What *expressive* values do grammatical features have?

- Are there important features of *expressive modality*?

Cohesion:

Question 8

How are (simple) sentences linked together?

- What logical connectors are used?

- Are complex sentences characterized by *coordination* or *subordination*?

- What means are used for referring inside and outside the text?

Text structures:

Question 9

What interactional conventions are used?

- Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?

Question 10

What larger-scale structures does the text have?