التحليل الخطابي النقدي لخطابات باراك أوباما الرئاسية ضد تنظيم داعش

م. رنا سالم عبيد

كلية الإعلام / الجامعة العراقية

rana.s.obaid@aliraqia.edu.iq

A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF BARAK OBAMA'S PRESIDENTIAL SPEECHES AGAINST ISIS

Inst. Rana S. Obaid

College of Media , Al- Iraqia University

rana.s.obaid@aliraqia.edu.iq

الملخص

يدرس هذا البحث خطاب باراك أوباما عام ٢٠١٤ حول التهديد الذي يمثله تنظيم داعش، مستعينًا بتحليل الخطاب النقدي وفقًا لإطار فان دايك. تهدف الدراسة إلى فهم كيف ساهمت اختيارات أوباما اللغوية في تشكيل تصورات الناس حول داعش، وكيف استُخدمت تلك الاختيارات لتبرير الإجراءات العسكرية التي اتخذتها الحكومة الأمريكية. ومن خلال تحليل الأفكار الرئيسة، وبنية الخطاب، وحتى التفاصيل اللغوية الدقيقة، تمكنت الدراسة من رصد الأنماط والسمات والمعتقدات التي صاغت مضمون الخطاب.

ركز أوباما بشكل متكرر على قضايا الأمن القومي، وإحساس أمريكا بالواجب الأخلاقي، وأهمية التعاون مع الدول الأخرى، وكان الهدف من كل ذلك هو كسب تأييد الرأي العام لجهود مكافحة الإرهاب. ومن خلال هذا التحليل، وجدت الدراسة أن الخطابات السياسية مثل خطاب أوباما تمتلك بالفعل قوة مؤثرة في تشكيل الرأي العام وتبرير قرارات الحكومة في أوقات الأزمات. تسهم هذه الدراسة في توضيح الكيفية التي تتداخل فيها اللغة مع السلطة والمعتقدات في الخطاب السياسي .

الكلمات المفتاحية:ـ التحليل الخطابي النقدي ، باراك اوباما، الخطاب السياسي، تنظيم داعش

Abstract

This study examines Barack Obama's 2014 speech about the threat of ISIS, using van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis to guide my study. The aim of the study is to understand how Obama's word choices may have shaped the way people saw ISIS and how those choices were used to justify the U.S. government's military actions. By really investigating the main ideas, speech structure, and even the smaller language details, the study able to spot patterns, themes, and the beliefs that shaped the speech. Obama often returned to the ideas of national security, America's sense of moral duty, and the importance of working with other countries. All of this was aimed at gaining public support for his counterterrorism efforts. Through this analysis, the study reveals that political speeches like Obama's have real power to influence how people think and to

justify government decisions in times of crisis. This research gives a clearer view of how language, power, and beliefs come together in political speeches.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, Barak Obama, Political discourse, ISIS.

1. Introduction

Language is more than just a way to communicate, it also shapes how we see ourselves and others (Tariq et al., 2020). It has a powerful role in society, influencing relationships and helping to decide who holds power (Sibtain et al., 2020). In politics, language is crucial because the words leaders choose can have real effects on how people think and act (Aazam et al., 2019). Political leaders, including presidents, often use language very strategically. They might use their speeches to influence public opinion, legitimize their own authority, or gathering people around a cause (Abdul Kreem et al., 2022). As van Dijk (2006) argues, these speeches aren't just meant to inform, they're often carefully designed to shape people's understand about what's happening, which is why it's important to be analyzed critically.

Whenever a president addresses the public, there's usually more going on than just an announcement. They're sharing policy, reacting to crises, and trying to explain or justify their choices (Abdul Kreem et al., 2022). And because the United States has such a big power and presence internationally, what the president says often impacts both national and international audiences (Haq, 2020). For these reasons, I decided to apply Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to Obama's speech, because CDA lets us explore not just what was said, but how it was said and what kind of impact it might have (van dijk 1997).

CDA, as Priatmoko (2013) points out, treats language as part of everyday social life and focuses on how power can be created and reinforced through words. By applying this approach, I hope to better understand how Obama used language to maintain support and persuade people about his policies in fighting ISIS.

Political discourse analysis, as a specific type of CDA, is especially helpful here. It demonstrate how politicians speak in high-stakes moments, revealing the strategies and images they used to persuade their audience (Tian, 2021; Ojha, 2022; Sarwat et al., 2024). Even though a lot has been written about U.S. presidential speeches, there hasn't been much work using van Dijk's method to look at how Obama persuade the audiences about actions used to face ISIS threat, so that's where my study comes in.

This research is focus on Obama's speeches about ISIS, which caught the world's attention (Dakhil, 2024). During his time as president, Obama chose his words carefully to persuade and explain why military action was needed, especially airstrikes. By carefully analysis the language he used, I want to uncover how he framed the threat, justified action, and positioned the United States as a global leader. Finally, this study aims to give us new insight into how political language can shape our understanding of international threats and the decisions that follow, and how it affects our security. .

2. Method

This study employs a descriptive qualitative methodology to examine the critical discourse structures in Barack Obama's September 10, 2014 speech on ISIS, as published on the official White House website. This speech was chosen because it showed the U.S. strategy against ISIS, marking a significant turning point in the international response to terrorism. The timing, message, and intended audience made it ideal for exploring how leaders try to legitimize tough decisions like military action and seek broad support (van Dijk, 1997).

Qualitative research focuses on analyzing non-numerical data, including texts, speeches, and other discursive materials, to capture contextual meanings and interpret social realities (Holosko, 2010). The study involves an in-depth examination of language use in political discourse, emphasizing how linguistic features reveal underlying ideologies, power structures, and persuasive strategies.

The process of CDA involved six stages (Wall et al, 2015). The researcher adopts these six stages in this research. First, the problem was identified by selecting Obama's speech as a representative political discourse addressing terrorism. Second, relevant literature on political discourse and critical discourse analysis was reviewed to establish a theoretical framework. Third, the researcher developed coding schemes to categorize key discourse elements, including themes, rhetorical devices, and ideological expressions. Fourth, the analysis proceeded by systematically identifying frequent themes, implicit messages, and persuasive strategies throughout the speech. Fifth, After coding, I went back and looked even more closely to find hidden social or ideological meanings. Finally, I considered how these findings fit into the bigger picture of U.S. foreign policy and counterterrorism.

My analysis followed van Dijk's framework, looking at the big-picture themes (macrostructure), how the speech was organized (superstructure), and the language details (microstructure) (Dijk 2015). This three-level approach helped me see how Obama's words worked together to build support for his ideas and policies.

I selected Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model rather than other models of discourse analysis (Fairclough, Wodak, etc) because Van Dijk model integrates thematic analysis, language analysis, and text structure. This model was suitable to discover both explicit and implied themes in Obama's speech. While, Fairclough focuses on broader social practice and intertextuality; Wodak model focus on historical context, Van Dijk stands separately by giving more importance to cognitive aspect, textual and situational factors to discover how Obama used language to persuade public and gain support for the United States' counterterrorism policy. Critical Discourse Analysis was applied to analyze how Obama used persuasive language in his speech to express ideologies, influence the public's view of ISIS and support counterterrorism actions. However, it shows just how influential speech can be in creating and reinforcing social and political beliefs.

3. Results and Discussions

Van Dijk's analytical framework was adapted for the present study. Many experts have introduced and developed various models of discourse analysis (e.g., Fairclough, 1995; Kendall, 2007; Leeuwen, 2008; Mills, 1992; van Dijk, 2008). van Dijk's model is the most popular and widely used model of discourse analysis, in which he may have the most practical elements. A CDA model proposed by van Dijk (2008) on the structure of the text was employed to figure out the macrostructure, superstructure, and microstructure.

3.1 Macrostructure

Referring to van Djik's theory, thematic is the global meaning of discourse. The analysis structure of the text within macrostructure cannot be determined by each sentence but need further exploration to understand the whole text to get a speaker's intentions. Thematic, as a lead sentence in speech or text, must be considered before, and it specifically looked at the common background or core idea or topic in speech. The main theme of Obama's speech is the United States' strategy to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group (ISIS) through a comprehensive and sustained counterterrorism effort including conducting airstrikes, increasing support for Iraqi and Kurdish forces, rallying an international coalition, and providing humanitarian assistance.

 "My fellow Americans, tonight I want to speak to you about what the United States will do with our friends and allies to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group known as ISIS. As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people". (Obama, 2014)

In this introductory extract, Obama intended to describe ISIS as "terrorist group" to recall the terrible picture of terrorism in the minds of the American people, and to show America's clear aim and target, that is, to eradicate terrorism and to secure America.

In supporting its main theme, Obama placed sub-topics in his speech. These are:

1-National Security: "As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people."

2-The Threat of ISIS: "ISIL is a terrorist organization, pure and simple. And it has no vision other than the slaughter of all who stand in its way."

3-America's Leadership: "Abroad, American leadership is the one constant in an uncertain world."

4-Call to Action: "Tonight, I ask for your support in carrying that leadership forward."

Further investigation of the macrostructure level is intertextuality by recalling 'old' information to assign the general theme appearance. The president aimed to explain the nature of the threat by mentioned the old information about US's achievements against Osama bin Laden and much of al Qaeda's leadership in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and how The United States has brought more than 140,000 American troops home from Iraq.

The implicit meaning of Obama's speech is that the United States is taking a strong and resolute stance against terrorist threats, while working with international partners and relying on American leadership and capabilities.

3.2 Microstructure

The microstructure is about analysis within discourse elements. The elements to be analyzed are **semantics, syntaxes, stylistics (lexicon), and rhetoric**.

3.2.1 Semantics

The semantics elements analysis in text or discourse include background, presupposition and detail. These elements help structuring the meaning and context of a text. They serve different functions in guiding an audience's understanding of the content and conveying the President Obama's message clearly and persuasively, while emphasizing the urgency and importance of the actions being proposed. We discuss these elements below:

1. Background

It provides context, establishes the larger framework, or sets the stage for the central ideas. It often includes general information, historical references, or foundational points that help the audience understand why something is happening. The background in the speech provides the foundational context for the central argument: the threat of ISIS and the measures the U.S. is taking to address it. It is also helped the audience understand why the issue matters and why action is needed and Framed the discussion within a broader historical and moral perspective. Examples of Background in Obama's speech can be seen below.

Historical Context: *"Over the last several years, we have consistently taken the fight to terrorists who threaten our country. We took out Osama bin Laden and much of al Qaeda's leadership in Afghanistan and Pakistan".*
Obama provides a historical overview of U.S. counterterrorism efforts, establishing credibility and continuity. He also referred to 9/11, reminding the audience of the long-standing nature of the terrorist threat, *"Tomorrow marks 13 years since our country was attacked".*

General Threat of Terrorism: *"Still, we continue to face a terrorist threat. We can't erase every trace of evil from the world, and small groups of killers have the capacity to do great harm."* Obama sets the stage for the discussion of ISIS as part of a larger, ongoing challenge.
Geopolitical Context: *"At this moment, the greatest threats come from the Middle East and North Africa, where radical groups exploit grievances for their own gain."* Obama used geopolitical context in his speech to provide a regional focus and explain why ISIS is a pressing concern.
Moral and Ethical Framework: *"No religion condones the killing of innocents. And the vast majority of ISIL's victims have been Muslim".* Obama, in his speech, established a moral position and framed ISIS as a uniquely brutal and illegitimate group.

2. Detail

The element of detail is the level of analysis that pays attention to how detailed the speaker conveys his massage because if the text is written in detail, this makes the audience understands quickly and capture the object of conversation accurately. In The following sentences are clear that Obama wanted to provide in detail specific information about the nature of the threat posed by ISIS to help the audience visualize the threat and the response, increasing emotional and intellectual engagement: *"They execute captured prisoners. They kill children. They enslave, rape, and force women into marriage. They threatened a religious minority with genocide" "ISIS leaders have threatened America and our allies",*

he also explained in detail the steps taken to strengthen ground forces in order to reinforce his credibility by showing thorough planning and action.: *"Since then, we've conducted more than 150 successful airstrikes in Iraq" "In June, I deployed several hundred American service members to Iraq to assess how we can best support Iraqi security forces."*

The long, clear expression shows that there is a detailed element used by Obama to deliver some points in detail such as his utterance about the U.S. strategy to combat ISIS. He tried to use enumerated points to break down the strategy into actionable components, providing clarity and specificity. These details make the argument concrete and persuasive.

"First, we will conduct a systematic campaign of airstrikes against these terrorists."

"Second, we will increase our support to forces fighting these terrorists on the ground."

"Third, we will continue to draw on our substantial counterterrorism capabilities to prevent ISIL attacks."

"Fourth, we will continue to provide humanitarian assistance to innocent civilians who have been displaced by this terrorist organization*".*

In the speech, there is interaction between background and detail. Together, these semantic elements create a persuasive, well-structured text that appeals to both logic and emotion. Background provides the "Why" by explaining why the U.S. is taking action and why it matters and Detail Provides the "How" by explaining how the threat is being addressed. The background in the following utterance sets up a contrast with past wars *"This effort will be different from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan"*, while the detail explains the specific approach being taken *"This counterterrorism campaign will be waged through a steady, relentless effort to take out ISIL wherever they exist, using our air power and our support for partner forces on the ground"*.

3. Presupposition

The last element of semantic is Presupposition**.** It refer to the facts that yet been proven, but still can be used to support certain ideas and statements. Obama's speech contains numerous presuppositions about the nature of terrorism, the role of the U.S. as a global leader, the effectiveness of military action, and the moral responsibility of the nation. These presuppositions are embedded in the language and structure of the text, shaping the audience's understanding and acceptance of the speaker's arguments:

National Security:

For example, when Obama says, "As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people," he's starting from the idea that everyone agrees this should come first. Presuppositions About National Security

The notion that Americans face ongoing security risks is reinforced by statements such as, *"As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people."* This assertion frames the safety of U.S. citizens as a constant concern and establishes the context for subsequent policy justifications.

Obama also highlights the serious threat from ISIS, not just for the Middle East, but possibly for the United States itself. He also warns, *"If left unchecked, these terrorists could pose a growing threat beyond that region, including to the United States."* This line doesn't just inform, it pushes people to see ISIS as a direct risk, not just far away. He uses this kind of language to persuade people and justify why taking action was necessary.

Presuppositions About ISIS

- Obama makes it clear he doesn't see ISIS as having any real religious or political legitimacy. he says *"ISIS is not 'Islamic.'* *"No religion forgives the killing of innocents,"* he's making that clear, and then follows it by adding, *"ISIS is certainly not a state."* With these lines, he states that there is no religious or political justification for what ISIS is doing, and shuts down any claim ISIS might make to represent a faith or a nation.

- He also goes out of his way to paint ISIS as unusually cruel even in a counties that that's seen a lot of violence like the Middle East. Obama makes a point of saying that these terrorists are uniquely cruel. He says, *"In a region that has known so much bloodshed, these terrorists are unique in their brutality,"* stating that how shocking and dangerous ISIS's actions are. He uses these descriptions to justify why the world looks ISIS in this way.

Presuppositions About U.S. Leadership

Throughout the speech, Obama emphasizes that the U.S. has a special role to play, both morally and strategically, in facing international threats. *"America will lead a broad coalition to roll back this terrorist threat,"* he is saying this to stress that U.S. leadership is key in moments of crisis. He continues in presenting the idea of U.S. leadership when he says *"Abroad, American leadership is the one constant in an uncertain world,"* reassuring his audience that America's assistance is still reliable.

At end of his speech, Obama mentions values like freedom and justice and dignity that should be protected everywhere. He says *"From Europe to Asia, from the far reaches of Africa to war-torn capitals of the Middle East, we stand for*

freedom, for justice, for dignity." Obama states that these values matter are universal and everywhere, and should be stood up for wherever they are at risk.

Presuppositions About the Effectiveness of U.S. Military Actions

- Obama shows how successful U.S. military action has been by pointing to facts like *"more than 150 successful airstrikes"* had been launched in Iraq. the U.S. military has already made progress and these successful missions have seriously weakened ISIS's capacity to fight.

- He follows up with strong language by reminding everyone just how powerful and far-reaching the U.S. military, *"If you threaten America, you will find no safe haven,"* sending a message that the U.S. can and will act anywhere it's needed. In other words, he emphasizes that enemies of the U.S. should know they can't hide.

Presuppositions About Coalition Efforts

Obama makes it clear the U.S. can't fight ISIS alone and no solitary nation can defeat ISIS. When he says*, "America will lead a broad coalition to roll back this terrorist threat,"* he's asking for global teamwork and international cooperation to counterterrorism threat. He's calling for unity among nations.

- He especially calls on Arab nations and their potential role to face this threat saying *"Arab nations... can help mobilize Sunni communities in Iraq and Syria, to drive these terrorists from their lands".* This is both a hope and a challenge to other countries to take a role in facing this threat.

Presuppositions About Congressional and Public Support

Obama is trying to emphasize that Unity comes up again and again, Saying *"I believe we are strongest as a nation when the President and Congress work together,"* he is emphasizing that defeating this threat will truly require teamwork between the branches of government. The Cooperation is key.

- He's also addresses the American people directly, *"I ask for your support in carrying that leadership forward,"* asking for their support to fight terrorism because he knows that real change only happens if everyone is on board, not enough for the top leaders to lead, but the whole country must stand behind them.

Presuppositions About Time and Effort

Obama admits this won't be a quick: *"Now, it will take time to eradicate a cancer like ISIS,".* He wants the public to know it's going to require patience and ongoing effort.

- He also reassures people that this campaign isn't just a repeat of Iraq or Afghanistan, but an effort that's learned from the past: *"This effort will be different from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan,"* assuring that the U.S. is doing a better and more thoughtful approach to dealing with this threat.

Presuppositions About American Strength and Resilience

Obama reflects on America's position: *"America, our endless blessings give an enduring burden."* He's reminding the country that with great power comes a responsibility to act, American power and moral values come with a responsibility to lead and help others on the world.

- He also shares optimism: *"America is better positioned today to seize the future than any other nation on Earth."* He wants listeners to believe the country is strong, ready, and up to the challenge. It is better positioned to take the lead in shaping the future.

3.2.2 Syntax

Syntax refers to the arrangement of words, phrases, and clauses to create well-formed sentences in a language. In analyzing the syntax of the text (speech), we focus on how sentences are constructed, their grammatical structures, and how they contribute to the rhetorical and persuasive goals of the speech. The syntax of the speech is carefully crafted to balance clarity, authority, and persuasion. The use of varied sentence types contributes to the rhetorical strength of the text. The arrangement of words and clauses reflects a deliberate effort to engage the audience, explain complex issues, and inspire collective action. The Syntax will more specifically see about **the sentence form and structure, and pronoun**.

Obama used a variety of **sentence types**, such as Declarative Sentences (Statements) *"As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people"* (Obama's Speech, 2014). These statements of the utterance above used to assert facts or opinions to establish authority and trustworthiness.

Imperative sentences are also used to call for action or unity and to directly engage the audience and urge them to align with the speaker's goals. *"Tonight, I ask for your support in carrying that leadership forward"* (Obama's Speech, 2014). In addition, few exclamatory sentences are used as in *"If you threaten America, you will find no safe haven",* to convey urgency and strong emotion, and to add forcefulness to the argument.

Sentence Length and Rhythm, the speech alternates between short, impactful sentences and longer, complex sentences to create rhythm and maintain engagement. The Short sentences are used for emphasis and to deliver key points succinctly. *"America is safer."* These sentences are direct and memorable, reinforcing critical ideas. Long, Complex Sentences are also used to explain policies, provide context, or justify actions. *"While we have not yet detected specific plotting against our homeland, ISIL leaders have threatened America*

and our allies", these sentences provide detailed explanations and convey thoughtfulness and thoroughness.

The text balances **coordination** (linking equal ideas) and **subordination** (linking supporting ideas to a main clause) to achieve clarity and nuance.

Using Conjunctions Like "And," "But," "Or" :
"We stand for freedom, for justice, for dignity."

"It will not involve American combat troops fighting on foreign soil, but it will involve air power and support for partner forces."

Coordination in the utterances above connects ideas of equal importance and creates a sense of completeness or balance.

Using Subordination Words Like "Because," "While," "If," "That" to add depth to sentences by providing reasons, conditions, or contrasts.
*"*While we have not yet detected specific plotting against our homeland, ISIL leaders have threatened America and our allies" , "If left unchecked, these terrorists could pose a growing threat beyond that region, including to the United S*tates".*

The speech occasionally uses **passive voice** to shift focus away from the actor and toward the action or effect, like *"These strikes have also helped save the lives of thousands of innocent men, women, and children", "Our combat mission will end later this year".* Obama used Passive voice in this utterance to emphasize outcomes and depersonalizes actions when necessary.

The syntax of the speech is carefully crafted to balance clarity, authority, and persuasion. The use of varied sentence types, repetition, and contrasts contributes to the rhetorical strength of the text, ensuring that key messages are emphasized and memorable. The arrangement of words and clauses reflects a deliberate effort to engage the audience, explain complex issues, and inspire collective action.

For **pronoun** element, Obama used various pronouns to serve specific rhetorical, emotional, and persuasive purposes. The strategic use of pronouns in the speech enhances its rhetorical impact by establishing authority, building unity, engaging the audience, and clearly identifying the enemy. The dominant pronouns (I, we, our, us) used to reflect the speaker's leadership and the collective action of the U.S. The President Obama used First-Person Singular Pronouns "I, me, my" to take ownership of decisions and policies, demonstrating leadership and accountability. While First-Person Plural Pronouns "we, us, our" are used to create a sense of unity and shared responsibility between the government, military, and the American people. Obama repeated the pronoun

"we" fifty-four times throughout his speech, that is, to create solidarity, and inclusion with his audience. Using "we," referring to allies and partners to emphasizes collective action and effort as international cooperation in fighting against ISIS.

The use of Second-Person Pronouns, "You, your" make the speech feel more personal and engaging, as if the President is speaking directly to each listener. In addition by using "You, your" pronouns, Obama reassured the public and acknowledged their concerns, making the speech more relatable by encouraging the audience to feel invested in the proposed actions.

In contrast, Third-Person Pronouns "They, them, their, its" are frequently used in speech referring to ISIS and other entities highlighting their actions and ideology. Obama used these pronouns to depersonalize and dehumanize ISIS and simplify the narrative, making it easier for the audience to understand who the adversaries are. Another purpose for using "They, them, their, its" in speech is creating a clear distinction between "us" (America and its allies) and "them" (the enemy), reinforcing the moral and ideological divide.

3.2.3 Stylistics (lexicon)

Context models serve as the bridge between mental representation (individual cognition, knowledge, and perception of events) and linguistic construction (words and meanings in discourse) (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). The interplay between context and stylistics highlights the adaptability of language in discourse. Consequently, stylistic analysis examines the meanings of words and sentences based on the contexts. The stylistic devices which deal with here are **the selection of pronouns and lexicons.**

The selection of pronouns and lexicons in a speech, such as President Obama's address on ISIS, functions as a stylistic device to establish tone, foster engagement, and contextualize content. Here's below how these linguistic choices serve specific purposes in this context:

The **pronoun** usage refers to people in a certain context for an implicit meaning in it. The pronoun notices create a collective identity and shared responsibility.

"We will degrade, and ultimately destroy ISIL," "As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people."

The pronoun we in the utterance above positions the audience and the speaker as part of a unified mission and fosters a sense of unity and collective effort.

The other usage of pronouns is to engage the audience on an emotional and moral level. Obama uses the pronoun *you* to directly engage listeners,

personalizing the message and appealing to individual citizens' sense of security and trust, as follows.

"I want you to know that the United States of America is meeting them with strength and resolve"

The other stylistic device is the **selection of lexicons**. The chosen lexicons reflect perspectives on the ideology and social matters. Lexicons like "Commander-in-Chief," "security," and "strategy" are used to emphasize Obama's authoritative role and competence. Such terms establish credibility and command trust. Obama also tried to use formal and decisive language like "systematic campaign" and "counterterrorism strategy" to convey seriousness and preparedness. Obama tried to defining threats negatively using lexicons like "terrorists," "killers," "barbarism," and "genocide" frame ISIS as a harmful force, rallying the audience against a common enemy. Emotionally charged lexicons, such as "brutality," "innocents," and "freedom," are used to evoke empathy and moral responsibility. In his speech, Obama sought to build support for his proposed actions by employing inclusive language, using expressions such as "together," "our common humanity," and "united." This emphasis on collective effort is further reinforced by stimulating statements like, "Our own safety, our own security, depends upon our willingness to do what it takes to defend this nation."

Obama also carefully balanced formality with approachability throughout his speech. While he incorporated formal terminology such as "coalition," "international community," and "ideology," he simultaneously used more accessible phrases like "make no mistake" and "let's make two things clear," ensuring that his message was both clear and relevant to a wide audience.

3.2.4 Rhetoric

Rhetoric refers to 'the art of using language effectively to persuade an audience' van dijk(1997:34) . Obama tried to employ effective rhetorical strategies in his speeches to convince the audiences about his viewpoints and support his proposed actions when saying, *"They execute captured prisoners. They kill children. They enslave, rape, and force women into marriage".* In these statements, Obama appeals to emotion by describing the violence of ISIS in powerful terms to reach directly to the audience's feelings of justice and humanity. It is also shown his trustworthiness, saying: *"We took out Osama bin Laden and much of al Qaeda's leadership"* referencing his role as Commander-in-Chief and past successful actions. In addition, Obama used inclusive language like "my fellow Americans" and "we will" to engage the audience as participants

in the effort. These rhetorical strategies is mainly used to inspire unity, justify actions, and build trust in the proposed course of action. Therefore, it can be concluded that the rhetorical element has been used by Obama in his speech.

3.3 Superstructure

Superstructure research focuses on analyzing the structure of speech sequences, particularly how a speech is opened and closed. Analyzing the speech in this way reveals how its organization supports its function as a call to action and a justification of policy. Obama's speech is structured into key components: **the opening, the main content or body,** and **the closing segment.**

*"*My fellow Americans, tonight I want to speak to you about what the United States will do with our friends and allies to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group known as ISIS.As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people…… We continue to face a terrorist threat... the greatest threats come from the Middle East and North Africa".

In the above part, Obama opened his speech by mention his American fellows to directly address them and then introduced the topic, the ISIS threat, and outlined the speech's purpose. He also emphasized his duty as a leader to protect citizens and explained the significance of ISIS as a danger to both regional and global security.

In the content part, Obama started from the detailed description of ISIS to the explanation of the strategy. He delivered some ideas those are nature of ISIS as a terrorist organization and discredited its legitimacy *"ISIL is not 'Islamic'... ISIL is a terrorist organization, pure and simple"*, threat analysis by explaining how ISIS endangers American citizens and international stability *"ISIL poses a threat to the people of Iraq and Syria, and the broader Middle East"* and Four-Part Strategy which are Airstrikes, Support for Ground Forces, Counterterrorism and Humanitarian Assistance *"We will conduct a systematic campaign of airstrikes… We will send an additional 475 service members to Iraq... to support Iraqi and Kurdish forces… We will redouble our efforts to cut off its funding; improve our intelligence… We will continue to provide humanitarian assistance to innocent civilians"*. Another idea delivered in speech was coalition building by calling for international collaboration, especially from Arab nations *"America will lead a broad coalition to roll back this terrorist threat… to enlist more partners in this fight, especially Arab nations"*.

In final part, closing part, Obama called for unity among Congress, the American public, and allies, reassured the audience of U.S. leadership role in peace and security, and ended with an inspirational message including a hopeful

and patriotic note, thanking servicemen and emphasizing shared values: *"My administration has also secured bipartisan support for this approach… "America, our endless blessings bestow an enduring burden… May God bless our troops, and may God bless the United States of America".*

3.4 Ideology

Obama's speech is shaped by a set of beliefs and values designed to reach both Americans and people around the world. He talks a lot about American leadership, national security, and the need for working with others. According to van Dijk (2014), these ideologies help form our collective identity and guide political decisions.

One thing that stands out is Obama's repeated use of pronouns like 'we', 'us' and 'our' .When he uses collective pronouns, He's not just talking to people; he's inviting them to join in, making everyone feel like they're part of the fight against terrorism.

. When he says, "We will degrade, and ultimately destroy ISIL," he's including all Americans in that mission. This is a way of getting people to feel connected to the actions being taken.

When Obama describes ISIS with strong words like "terrorists," "killers," "barbarism," and "genocide," he's making sure there's no doubt about how he wants people to see the group. This language positions ISIS as a clear enemy, and it makes American action feel not just necessary, but right. he ideologically positions the group as a threat to national security, and makes it clear that the U.S. has a moral duty to take care of this problem. It is a strategy of justifying American action.

Obama also connects what's happening now to past successes, like the killing of Osama bin Laden and the overthrow of much of al Qaeda's leadership. These reminders help people feel confident in the current strategy and support the belief that the U.S. has a unique leadership role globally.

Throughout the speech, Obama further appeals to the belief in that the U.S. has the role of a defender, not just of itself, but of human rights and justice for all. His call for partnerships with other countries shows that he believes fighting ISIS is a shared responsibility, not just an American one, but both at national and around the world.

4. Conclusion

Looking back at this study, it's clear that Obama's 2014 speech about ISIS was carefully crafted to do more than just inform. By using van Dijk's Critical

Discourse Analysis, I found that Obama chose his words and structure to make the fight against ISIS seem urgent and important, to justify military intervention, and to highlight the U.S. as a global leader in counterterrorism.

He used strong and deliberate language to create a sense of urgency and a moral call to action, bringing people together in support of the administration's plan. The speech also shows just how much power language has, by using inclusive words and emotional appeals, Obama was able to frame military action as not only necessary but also as the right thing to do.

Finally, this study demonstrates that political leaders use speeches to shape national identity, rally public support, and justify tough decisions, especially in times of crisis. By critically analyzing speeches like this, we can better understand how language influences our views and shapes the world we live in by revealing the implicit messages within the text. It became clear that language doesn't just communicate ideas, but plays a major role in justifying decisions and shaping how people think about government policies. This research enhances understanding of language role which plays in political speeches, especially during times of crisis, and how it can shape how we as people understand global events.

5. Future Implications

From this study, the future research can built by comparing Obama's speeches to other international presidents' speeches on the same issues, enabling us to explore more about how presidents from different culture display language, power and ideology in political speeches. In addition, if speeches from different contexts are being analyzed, it will be interesting to see the differences in the rhetorical strategies used by politicians about certain topic.**References:**

Abdul Kreem, M. S., Ali, Z. A., & Al-Bahrani, R. H. (2022). Intonational patterns of persuasive strategies in Blair's speech: A socio-cognitive phonological analysis. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 18*(1), 683-696. https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.212

Dakhil, T. A. (2024). Analysis of Muqtada Al Sadr's and Biden's Speeches on Terrorism: A Discursive Comparative Study. *TEFL Journal (TJ), 2*(1).

Haq, M. (2020). *Political Science Theory & Practice* (pp. 412-414). Brookland.

Holosko, M. J. (2010). *An Overview of Qualitative Research Methods*. SAGE Research Methods.

Ojha, S. R. (2022). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches Delivered during Presidential Elections in the USA* (Doctoral dissertation, Department of English Education).

Priatmoko, N. A., & Cahyono, S. P. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's Speech*. Semarang: Universitas Dian Nuswantoro.

Sarwat, S., Panhwar, A. H., Shahzad, W., & Shahzad, S. K. (2024). Critical Discourse Analysis of the Speech of Recep Tayyip Erdogan at the United Nations General Assembly. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 5*(1), 95-106.

Sibtain, M., Aslam, M. Z., Khan, A., Khan, M., Atiq, M., & Bhatti, H. (2020). Rhetorical and persuasive strategies employed by Imran Khan in his victory speech: A socio-political discourse analysis. International Journal of English Linguistics, 10(1), 349.

Tariq, K., Nawaz, M. S., & Farid, A. (2020). Imran Khan's Speech at UNGA: A Reflection on Us vs. Them Divide Using Fairclough's 3D Model in CDA. *Research Journal of Social Sciences & Economics Review*.

Tian, L. (2021). Critical discourse analysis of political discourse—a case study of Trump's TV speech. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 11*(5), 516-520.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. Belgian journal of linguistics, 11(1), 11-52.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse, context and cognition. *Discourse Studies, 8*(1).

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 11*(2), 115-140.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Tannen, H.E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), The Handbook of Discourse Analysis (pp. 466-485). Wiley-Blackwell.

Wall, J. D., Stahl, B. C., & Salam, A. F. (2015). Critical discourse analysis as a review methodology: An empirical example. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 37*(1991), 257-285.