


Analysis of Speeches by the Former President of the US, Barack Hussein Obama, Regarding the Middle East and Northern Africa

Aleign Aschale Wudie, Addis Ababa Science and Technology University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0267-2655>

ABSTRACT

The main intention in this article is to critically analyze the ex-president Barack Obama's speeches regarding the Middle East and (North) Africa and see how US-America, Middle East, and Africa are framed in political ideologies. Data is collected from the four speeches delivered by the ex-president of the USA in different places and settings. The data is analyzed using critical discourse analysis (CDA). The findings revealed that political ideology sleeplessly aspires to safeguard the interests of America and her "true" allies to sustain their world power and to suppress the "others" in the counterfeit names of tolerance, engagement, aid and support, democracy and freedom, knowledge-driven economy, peace and security, etc., that targets the younger generation. Contemporary pretexts and extensions have been done with discourse manipulations and real-life interventions.

KEYWORDS

Allay, Discourse, Engagement, Ideology, Power and Hegemony, Regulation and Emancipation, Representation

INTRODUCTION AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Barack Obama, President of the United States of America since 2008 has made customary to deliver relatively longer remarks when it comes to issues of turmoil: peace, security, prosperity, engagement and change in many occasions since his presidential candidacy and the two-term seats at the White House. Likewise, the seventy-three paragraphed speech, delivered with frequent and extended "applauses" (about 85 applauses) to the young Israelites mentioning Israel more than 190 times directly and indirectly on March 21, 2013 at Jerusalem Convention Centre (Jerusalem), could be taken as the best substantiation; the others likewise.

In the following section, I would like to pinpoint, synthesize and analyze his key sample speeches regarding the Middle East and (North) Africa. Even if it is all about these tsunami regions of relevance to America, it reflects America's clear international political and economic interests reaffirming that "though these countries may be a great distance from our shores, we know that our own future is bound to this region by the forces of economics and security, by history and by faith".

DOI: 10.4018/IJTIAL.2020010102

This article published as an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and production in any medium, provided the author of the original work and original publication source are properly credited.

Hence, it is important to note in the following section about the analysis of Obama's speeches concerning the Middles, which you can easily decipher, that the discursive event and discursive structure interrelatedness of ideas proposed by Norman Fairclough, have been due to the results of the analysis. To put it in clear terms, the speeches which are called the discursive events shaped the texts that are the discursive structure, and the discourse became subject of interpretation by the audience, which shaped the discourse practices of President Barack Hussein Obama and the target people (region).

Based on Wodak's (2002:3) three fundamental concepts that figure indispensably in all CDA are "the concept of power, the concept of history, and the concept of ideology." As Fairclough (2002), Fowler, Hodge, Kress, and Trew (1979), and Wodak (1989) agreed, binding in power use or abuse are political office, political rhetoric, economic power, interference in the affairs of other countries, and selective ally making to mention but a few. For Fairclough (1989, 1992), nothing is capable of changing and influencing people's mind except language use. Countries with big power can also make big change and put big influence on other countries. Taking US America and the historic president of that country is the best sample for a research analysis.

Considering the fore mentioned variables vital, this study employed them all dialectically in the analysis to bring forth the real intent of President Barak Hussein Obama's speech delivered to key personalities and the world. That is, the main objective of this study is to critically analyze the discourses (CDA) of President Barack Hussein Obama regarding the Middle East and (North) Africa via the world in exercising real and assumed power. Very specifically, the study has tried to discover with whom Obama is Pro-ideology in de facto in the Middle East and North Africa (either be called Middles), uncover Obama's representation and justification of America and it's "allied" power and cooperation in Middles, explicate Obama's personal, state and international interests and envisaging (doctrines), and to unpack Obama's emancipatory and regulatory strategies of the Middles.

It is presumed that when situations demand people (especially politicians) tend to grab to the "pro-one" of the mass. Their ideology and political discourse dialectically articulated can be a vehicle towards achieving that ultimate end. The adequate exploitation of language manipulation politics could grant a political benefit and firmly regulate people against their interests or totally emancipate to be vibrant citizens in their own. The researcher inquired the following questions to be answered. First, how does Obama stand for, envisage and legitimizes national and international security, peace and prosperity, and intervention in the affairs of "sovereign countries" in discourse? What are the real agenda behind the allied and collided US- "Arabs"- Israel? How does Obama represent world change, power/hegemonic contestations and envisage operationalisation for "change, peace, security and prosperity"? What kind of discourse Obama wants to emerge in Israel and the Arab (Muslim) World? And what are the general and specific, covert and overt discourses drown up on and combined or not done so?

To analyze Obama's discourse in Middle-East and the world, I have used the analytical framework for CDA which is represented schematically below by Fairclough (2002, p. 125) which has been "modeled upon the critical theorist Roy Bhaskar's concept of "explanatory critique" (Bhaskar, 1986; Chouliaraki and Fairclough cited in Fairclough, 2002). These generally are: Focus upon a social problem which has a semiotic aspect, identify obstacles to it being tackled, through analysis of (the network of practices it is located within, the relationship of semiosis to other elements within the particular practice(s) concerned, and the discourse (the semiosis itself). Bhaskar (1986) and Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) take the discourse in itself as a consideration of a structural analysis. That is, it is the analysis of the order of discourse (Richardson, 1996), the interactional analysis (Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015), the inter-discursive analysis (Wudak & Meyer, 2002; Bhatia, 2016), and the linguistic and semiotic analysis. Besides, the CDA considered whether the social order (network of practices) in a sense 'needs' the problem, identified the possible ways past the obstacles, and reflected critically on the whole analyses (Greve & Salaff, 2005).

In the process, the researcher opted for drawing up on Obama's clue words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs that signal representation, emergence, recontextualizations, operationalisation, and the order of discourses at transdisciplinary way. Besides, word count-analysis, according to Waters, Steele, Roisman, Haydon and Booth-LaForce (2016), of priority, weight and focus for some issues of sticking, colliding, tagging and distancing regarding Barack Obama, America, the Middles and the World have been used.

RATIONALE OF THE SPEECHES SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

In this study I have drawn up four thermal keynotes made in different contexts of assorted order of discourse and social structure. The speeches were given to the People of Egypt in 2009, the American people in 2011, the American-Israelites lobby group (AIPAC) in 2012 and People of Israel in 2013. Even though the remarks had been made to the aforementioned target countries, they have been meant to the international community. So, their international intention is taken as a text-meter. These four remarks were similar in nature in which their themes are all about the Middle East and (North) Africa, but they are both advises and warnings to the world that have similar interests, plans and moves. Besides, the keynotes made represent United States of America's contemporary foreign affairs ideology, policy and practices. For the strong keen to get the 'real yolk out of the layered egg' in US-America's interest on Middle East and Africa, I have opted for these four remarks of President Obama in different places and years to different audiences and target groups. It is believed that these speeches represent US America and her people's discourse, ideology and power towards the "other countries".

THE CDA OF BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA'S SELECTED SPEECHES

Narrating Morality and Religion

Apparently, Obama begins with "thank you", "thank you" and "*shalom*", extends "a greeting of peace from Muslim communities: *assalaamu alaykum*" and expresses a very warm welcome received for his presence and visit at least in the languages of the audience and the "superpowers" to grab intimacy and to show 'alliance'. Obama very carefully draws successful/important people and palaces quoting their names, even nick names, their achievements and sayings: "I want to begin by thanking Hillary Clinton"; "I am honored to be in the timeless city of Cairo..."; "Rosy (AIPAC's president Lee Rosenberg), thank you for your kind words...you have been a dear friend of mine for a long time and a tireless advocate for the unbreakable bonds between Israel and United States..."; "Bibi" (Prime Minister Netanyahu); "It is a great honor to be here with you in Jerusalem and I am so grateful to the welcome that I have received from the people of Israel"; and "I am grateful for your hospitality, and the hospitality of the people of Egypt".

In such and so discourse, he attempts to bring shared intimacy and friendship and go through their heads and hearts which have big moral values embedded in genre, discourse and style. He also includes a seemingly 'friendship' violating the consistency of morality as he greets them in different languages embedded in the religion of a difference which is a reflexive representation to show a semiotically constituted way of being "the same", (Fairclough, 1989), for Barack Obama. Likewise, his closing remarks are always very religious: "May God's peace be upon you"; "God bless you, God bless the people of Israel, God bless the United States of America."; "May God bless you. May God bless Israel. May God bless the United States of America. *Toda Raba*". From the closing remarks, the entire theme in narrating and representing religion and morality is the enacting, inculcating and re-scaling strategy of 'sacrosanct', 'partnership' and 'cooperation' for operationalisation; the idea which preaches in religious closing remarks to show "intimacy and brotherhood" though it is all addressing America and the Christians.

What is more, world religion is represented as “the three great religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—that trace their origins to Abraham, and see Jerusalem as sacred” which he believes “faith should bring us together...Christians, Muslims, and Jews”, and appreciates a universal “rule that lies at the heart of every religion—that ‘we do unto others as we would have them to do unto us’” in compromises for religious tolerance in differences. In a similar regard Obama dictates and preaches a lot about Islam to the Muslims; this is teaching the best teachers:

Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance. We see it in the history of Andalusia and Cordoba during the Inquisition. I saw it firsthand as a child in Indonesia, where devout Christians worshiped freely in an overwhelmingly Muslim country. That is the spirit we need today. People in every country should be free to choose and live their faith based upon the persuasion of the mind and the heart and the soul. This tolerance is essential for religion to thrive, but it's being challenged in many different ways. Among some Muslims, there's a disturbing tendency to measure one's own faith by the rejection of somebody else's faith. The richness of religious diversity must be upheld—whether it is for Maronites in Lebanon or the Copts in Egypt. And if we are being honest, fault lines must be closed among Muslims, as well, as the divisions between Sunni and Shia have led to tragic violence, particularly in Iraq. Freedom of religion is central to the ability of peoples to live together. We must always examine the ways in which we protect it. For instance, in the United States, rules on charitable giving have made it harder for Muslims to fulfill their religious obligation. That's why I'm committed to working with American Muslims to ensure that they can fulfill zakat. Likewise, it is important for Western countries to avoid impeding Muslim citizens from practicing religion as they see fit—for instance, by dictating what clothes a Muslim woman should wear. We can't disguise hostility towards any religion behind the pretense of liberalism.

In his speech as quoted above, Obama tried to enact and inculcate morality that should originate from religion and loves to quote Jews, Muslims, and Christians, “we are one”. On the other hand, he promotes the “Zionist-idea-an idea to be free in one's own land”, the faiths in Islam and Christianity which should sparkle peace, security and morality from within and bids people firm; “Be conscious of God and speak always the truth”, even though both Muslims and Jews (even Christians) have a strong affair of the Holy Land; Israel, Jerusalem.

In an attempt, Obama imagines the emergence and hegemony of power in recontextualizations and re-scaling of religion and morality according to “a new beginning keeping in mind what has been written: The Holy Koran tells us: ‘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.’ The Talmud tells us: ‘The whole of the Torah is for the purpose of promoting peace.’ The Holy Bible tells us: ‘Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God...’ We know that is God's vision. Now that must be our work here on Earth”. In these quotes from every religion, he wants to show that each religion worships the “same” idea; Theo-philosophical congruence should emerge and non-upheaval engagement in religions should pursue and transform.

Generally, Obama wants to emerge a discourse within religion, morality and the people-metaphors that hold the “solution lies with the people” conforming and sustaining “not simple by men and women, but by laws” that originates from religion. These discourses create dilemma in the people and the tension helps the powerful people to interfere freely in the affairs of others.

NARRATING CHANGE

There are themes in the discourses that are salient in each speech of Barack Obama on the Middle and Africa related to “change”. Obama likes the way that “There must be no doubt that the United States of America welcomes change that advances self-determination and opportunity” from the

people “demands for consistent change—with change that are consistent with the principles”. The principles are all for Americas self-fulfillment with the discourses of “support” and “democracy”. He also said that America “must support positive change in the region... through... efforts to advance economic development for nations that are transitioning to democracy”. This is a positive intention that “cools down” negative expectation.

He would like to represent change and “globalization” as “a new beginning” in a strong belief that “change cannot happen overnight”. Besides when Obama needs a real change to be understood and underscored, he uses repetition to discourse as it figures in “lively...lively may be an understatement” hinting “the obligations-the obligations” that “I have made it clear to the (country) people, I have made it clear to the (country) people” that “it was innovation in Muslim communities, it was innovation in Muslim communities...” “I know-I know”, “as in the story of Isra-as in the story of Isra” which has brought and is bringing “revolutionary” “democratic” “change”. For Obama, ‘globalization’ is narrated as the process of ‘homogeneity’ one affected easily in the ‘network’. For instance, he has:

learned from recent experience that when a financial system weakens in one country, prosperity is hurt everywhere. When a new flu infects one human being, all are at risk. When one nation pursues a nuclear weapon, the risk of nuclear attack rises for all nations. When violent extremists operate in one stretch of mountains, people are endangered across an ocean. When innocents in Bosnia and Darfur are slaughtered, that is a stain on our collective conscience. That is what it means to share this world in the twenty-first century. That is the responsibility we have to one another as human beings.

He mentions a recent ‘phenomenon’ to show the ‘new emergence of globalization’ and its future inevitable ‘dominance’. Obama believes that “the sweeping change” has been “brought by modernity and globalization”. However, he understands people all over the world that change can bring fear quoting that:

In all nations—including America—this change can bring fear. Fear that because of modernity we lose control over our economic choices, our politics, and most importantly our identities—those things we most cherish about our communities, our families, our traditions, and our faith.

Likewise, Obama added his fear for the “change” he would like to represent and recontextualise it for operation in that:

civilizations are doomed to clash. Many more are simply skeptical that real change can occur. There’s so much fear, so much mistrust that has built up over the years. But if we choose to be bound by the past, we will never move forward. And I want to particularly say this to young people of every faith, in every country—you, more than anyone, have the ability to re-imagine the world, to remake this world.

Fear and terror, as Obama believes, have been due to “Al-Qaeda, Osama Bin-Laden and other allied terrorist groups” in which they believe that “violence against the West, men, women and children was the only path to change”. However, extraordinary ‘change’ can come from few individuals’ philosophies and ideologies, as Obama would like to ‘emerge’ and ‘reengage’; “there are times in the course of history when the actions of ordinary citizens spark movements for change because they speak to a longing for freedom that has been building up for years”. Mentioning and associated fear and terror to the Muslim community can easily help him interlink terrorists to the same.

Obama also understands that change will come not from the old and the adult community, but from the young generation who would like to discover life.

Throughout the region, many young people have a solid education, but closed economies leave them unable to find a job. Entrepreneurs are brimming with ideas, but corruption leaves them unable to profit from those ideas.

Isn't this an attempt to detach the old and the youth? He is dead in beat of the persistence from the old generation that is not bringing change by saying "The international community is tired of an endless process that never produces an outcome". He strongly tried to reorder and reorient the young of his favorite politics by saying that "You (*the young Israelites*) must create the change that you want to see". Obama sees the change to "Look at the young people who've not yet learned a reason to mistrust, or those young people who've learned to overcome a legacy of mistrust that they inherited from their parents".

Generally, Obama would like to represent "change" in that "through the moral forces of nonviolence, the people of the region have achieved more change in six months than terrorists have accomplished in decades". Furthermore, "change" of a different "magnitude does not come easily... but it will be years... along the way, there will be good days and there will be bad days...in some places, change will be swift; in others gradual...calls for change may give way, in some cases, to fierce contests for power". Americans are taking "concrete actions to change course" in 'democracy', 'entrepreneurships', 'innovation', 'freedom', 'independency', etc. He added that "No one-no single step can change overnight what lies in the hearts and minds of millions. No single step is going to erase years of history and propaganda". But for Barack Obama "...the greatest miracle is recognizing that the world can change". Nobody dislikes change, but they orientation and redirection of American-lead change could be a disastrous one.

NARRATING OBAMA'S DOCTRINE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Obama has vibrant strategies in taking an initial skepticism in all sensitive issues of the Middle-East, North Africa and the international arena of such brittle-'turmoil' which he believes that useless conflicts will weaken necessary wars. Hence, his genre and styles representing "America's future is bound to Middle East and North Africa 'square-be-square, time-by-time, and country-by-country by the "forces of economy, security, history, and faith" understanding that "some nations are blessed with oil and gas" with natural resources and the way to share this resources with is a "soft talk with big stick".

It is crystal clear that Israel and America share imperative interests in a chaotic Middle East thought that has different levels and intensities of friendship. These are one, banning the Iranian regime's sprint for nuclear weapons and terror-driven regional supremacy, two, regulating Syria's escalating instability while tracking its swapy stores of chemical weapons, putting an 'eagle eye' on radical Islam- "violent Islamic extremism", and a "lasting security, peace and prosperity" between Palestine and Israel-the big dilemma. In the likewise, another and capably threatening country (mostly Islamic) shall never exist, and this shall be achieved by a bit-by-bit demolishing of such emerging countries who start to speak to the Americans' necks and noses.

Obama has both promotive and regulative strategies to be "engaged" in for "democracy and freedom". The "security and peace" of the Middle East is a top priority for America and its international interests to exploit the adequate "'treasures', 'patents', 'innovation', 'recourses' timeless holy sites and ground breaking innovations" and America is "working with the world that is united" so that "Iran (or any x country) must not get a nuclear weapon", and America could gamble free of the blaze.

As Israelis have lived in "a neighborhood where many... have rejected the right to exist", Obama would like to 'renew', extend and underscore strength, justice and resolution before action to be taken in the Middle East and the world. Obama's warnings repeated in every keynote itinerary (route) show it crystal clear that Iran or a similar hostile country will never ever be allowed to 'develop' and 'possess

nuclear weapons'. That understanding, coupled with crippling sanctions, is clearly envisaged to persuade the Iranian government for the 'golden bridge of peace' in which "everything is on the table".

"Obama's doctrine" as an all-waiting lists style seems erroneously predictable in which the pivotal point of the doctrine would emphasize "negotiations" and "collaborations" with exclusive of "confrontation", "war" and "unilateralism" in every international affairs; the Middles special, to avoid "fear" and "terror" from "Islamic extremism, violence" and advancing to escalating "democracy", "globalization", "liberalism", "freedom" and the multi-genres of the 'new capitalism' agenda which targets to begin with "the young-you and me, we" as engines of "the Middles Awakening".

Most importantly, any 'allay', 'support' and 'aid' 'engagement' in the Middle East, Africa and Southeast Asia is believed as stimuli in creating many jobs in the United States of America or anywhere in the world of any form securing America's interests of a contemporary. New engagements and friendships are believed to create confusions and US America-Israelites will detect the problems and act as the troubleshooters and maintain the way. For so, Obama explained his doctrine in Muslim countries in that:

On science and technology, we will launch a new fund to support technological development in Muslim-majority countries, and to help transfer ideas to the marketplace so they can create more jobs. We'll open centers of scientific excellence in Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia, and appoint new science envoys to collaborate on programs that develop new sources of energy, create green jobs, digitize records, clean water, grow new crops. Today I'm announcing a new global effort with the Organization of the Islamic Conference to eradicate polio. And we will also expand partnerships with Muslim communities to promote child and maternal health. All these things must be done in partnership. Americans are ready to join with citizens and governments; community organizations, religious leaders, and businesses in Muslim communities around the world to help our people pursue a better life.

In a nutshell, Obama needs the Middles and entire world to lean down America and her "true allies" and please them, to unquestionably accept their narratives, be convinced vibrantly on each split of seconds without fault lines; nevertheless, America understands the need to revise its narrative and get rid of the propaganda that animates the entire worldview for re-engagement, rescaling and recontextualizations of partnership governance, as US-Israeli people wonder why peace hasn't been achieved though great political propaganda and plans have be 'ratified' and "operated?" With Israel and the Jewish people; all the same since 65th years, Obama affirmed us clearly to:

make no mistake-those who adhere to the ideology of rejecting Israel's right to exist, they might as well reject the earth beneath them or the sky above, because Israel is not going anywhere. And today, I want to tell you-particularly the young people-so that there's no mistake here, so long as there is a United States of America-Atem lo levad. You are not alone.

REPRESENTING THE ALLAY DILEMMA CONTINUUM AND IDEOLOGY/POWER CONTESTATIONS

Obama knows how to bridge the gaps as a go-between, on the one hand, and shows an "eternal allay" using simple and intimate discourse and representations, on the other side. He always begins with a masked 'thank you' in the 'dominant' language of his audience 'shalom'/'assalaamu alaykum'/'good + time and catchy discriminatory phrases "I bring with me *the support* of the American People and the friendship that binds us together", "and I am proud to carry with me *the goodwill* of the American people". These all attempts can clearly represent the political dilemmatic discourse of America even to her Middles allies and the discriminatory power pull-and-throw at different speeds and distances.

Likewise, he represents intimacy and allay in a sense of ‘witnesses to the ancient history...at the Shrine of the Book’ and by invoking memories of the greatest achievements of the country and of the people with Israel:

I've seen Israel's shining future in your scientists and your entrepreneurs. This is a nation of museums and patents, timeless holy sites and ground-breaking innovation. Only in Israel could you see the Dead Sea Scrolls and the place where the technology on board the Mars Rover originated at the same time.

In addition, he depicted the amalgamation of religion (tradition) and academics (progress) as ways to see America's allies (the Muslim world) in a Theo-scientific way which has always been very dilemmatic her:

For over a thousand years, Al-Azhar has stood as a beacon of Islamic learning; and for over a century, Cairo University has been a source of Egypt's advancement. And together, you represent the harmony between tradition (religion) and progress.

Above and beyond, his language is very oscillatory (from friendship to a greatest politician) to get rapports of both intimacy and power accompanied with magical body languages that can shorten the distance between him and the audience. It is easy to detect so that Obama makes his audience more easily understand and accept his political speeches by means of easy and mixed sentence structures throughout his speech with his peculiar intonation and voice modulation for power and hegemony. Moreover, by using his name, position ‘as a politician’, ‘as a friend’, ‘you and me’, ‘power’, ‘America’, ‘the American People’, ‘my country’, religious beliefs, and by calling Israel, the Jewish and the people very frequently, he successfully shortens the distance between him and the audience, especially with Israelites. So it can help him persuade the “Jewish ‘youth’” to accept, support, and confirm his allies and actions.

Obama uses most of the linguistic mechanisms of power in the models such as religion, persuasion and future plan's statements. Obama also narrates and represents Biblical themes and religion where his clear dilemma oscillates back-and-forth in showing equal weigh at some time and discrimination at another when he believes his (America's) and its ally's power is rivaled.

Likewise, since Obama's beginning with his juvenile political rally through his seat grant at White House, he has been believed to speak with a “forked” tongue; very intricate to know what he really thinks. As a result, majority of the Israelis and the Muslims (Arabs) have no clue for Obama whether he is Pro-Israeli or Pro-‘Arabs’/Palestinian. Obama's statement in this speech “let me say this as a politician: I can promise you this, political leaders will never take risks if the people do not push them to take some risks,” shows that he and his administration tacitly and probably unconsciously admit that he has caved to the Israel lobby and wants a push from both sides, not from one.

Indeed, the most remarkable aspect of Obama's political discourses in his entire presidency and with regards to the Middles has been its emphasis on shrewd calculation of the compromise most suited to “his country” and himself. Obama's triumph during the trip were “symbolic” which were achieved by smiling and uttering soothing expressions about Israel's achievements and inherent legitimacy toward convincing Israelis and American Jews.

From transitivity analysis, we can see material process; a process of doing has been used mostly in his speeches. Obama would like to show the world what his government (America) has achieved, what they are going and what they will do to hold a strong power. He will do whatever he likes to do on (Islamic) countries that have “chemical weapons”, and “to prevent a nuclear armed” region, for America could grab and resource and gamble freely.

Apparently America has always been behind allegations of shackled and demolished countries which were thought to be ‘growing in power and economy’: ‘Korea’, Russia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Tunisia,

Libya, Egypt, Yemen, Syria, Iran and it goes on the queue day in-and-day-out, year-in-and-year-out as long as it shall benefit America for power and a hegemonic discourse. It has also appeared that United States of America has multifaceted (double) standards of “allay”, “partnerships”, “support”, “collaboration”, “aid”, “friendship” and “interests” that show the clear alley dilemma: with Israel, “make no mistake” America has “unshakable”, “unbreakable”, “strong” and “eternal” “bonds” from both sides-“the strong bipartisan support”; with Iraq, she has posed big pressures to the government and the people; with Libya, Tunisia and Syria America cooperates with the people and the opposition parties; with Bahrain, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Egypt, etc. she comes with the government in “eternal partnership” and “love”.

Nevertheless, Palestine is the stroke and nuisance that measures America’s, and still Obama’s, dilemma to relive and an inability of a decision to “transform” words into “actions”. Hence, America is neither Pro-Israel nor Pro-Arabs; she is pro-self as long as her political and economic power and interests are kept on the safe-side.

NARRATING AND REALIZING IDENTITY AND BACKGROUND

Barack Obama shows the gradual decline of confidence in American power to be safeguarded in; the raging fire anti-West, Anti-Semitism, Anti-Americanism, Anti-globalization and many genres of “Antis” all over the globe; and the ongoing borderless war against ‘terrorism’ in all its facets which put greater ‘security challenges’ intricate to bear up. Hence, it triggered him with the theme of “re-imagine”, “renew”, “engage”, “change”, “recover” and “rebuild” that aimed to enhance America’s reputation and power and restore its popularity around the world. This ‘engagement’ has taken multidimensional approaches such as intervention, renewal, friendship and reconstruction in the “Middle East” “to mark a new chapter of American diplomacy”. He uses simple tenses to present the domestic and the worldwide situations ranging from political, economic and cultural fields at present in all the four speeches.

Obama brings an inspiration-a role model for many youths internationally. He always inculcates his personal story and the story of many from history in the Christianity, Islam, and Judaism; from freedom fighters has amazed and aroused a sense of “touching history” and in immediate decision to “engagements” (see all of Obama’s Speeches). He would not like to take a stand in any religious sect; otherwise asked. These all attempts are the rebuilding of Americans’ identity crisis as they are multi-ethnic who clustered at the Amerigo Vespucci’s Island.

His charismatic quality and phenomenal rhetorical ability have ever added to his halo, not for “actions” but for shows. From the history of African-Americans and the ‘recontextualizations’ of Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King Jr. who “stood proud against discrimination and oppression” and with the recent fact that he was “chosen by the American people to lead” them, he creates and rescales his identity as politically powerful. He also uses religious references to show that he leads politico-religious identity. Besides, Obama would like to symbolize “a new and modern connotation of “the right to freedom, change and the pursuit of happiness” to overarch as his newly modified vehicle for ‘globalization’, ‘knowledge economy’, ‘change’ and ‘engagement’. In the following section, a word count analysis is presented to support the foregone data and the findings.

WORD COUNT ANALYSIS WITH A FOCUS ON PRIORITY AND WEIGHT-GIVING

According to data (Table 1) retrieved using Adobe search analysis from the four keynotes, Barack Obama is inclined to the use of harmless words (using major positive words 566 times more frequently) as a strategy to re-contextualize and represent peace, security and prosperity in the eyes of his “new engagement’ and “change” strategies. He would like to approach not from the “violent” (major words counted 322) side of ideological representation of politics to win “cooperation”. Hence, he was non-hostile in his speeches.

Table 1. Dichotomy discourse analysis of Obama’s speech

No.	Positive Word	Frequency	Negative Word	Frequency
1	Right (Good)	178	War	51
2	Democracy	44	Nuclear	33
3	Work	38	Violence	30
4	Freedom/free	35	Kill /die	23
5	Support	33	Weapon	23
6	Change	38	Against	23
7	New	31	Conflict	23
8	Economy	31	Terror	16
9	Transform	24	Extremism(st)	16
10	Start /begin	24	End	16
11	Bring (change)	18	Threat	14
12	Develop	17	Hate	10
13	Build	15	Prevent (avoid)	10
14	Grow	14	Risk	10
15	Independence	10	Tension	9
16	Possible	9	Stop	8
17	Engage	7	Danger	7
	Total	566		322

Similarly, data under Table 2 shows that Obama has spent his time by “stating and explaining (is/are, 480)” ideology to rescale his political actions and policy and re-engage in the Middles in his “Obamatic ideology”. The auxiliaries show the discourse orders, genres and styles that Obama has been trying to enact and inculcate in his policy. He opted for politeness, little instructions and external obligations to comply. He has been preparing and cleaning the mess to start operationalisation before he leaves his seat at White House.

As per data presented at Table 3, roughly, we can conclude that Obama’s priorities in the international arena are “peace” and “security” for America and its allies followed by prosperity at

Table 2. The discourse in the use of auxiliaries

No.	Auxiliary	Frequency
1	Is/are	480
2	Will /shall	202
3	Must /Have to/has to	104
4	Can /could	102
5	Would/Should	65
6	Do	34
7	May /Might	21
8	Don’t /Must not	6

Table 3. Discourse in peace, security and prosperity priority analysis

No.	Word	Frequency
1	Peace	93
2	Security	72
3	Prosperity	19

as ancillary for the target country. The following table also shows the priority given at regional and country level.

From Table 4, we can deduce that the international (18) or global (10) agenda of his speeches were all about Israelis’ and Americas interest-these two countries are what for Obama, America (153) and Israel (200). Besides, Iran (57), Iraq (22), Egypt (19) and Syria (12) are under the red-point target for attack if not “allied” and come to “the table”. However, Palestine (8) is not a country of agenda but an area not to be neglected to prevent the fire before its eruption.

A discourse use implication shown under Table 5 leads to believe that Obama gives the highest concern of protection/security for the Jews/Jewish religion followers-Israelites, advises the Islam/Muslims not to be hostile to them and the Christians; “Islam must be based on what it is, not what it isn’t” .

Data compiled under Table 6 gives us the clear implication that Obama needs cooperative work, sympathy and closeness (the We, 478) assigning himself (the I, 284) as a team (world) leader that the rest has to believe, follow and worship him. He would like to figure out cooperation from the youth (42) and male (the He, 52) generation. Generally, Obama speaks the “I” and “We” ideology believing himself as the ‘architect’ and ‘leader’ of the New World Order, Neo-Liberalism/New Capitalism, Democracy and Freedom and seeking others to cooperate with him. He would like to address the rest within the mass like “They” (131) and “You” (145). So he would like to give the “wine and the bread” if “peace and security” remain unchanged, kept constant.

Table 4. Discourse from national-international priority analysis of countries/regions

No.	Region	Frequency	Country	Frequency
1	International	18	Israel	200
2	Global	10	America /US	153
3	My country	7	Iran	57
4	Foreign	4	Iraq	22
5	Local /National	4	Egypt	19
6	Our country	3	Syria	12
7	(Your) country	1	Palestine	8

Table 5. Discourse from religious affiliation and target analysis

No.	Word	Frequency
1	Jew/Jewish	257
2	Islam/Muslims	97
3	Christian	10

Table 6. Discourse from noun-pronoun analysis

No.	Noun/Pronoun	Frequency
1	We /us/our/ours	478
2	I/me/my/mine	284
3	They/their	145
4	You/your	131
5	He/him/his	52
6	“Youth”	42
7	Women	21
8	Men	13
9	She/her/hers	6
10	Father	4
11	Child	4
12	Old	2
13	Mother	1

CONCLUSION

It has been clearly understood by wise politicians that politics is a struggle for power in order to strongly build beneficiary political and socio-economic ideas, and to transform into real practices on the ground. As a deep-seated part of the process, language plays the decisive role in every political battle which is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language (discourses) dialectically articulated with inclusions of the semiosis. In this regard, the critical analysis of the political discourse of Barack Obama’s speech regarding the Middles targets on condemning the “tyrants”, “extremists”, nuclear armed countries and “change” resistant’s. It also targets on the moldable and accommodable “young” generation for “change” with the vaccines and instruments of freedom, democracy, equality, tolerance, technology and globalization in order for America to easily slip and swipe into a given country (abundant in resource or politically important) without war and confrontations. Positive orientation is what comes out as President Obama’s intention of discourse use. The narrations of ideology, change, morality, religion, hegemony, identity and the allay dilemma discourse analysis in this article are also the clear evidences from Obama’s (America’s) own words that America’s hand and head is already in other countries. It is also possible to draw a conclusion that America’s socio-economic and political strategies are backed by masked terms of support, allay, cooperation, renewal, engagement, partnership, interference and other beneficiary means of doorways for America to easily access the required resources or political advantages.

REFERENCES

- Bhatia, V. K. (2016). *Critical genre analysis: Investigating interdiscursive performance in professional practice*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315690315
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2002). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific Research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis: Introducing Qualitative Researches* (pp. 121–138). London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol 2, pp. 258-84). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Greve, A., & Salaff, J. W. (2005). Social network approach to understand the ethnic economy: A theoretical discourse. *GeoJournal*, 64(1), 7–16. doi:10.1007/s10708-005-3919-0
- Richardson, T. (1996). Foucauldian discourse: Power and truth in urban and regional policy making. *European Planning Studies*, 4(3), 279–292. doi:10.1080/09654319608720346
- Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., & Schiffrin, D. (Eds.). (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol. 1). MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Waters, T. E., Steele, R. D., Roisman, G. I., Haydon, K. C., & Booth-LaForce, C. (2016). A linguistic inquiry and word count analysis of the Adult Attachment Interview in two large corpora. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 48(1), 78.
- Wodak, R. (1989). *Language Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse*. London: Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:10.1075/ct.7
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is About- A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1–13). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2002). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis: Introducing Qualitative Researches*. London: Sage.

Alelign Aschale Wudie (PhD) is an Assistant Professor at Addis Ababa Science and Technology University (AASTU). He studies applied linguistics and communication, specializing on Ethiopia in History: Discourse, Ideology and Power. He obtained his MA Degree from Addis Ababa University in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). He has more than 12 years of teaching experience on various subjects. Dr. Alelign has published several articles and book chapters on trans-disciplinary issues. He is also a distinguished researcher, consultant and trainer on multidisciplinary issues.