Obama Ending the War in Iraq: a Critical Discourse Analysis

DoaaTaher AL-dihaymawee[1]; Asst. Prof. ShahlaSharifi[2]; Asst. Prof. Ali Alizadeh[3]

PhD student/ Ferdowsi University[1]

College of Humanities/Ferdowsi University[2,3]

duaataher1994@gmail.com;Sh-sharifi@um.ac.ir; alalizadeh@um.ac.ir

Abstract

The unique thing about America war on Iraq is that this war ended twice. The first time on 1 May 2003 by President George W. Bush on the aircraft carrier USS Abraham Lincoln "mission accomplished". And later by Barack Obama in December 2011. Because of its importance which Obama describes as *"The Iraq war has lasted longer than World War I, World War II, and the Civil War."* Thus, the researchers apply Wodak's (2001; 2009) *discourse-historical approach* and van Leeuwen's (2008) *sociological categories of actor representation approach* to uncover the linguistic strategies in both the micro and macro level that President Obama uses in two of his speeches about ending the war in Iraq. The first speech was delivered in August 2010, while the second speech was delivered in December 2011. According to Obama, this war has achieved its aims as the American troops succeeded in toppling Saddam Hussein and fighting AQI (Al-Qaeda in Iraq) for nine years and killing the head of al-Qaeda Osama bin Laden. Therefore, America and its allies are safe now from any terrorists' threat from Saddam or bin Laden. Obama also mentions that the American troops supported the Iraqis to have a democratic government elected by its people in a free election which is American's aim for establishing democracy in the Middle East. All these achievements support Obama's opinion that the war should end now since Iraqis have a free government and they also win the civil war by rejecting the sectarian's ideas. These topoi of achievement lead to the topoi of ending the war and topoi of sacrifices. Therefore, Obama declares the necessity of ending the war as more than 1.5 million US troops have participated in making these achievements and many of them have either lost their lives or wounded for the sake of Iraq freedom.

Key Words: Barack Obama, Critical discourse analysis, Ideology, Iraq, and War.

1. Introduction

Iraq has enjoyed a unique and long role in the history of humans. In its fertile valleys, the world knew the dawn of human civilization (Ghareeb, 2004: xxxix). Modern Iraq is established in 1920 by the British government whose forces had occupied it during World War I. Baghdad is the country's largest city and it is also the capital (Mance, 2003: 10). Moreover, Iraq became a republic in 1958 but has been under a dictatorship controlled by a single party, the Ba'th Party, since 1968 and Saddam Hussein was the last ruler from this party (Mance, 2003: 13).

With the death of the former president of Iraq Ahmad Hassan Al-Baker in July 1979, Saddam Hussein became the president of Iraq. Hussein engaged in two armed conflicts: the Iraq-Iran

war (1980-1988) and Invading Kuwait (1990), in which the UN directly imposed economic sanctions on Iraq. The United States made a coalition with thirty-state to liberate Kuwait. The coalition militaries, supported by the UN, declared 'Operation Desert Storm' on 17 January 1991. Sanctions continued, only to be lifted when Iraq fully destroyed its WMD programs (Ghareeb, 2004: lxviii; lxix). Due to the sanctions Iraqis suffered from poverty, lack of medical treatment, and unemployment. (Tucker, 2010: 592).

After 11 September. Bush placed Iraq, North Korea, Iran, 'and their terrorist allies' in the category the 'axis of evil'. The US occupied Afghanistan and toppled its regime in October 2001 (Beeson, 2006; Ryan & Kiely, 2009). Alterman and Green (2004) argue that Bush and were willing to deceive the Americans about the level of threat Iraq presented, and its relation to the terrorist attack on Washington and New York. In September 2002, Bush declared that "You can't distinguish between al Qaeda and Saddam when you talk about the war on terror". According to them, Bush was misleading his country by exaggerating the level of threat Iraq represented to the USA and its ally. Nevertheless, Bush minimized the difficulty and cost of the war. He described it as "relatively short and hugely successful" (Hehir, 2008: 60-62). On March 20, 2003, the US launched the war against Iraq. The combat was known as Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) (Davidson, 2011: 133).On May 1, 2003, President Bush declared that the "Mission Accomplished", Bush's message was that the difficult part of Operation was over as Saddam Hussein had been overthrown and few US soldiers lost their lives during bringing him down (Shimko, 2010: 173). Americans believed that their troops would start to return home soon. Paul Bremer arrived in Baghdad two weeks after the military operation. He disbanded the Iraqi Army and the majority of the country's internal security forces and police. Tens of thousands of Baath Party members were enforced to leave their positions whether they were hospital administrators, oil ministry engineers, or university professors. Thus, this left a hundred thousand Iraqis jobless and angry. Bremer recognized that "we were the government of Iraq under international law," which made him the new leader to Iraq. Although the US assumed that they came to liberate the Iraqis, the Iraqis, in turn, found their new ruler had an American face. Thus, according to one participant, "we stopped being liberators and became occupiers". Not long, the deadly clashes between the Iraqi civilians and the US troops started (Shimko, 2010: 173-175).

Iraq's insurgency had the desire not only to kill American troops but also the ambition to be in power when the US forces leave. Washington urged Iran, Pakistan, and Syria, to stop Mujahideen fighters from crossing their borders to Iraq (Moore, 2004: xiv). Meanwhile, the Jordanian Abu Musab al- Zarqawi who pledged allegiance to Osama bin Laden established the AQI (Al-Qaeda in Iraq). AQI Comprised of Iraqi radical Islamists and foreign Jihadists (Kaválek, 2015: 2). They prearranged suicide bombings targeting government institutions, Iraqi security forces and civilians (Slim, 2019: 7), AQI fighters had one main goal, which was to defeat the US troops and establish a Sunni Islamic state in Iraq that could expand in the region (Naylor, 2009: 14). They skillfully represented themselves as a saviour of Sunni minorities against Shiites majorities and by this, they succeed in encouraging sectarian violence. In 2006, the sectarian civil war started in its most obvious form after AQI bombed the al-Askari shrine, a Shi'a holy site. Baghdad and several other

mixed areas in Iraq were in the fist of sectarian violence (Slim, 2019; Kaválek, 2015). Thus, in 2004 the number of U.S. troops killed in Iraq reached 1,000 and between 300,000 and half a million Iraqi civilians dead (Manning & Clarke 2009: 151).

In 2009, George Bush administration ended and Barack Obama became the 44th president of the United States of America. Yet, he was the first African American president to hold the office. Obama tries hard to develop America's economical, educational, and foreign affairs. His continuous effort to improve the USA leads Obama to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2009(Jiménez, 2017: 20). Therefore, this study is concerned with Iraq war during Obama's precedency and his speeches about ending the war in Iraq. However, many studies have been done about Obama's among them Post (2009), who selects six speeches for both Barack Obama and John McCain in the 2008 US election to study according to Van Leeuwen's Social Actor Network (2008). In 2010, Wang examined Barack Obama's presidential speeches from the perspective of critical discourse analysis in general and Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar, transitivity and modality, in particular. The speeches that Wang selects are Obama's Victory Speech and Obama's Inaugural Address on January 20, 2009. Another study about Barack Obama is done by Aschale (2013). Aschale used Norman Fairclough's (1989)'Dimensions of Discourse Analysis' model to study president Obama's speeches. The researcher selected four speeches: the People of Egypt in 2009, the US people in 2011, the American-Israelites lobby group in 2012 and 2013 to People of Israel. These four speeches have the same theme all about (North) Africa and the Middle East, however, they are delivered in different years and places to different audiences. Jiménez (2017) selects six linguistic devices: hedging, deixis, the rule of three, anaphora and parallelism, contrastive pairs, and metaphors, in the selected speeches of two American presidents, Barack Obama and Donald Trump. The researcher selects three speeches for each president on the same or very similar topic: the victory speech, the economy speech and the inaugural speech.Abdelaal, Alisood and Sase (2015) and Tekaya (2016) examine Obama's speeches related to ISIS. Thus, no study has been done so far examining Obama's speeches relating to ending the war in Iraq. The researchers are going to use Wodak's (2001; 2009) *discourse-historical approach* and van Leeuwen's (2008) *sociological categories of actor representation approach* to fulfil this gap in the studies. The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the macro-topics that President Obama uses in his speeches about ending the war in Iraq?

2. What are the micro-strategies and categories that President Obama used to represent ending the war in Iraq?

3. How do the macro-topics and micro-strategies uncover Obama's ideology?

2. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is also called Critical linguistics, and the two terms sometimes used interchangeably (Wodak& Meyer, 2001: 1). In the late 1970s, Critical Discourse Analysis started in the work of Gunter Kress, Roger Fowler, Tony Trew and Robert Hodge, at the University of East Anglia. It is found in the publication of *Language*

and Control (1979) that shows how grammar and language are used as ideological instruments (Machin, &Mayr, 2012: 2). CDA roots can be traced back to text linguistics, classical rhetoric, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and applied linguistics. (Wodak& Meyer, 2001: 3).Van Dijk (1993) argues that critical discourse analysis is a category of discourse analytical research that principally examines the way social power, dominance, inequality, and abuse are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by talk and text in the political and social context (Van Dijk, 1993). Therefore, in his book *Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis* (1995:17), Van Dijk defined Critical Discourse Analysis as follows:

> Critical Discourse Analysis has become the general label for a special approach to the study of text and talk, emerging from critical linguistics, critical semiotics and in general from the socio-politically conscious and oppositional way of investigating language, discourse and communication. (1995:17)

Van Dijk (1988; 1995) states that CDA is mainly multidisciplinary, and it focuses greatly on the relations between discourse and society, especially social cognitive, culture, and politics. (vanDijk, 1995:17). Moreover, Machin and Mayr (2012) state that the term 'critical' means 'denaturalising' language to expose the hidden ideas, absences, and assumptions in texts (Machin, &Mayr, 2012: 5).

CDA aims to study public speech, such as newspaper, advertisement, official documents, political propagandas, school books, regulations, laws and so on (Wang, 2010: 254). Revealing strategies that seem normal on the surface, but they are ideological and they seek to shape the representation of persons and events for certain ends (Machin &Mayr, 2012: 5). CDA attempts to discover the links between language, power and ideology (Wang, 2010: 254).

3. Theoretical Framework

The researchers have used two critical discourse analysis approaches Wodak's (2001; 2009) *Discourse–Historical Approach* and van Leeuwen (1996; 2008) *Sociological categories of actor representation*. Wodak's approach represents the main topoi which highlight the non-linguistic aspects including social, political and historical backgrounds of the chosen cases in this study, whereas van Leeuwen's approach represents the linguistic level which integrates with Wodak's approach in an intra-local level of analysis. Thus, the key concepts of the adopted approaches of CDA can be elucidated which constitute the theoretical framework of the study.

4. Methodology

During his presidential campaign in 2008, Obama promises to end the war on Iraq and give the chance to thousands of Americans to return home. Right from the beginning, Obama was against this war, and after Bush's claims of Saddam's possession of WMDs proves to be wrong, and war that is shown to be a simple but prove to be one of America longest war. It moves beyond a war to liberate Iraq to a war of occupation that lasted nearly nine years. America starts the war thinking that it is going to be simple and glorifies victory that will establish America as

the leading force in the world, however, American was mistaking because this war turns to be a blood bath for both sides. Therefore, Obama considers ending this war as there is no benefit from continuing it except spending more lives and money. Obama first speech is taken from America Rhetoric, which is an online site that has been created by Professors Martin J. Medhurst and Stephen E. Lucas. It contains full-text transcriptions and videos to the top 100 speeches in the most significant American political speeches of the 20th century. This speech can be found in the following links: https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/barackobamairaqendofcombatops.htm. It is delivered on 31 August 2010, Oval Office of the White House, Washington, D.C. under the title "*Barack Obama Address to the Nation on the End of Operation Iraqi Freedom*".

To carry on in his plan of withdrawing his Forces from Iraq, US President Barack Obama delivers the second speech at Fort Bragg, North Carolina on 15 December 2011, to comment that the withdrawing is almost accomplished. The second speech is taken from BBC formal online site. It can be found under the title *President Obama Iraq speech* the following link:https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-16191394.

5. Data analysis

First speech: Barack Obama Address to the Nation on the End of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Declaring War on Iraq 2003 is considered the worst decision in the United States foreign policy. Obama tries to take the opposite direction. During his first election campaign, Obama promises the Americans that he is going to put an end to the USA war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Accordingly, as he becomes president in 2009, he orders the foreign policy office to take the first steps. On 31 December 2011, the majority of the American troops in Iraq returns to America to celebrate the Holidays with their families. Obama declares this speech on 31 August 2010, Oval Office of the White House, Washington, D.C. At that, practically 100,000 U.S. troops have left Iraq. The American bases in Iraq closed or transferred to the Iraqis troops. And millions of pieces of equipment move out of Iraq.

1. Discourse Topics

Example (1): Topoi of achievement, Challenges, and Sacrifices

A. 'The Americans who have served in Iraq *completed every mission they were given*. They *defeated a regime* that had terrorized its people."
B. "our troops *fought block by block* to help Iraq seize the chance for a better future."
C.   "They shifted tactics to protect the Iraqi people, *trained Iraqi Security Forces*, and took out terrorist leaders."
D. "This year also saw Iraq hold *credible elections* that drew a strong turnout."
E. "Of course, violence will not end with our combat mission. Extremists will continue to set off *bombs, attack Iraqi civilians* and try to spark *sectarian strife*."
F.   " Iraqis are a proud people. They have *rejected sectarian war*, and they have no interest in endless destruction."
G. "Thousands of Americans *gave their lives*; tens of thousands have been *wounded*."
H. "Our relations abroad were *strained*. Our *unity at home was tested*."
I. "vast resources abroad at a time of *tight budgets* at home."

Obama mentions all the US troops' achievement during their existence in Iraq. Starting from toppling Saddam Hussein to protecting Iraqis and creating a new Iraqi army and *"trained Iraqi Security Forces"* as in (A, B, and C). Fighting side by side with the Iraqi troops to defeat AL-Qaeda and *"took out terrorist leaders",* is America second greatest achievement in Iraq. America also supports the Iraqis to make the first democratic election as in (D). Accordingly, Obama last achievement for both Iraqi and American people is keeping his promise of withdrawing the US troops from Iraq. One the other hand, Iraqis' greatest achievement during this hard times of war is rejecting the sectarian war that continued from 2005 to 2009 by understanding its danger on their future *"[t]hey have rejected sectarian war, and they have no interest in endless destruction".* Still, the American withdraw from Iraq at that point is challengeable as terrorists and extremists may continue to attack peaceful civilians *"Extremists will continue to set off bombs, attack Iraqi civilians and try to spark sectarian strife."*

Declaring ending a war requires mentioning all the sacrifices that already have been done. On the scale of lives, thousands of American troops gave their lives. Besides, thousands have been wounded as in (G). In (H), Obama states that the war on Iraq has strained America's relation abroad as many nations do not believe in the necessity of this war. Collins (2008) states "*U.S. standing among friends and allies has fallen. Our status as a moral leader has been damaged by the war, the subsequent occupation of a Muslim nation, and various issues concerning the treatment of detainees."* After the British withdraw from Basra in 2007 lead to increasing the isolation the U.S in Iraq. Likewise, the war on Iraq shakes the Americans unity *"Our unity at home was tested"* as many Americans were against this war right from the beginning. Obama was one of the people who were against this war*"from the start"*. On October 2002, He considers going to this war as "*dumb*" and "*rash*" and based *"not on principle but on politics"*(Pedersen, 2009: 8). On the financial scale, this war coasts America's budget a lots *"vast resources abroad at a time of tight budgets at home"*. This is one of the reasons Obama decides to put an end to it.

2   Referential Strategy

Example (2): GenericisationandAssimilation

   A. "At every turn, *America's men and women in uniform* have served with courage and resolve."
   B. *"Iraqi forces* have moved into the lead with considerable skill and commitment to their fellow citizens"
   C. *"Iraqis*are a proud people. They have rejected sectarian war,"
   D. *"Only Iraqis* can build a democracy within their borders."
   E. *"Our troops* are the steel in our ship of state."
   F. "Tonight, I'd like to talk to you about the end of *our combat mission in Iraq*,"
   G. *"the future* that we're trying to build for our nation - *a future* of lasting peace and long-term prosperity"
   H. *"A war* to disarm a state became a fight against an insurgency."
   I. *"The Americans* who have served in Iraq completed every mission they were given."
   J. *"The Iraqi people* will have a strong partner in the United States."

In (A), Obama uses genericisation as he greets the American troops' courage. Referring to them as "*America's men and women in uniform*" to indicate that regardless of

their gender they act with bravery in Iraq. Another name he uses for them is "*our troops*" which is genericisation as he refers to the American troops in general regardless of the spot they serve in. Moreover, the substation for securing Iraq after the American force withdraws is the Iraqi forces as in (B). Obama here uses the term "*Iraqi forces*" without any article to emphasize on their nationality. As genericisation is used to represent people as a type. Extract (D) stands for all the Iraqi people who want to build their country by rejecting the sectarian war and making a democratic election. Emphasizing the great role that the Iraqi people can make in rebuilding a stable home, Obama uses the genericisation "*only Iraqis*". To emphasize that *'only'* Iraqis and no other nationality or forces can rebuild democracy in Iraq.

As assimilation is one type of van Leeuwen's Specification. Thus, it is used to specify certain aspects as seen in (F), when Obama specifies the scope of his speech to "*the end of our combat mission in Iraq*". Another assimilation from this type is "*The Americans*" in (I), which is plural with definite article specify the US troops in Iraq. Assimilation also comes with mass nouns as "*future*", and "*war*" in extract (G and H). The noun phrase "*the Iraqi people*" in (J) is assimilation not only by using the mass noun *'people'* but also by using plural with a definite article.

Example (3): Individualisationand nomination

A. "From this desk, seven and a half years ago, *President Bush* announced the beginning of military operations in Iraq."
B. "That's a message that *Vice President Biden*is delivering to the Iraqi people through his visit there today."
C. "I spoke to *former President George W. Bush*. It's well known that he and I disagreed about the war from its outset."

Obama policy emphasizes the theme of 'change', change in the domestic and foreign policy. In foreign policy, Obama's foreign policy emphasizes the issue of ending the war on Iraq and Afghanistan and bringing American troops home. The aim of this "*change*" is to enable America to reengage with the world and away from the isolated spot that USA found itself in after Bush war on Iraq 2003, which continues during his two administrations (McCormick, 2011: 235). Therefore, Obama's promise of change lay more on a new way of thinking about foreign policy. On January 2008, he stated, *"I don't want to just end the war, but I want to end the mindset that got us into war in the first place."*(Unger, 2016: 3). This approach dates back to Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, yet it has some recent expression from Carter and Clinton administrations' foreign policy (McCormick, 2011: 235). Both approaches, Bush's neoconservative approaches and Obama's liberal internationalist call for American leadership. They use different methods to pursue that goal. The Bush approach emphasizes on building democracy from the top-down, while Obama imposes it from the bottom-up. Obama's approach depends on diplomacy and *"soft power"* means for achieving foreign policy change. However, Bush's approach depends on coercive diplomacy and *"hard power"* means (McCormick, 2011: 236-237). Vasconcelos (2009) describes it as *"radical departure from the confrontational style of conducting a foreign policy that characterized the Bush era"*. Despite their differences, Obama addresses George

Bush respectable via using formal nomination as there is mention to the surname only "*Bush*" with honorification "*President*" as in (A). Obama here mentions Bush's title as if he still a president. The correct title for Bush at this point is "*former President*" as in (C) since Bush is no longer a president. In (C), mentioning Bush's full name make it semi-formal nomination with preceding honorification "*former President*". Extract (B), Obama takes about his Vice President *"Biden"* by mentioning the surname only which make it formal nomination with the honorification "*Vice President*". Accordingly, the manner that Obama speaks about other reflects that he is highly educated and respectable man as he tends to address other people even those who are beneath him with huge respect via mentioning their surname and full titles.

Example (4): Aggregation

    A.   *"Thousands of Americans* gave their lives; *tens of thousands* have been wounded."

    B.   "And like *all Americans*, I'm awed by their sacrifice,"

    C.   *"Last February,* I announced a plan that would bring our combat brigades out of Iraq,"

    D.   "We've removed nearly *100,000 U.S. troops* from Iraq. We've closed or transferred to the Iraqis*hundreds of bases*. And we have moved *millions of pieces of equipment* out of Iraq."

When Obama first came to power, he promised to end the war in Iraq as seen in (C). He enters the White House in January 2009, after only a month *"Last February"* he announces the withdraw plan. Obama uses two statistical aggregations to refer to the huge number of loses among the US troops "*Thousands of Americans* gave their lives; *tensof thousands*have been wounded". Since this speech is delivered in August 2010, thus, the withdraw has already started. In (D), Obama uses numerical aggregation to give the exact number of troops and equipment that have already been transferred from Iraq. At that point around "*100,000 U.S.troops*" have left Iraq. Consequently, "*hundreds of bases*" either closed or transferred to Iraqi troops, and "*moved millions of pieces of equipment out of Iraq"*.

3 Predictical Strategy
Example (5): Metaphor

    A.   "And sometimes *in the midst of these storms*,"

    B.   "These are *the rough waters encountered during the course of one of America's longest wars.* Yet there has been one constant *amidst these shifting tides***."**

    C.   "We've persevered because of a belief we share with the Iraqi people -- a belief that out of the *ashes of war, a new beginning could be born* in this cradle of civilization"

    D.   "Our troops are *the steel in our ship of state*. And though *our nation may be travelling through rough waters, they give us confidence that our course is true*, and that beyond the pre-dawn darkness, better days lie ahead."

Obama delivers this speech at the beginning of his presidency. At a time of great difficulties for all Americans which Obama assimilates to *"the midst of these storms"* as in (A). Due to America financial crisis in 2008 many Americans lost their jobs. Accordingly, the crimes level increase and that put America in a very difficult situation in which Obama

tries hard to fix it. In (B) Obama describes the state of America war in Iraq as "*the rough waters*", as the war shifted from its main aim of toppling Saddam to entering in one of America longest war. A war started under the claim of disarming Iraq from WMDs, in which none is found to a bloody war with different terrorist groups under the name of Al-Qaeda in Iraq. While the "*shifting tides*" of war continues strongly, America has one constant aspect to rely on which is the bravery of America's men and women in uniform, who tend to keep the peace inside as well as outside America.

Thirty-six of Saddam rule, during which Iraqis suffered from Iran and Kuwait war and a sanction for thirteen years. After America topple Saddam in 2003, Iraqis suffered dreadful years of sectarian war. Yet, Obama believes that out of *"ashes of war, a new beginning could be born"* and Iraqis can build their home and have a bright future as seen in (C). The metaphor of water appears again in (D), as Obama describes America struggles both inside represented by the financial difficulties and outside represented by his efforts to bring his troops safely home. Therefore, the United States is like a ship travelling in rough water. And the steel which is a symbol for strength is the US troops (both inside and outside America) who keep this ship strong while it is travelling in this berserk water to make sure that they are sailing safely in the right direction.

4. Intensification/Mitigation Strategy

Example (6): Speech Act and hyperbole

A. 'We've now been through *nearly a decade of war*."
B. "President *Bush announced the beginning of military operations in Iraq*."
C. "Thousands of Americans *gave their lives*; tens of thousands *have been wounded*."
D. *"I'm awed* by their sacrifice, and by *the sacrifices of their families*."
E. "So tonight, *I am announcing that the American combat mission in Iraq has ended. Operation Iraqi Freedom is over,*"
F. "And Iraqi forces have taken the fight to al Qaeda, removing much of its leadership in *Iraqi-led operations."*
G. *"Extremists will continue to set off bombs, attack Iraqi civilians and try to spark sectarian strife.* But ultimately, these terrorists will fail to achieve their goals."

Obama starts his speech by mentioning three important facts. First, the war in Iraq continues much longer than expected "*nearly a decade*". Secondly, thousands of Americans give their lives and thousands are wounded in this long war as in (C). Third, Iraqi forces are capable to fight AL-Qaeda by themselves as they have already killed prominent terrorist leaders in *"Iraqi-led operations"*. Thus, these facts, which is a representative speech act, proves that this war must end as it coasts America a lot of time and souls, in addition to the fact the Iraqi military is capable to secure its country. Moreover, Obama expresses the feelings of loss, sorrow and scarifies for the America families who lost their beloved ones*"I'm awed by their sacrifice, and by the sacrifices of their families"*, and the feeling of being proud for the Iraqis rejection for the endless struggle of the sectarian war*"Iraqis are a proud people. They have rejected the sectarian war, and they have no interest in endless destruction"*. This fall within the category of expressive speech act. Obama does not mislead Iraqis by mentioning that they are going to have a bright future after the Americans leave as

in (G). He was realistic by mentioning that Iraq is going to face many challenges by terrorist and that was true because afterwards ISIS is created. However, he states that Iraq is going to defeat these challenges, which is untrue as ISIS controls large territory in Iraq between 2014 and 2017. Speaking about what the future is going to hold is a commissive speech act. Moreover, since a Declarative speech act is basically about changing the world by their utterance that can be found in (B and E). The world has changed twice for the Iraqis, first by declaring the war on Iraq in 2003 by George W. Bush. And later when Obama declares withdrawing the American forces from Iraq in 2010. Both create a radical change in Iraq.

Second speech: President Obama Iraq speech

Obama's first and second speech deal with the same topic which is ending the war in Iraq. Except that the span of time is different. The second speech which took place at Fort Bragg, North Carolina on 15 December 2011. At that time, over 150,000 US troops reach home, and other small groups are in their way or ready to leave Iraq.

1. Discourse Topics
Example (1) Topoi of Ending War and Sacrifices
- A. "And we are *ending a war* not with a final battle, but with *a final march toward home*."
- B. "We know too well the heavy *cost of this war*."
- C. "More than *1.5 million Americans* have served in Iraq - *1.5 million*. Over *30,000* Americans have been *wounded*…"
- D. "Nearly 4,500 Americans made the *ultimate sacrifice* …"

The American war in Iraq 2003 is not as simple as Bush declares that it is going to be. It coasts America a lot financially and many soldiers lost their lives and many others were wounded. Extracts (B, C and D) are a clear representation to *topoi of sacrifices* as many families lost their loved ones. Obama opens and ends his speech emphasizing that he ends the war in the best way possible as ending this war at that time is showing America strength and leaving the world more secure since this war achieved its purpose by removing Saddam's threat. More importantly, the war ended with a final peaceful and happy withdrawing home during the best time of the year the Christmas holidays. Therefore, American soldiers can celebrate Christmas with their families safely. Instead of ending a war dreadfully with a final battle that may cost America more physically and financially. This peaceful returning is the best end for this long war as Obama avoid the term 'occupiers' and presented America as a country which helps Iraqis to have a democratic government and after achieving this they withdraw.

2. Referential Strategy
Example (2): Genericisationand Assimilation
- A. *"American troops* breaking the back of *a brutal dictator* in less than a month."
- B. "we have gone after al- Qaeda so that *terrorists* who threaten America …"
- C. "with*a representative government* that was elected by its *people."*
- D. "And in the face of ancient divisions you stood firm to help those Iraqis who put their faith in *the future*."
- E. "with*the Iraqi army and police*, you helped turn the tide toward peace."

F.   "the precision of our efforts against *al-Qaeda in Iraq*,"

G.   "We also know that these numbers don't tell the full story of *the Iraq war* - not even close".

H.   "*War* is not a political word here. *War* is where our friends and neighbours go."

The above extracts narrate the story of America in Iraq from 2003 to the time of the US troops withdraw. America first achievement in Iraq is deposing Saddam Hussein in less than a month. Here, "*American troo*ps" is genericisation by using plural without definite or indefinite articles. On the other hand, "*a brutal dictator*" is also genericisation but it is by using singular with an indefinite article. America second achievement from this war is fighting "*terrorists*", which is America main aim after 11 September attacks to protect their contrary from any future threat and to fight terrorists all around the world. Thus, invading Iraq in 2003 was under the claim of Saddam Hussein supports to AL-Qaeda. The term "*terrorists*" here is genericisation by using plural without article.

Obama states that he does not order his forces to leave Iraq unless Iraq is taking the first step toward democracy by giving the lead to "*a representative government*" selected by its "*people*". There is assimilation by using the mass noun "*people*" referring to the Iraqis. Another mass noun that uses as assimilation is "*war*" and "*future*" as in (D and H). During the sectarian war, the US troops fight side by side "*the Iraqi army and police*" which is assimilation by using plural references with definite articles as in (E). Remembering their great achievement in Iraq, Obama mentions their fight against "*al-Qaeda in Iraq*". It is assimilation as this term specify only this terrorist group among many others around the world. Extract (G) contains assimilation in "*the Iraq war*" as the mass noun war with definite article specifying the war in Iraq among America other wars.

Example (3): Individualization and Nomination

A.   "As *Michelle* mentioned, we also know that the burden of war is borne by your families."

B.   "As the *Mayor of Fayetteville* put it: 'War is not a political word here....'"

C.   "*Osama bin Laden* will never again walk the face of this Earth."

In the above extracts, Obama mentions three different individuals. Talking about the burden of the war of Iraq, Obama mentions his wife, Michelle's view about the suffering that the American families go through when they lose their beloved ones. And he supports that view by quoting the*"Mayor of Fayetteville's"* words. Thus, the second individual is presented by mentioning his title only. In (C), Obama mentions the third individual which is *"Osama bin Laden"*. Killing him is considered one of the greatest achievement during Obama's presidency.

Although, Obama is known as a highly respectable president, yet he is very friendly when he talks about his family as seen in (A). He uses informal nomination by mentioning his wife first name only. In (B), Obama uses honorification by stating the only title of "*the Mayor of Fayetteville*" which indicates that his title is more important than his name. Talking about the death of al-Qaeda leader *"Osama bin Laden"*, Obama uses semi-formal nomination by mentioning the given name and the surname only without mentioning bin Laden's title as the former leader of al- Qaeda.

Example (4): Aggregation

A.   "It has *many challenges* ahead."

B.   "This is an extraordinary achievement, *nearly nine years* in the making."

    C.   "More than *1.5 million Americans* have served in Iraq - *1.5 million. Over 30,000* Americans have been wounded …"

    D.   "Nearly *4,500 Americans* made the ultimate sacrifice - including <u>202</u> fallen heroes from here at Fort Bragg - *202*."

    E.   "America stronger and the *world more secure*. Because of you"

Obama uses statistical aggregation to state that the war in Iraq which continues for "*nearly nine years*" reaches its end. He recalls all the memories from "*the early days*" of this war when the situation was very challenging and how the US troops did everything to overcome these challenges. Obama uses the statistical aggregation "*1.5 million*" twice in (C) to refer to the huge number of American forces that participate in this war which reaches over one and half million. He continues to use statistical aggregation in (C and D) to highlight the huge numbers of wound American soldiers, which reaches over "*30,000*" in addition to nearly "*4,500*" dead soldiers. Lastly, (A and F) represent the future after the US troops withdraw. In Iraq, Iraqis are going to face "*many challenges*", meanwhile, Obama states he is going to work hard to make "*the world more secure*". Therefore, the quantifiers *'many'* and *'more'* serve the purposes of aggregation.

3. Predictional Strategy

Example (5): Metaphor

    A.   "By battling and building block by block in Baghdad, by bringing tribes into the fold and partnering with the Iraqi army and police, you *helped turn the tide toward peace*."

    B.   "Osama bin Laden will never *again walk the face of this Earth.*"

The American troops sent to depose Saddam. But the plan drifts away, soon the US troops find themselves in the middle of chaos in which they become a peacemaker, trainers, and advisers. According to Obama in (A), they help the Iraqis in building their state a "*block by block*". They also help to unite the Sunni and Shia tribes in the chaos of the sectarian war. By this, they help to turn "*the tide toward peace*", which is a water metaphor for the American troops' great efforts in the time of war. However, every American president works hard to have the honour of killing the head of the most horrible terrorist group of all times Osama bin Laden. Eventually, Obama has this honor, which is considered one of his great achievement in foreign policy. In (B), Obama gives the honor for his troops for defeating America number one enemy by killing its leader. Instead of saying that Osama bin Laden is dead, Obama uses a metaphor representing the impossibility of bin Laden walking again on the face of the earth.

4. Intensification/Mitigation Strategy

Example (6):Speech Acts and hyperbole

    A.   "Now, Iraq is not a perfect place. It has *many challenges ahead*."

    B.   "By battling and *building block by block in Baghdad*"

    C.   "Over *30,000 Americans* havebeen *wounded* and those are only the wounds that show".

    D.   "Nearly *4,500 Americans made the ultimate sacrifice* - including *202 fallen heroes from here at Fort Bragg - 202*."

    E.   "So today, we pause to say a prayer for all those *families who have lost their loved ones… We grieve with them*"

    F.   "Osama *bin Laden will never again walk* the face of this Earth".

    G.   "you we are ending these wars in a way that will make *America stronger* and the *world more secure*".

The domain feeling in the above extracts is the feeling of grieve, lost, and mourn, which is a representative speech act. As Obama recalls America troops' sacrifices in Iraq. He mentions and emphasizes the huge numbers of wounded, dead, and the deep loss of their families as in (D, and E). In (C), Obama states that over 30,000 American soldiers have been wounded psychical "*wounds that show*", indicating that there is more number for those whom were spiritually wounded because of the cruelty of war. Despite this cruel and long war still, Iraq has many challenges ahead. This indication for the Iraq future is a commissive speech act.

Obama claims that the American troops build *"block by block in Baghdad"*, which is hyperbole to exaggerate US troops' offers in Iraq as in extracts (B). Another hyperbole is found in (G), Obama mentions that this war makes America stronger, which is untrue as America financially faces a great crisis during the war and many people lost their jobs (Jervis, 2017: 32), that why Obama states that *"one of the biggest savings we can make is to change our policy in Iraq."* (Independent Institute, 2011: 1). The strength of the country should be obvious in its economic strength and vice versa. Politically, Obama states that this war makes the "*world more secure*", which is another exaggeration as the savages terrorist group in human history ISIS soon has been created and controlled a large territory in Iraq and Syria, in addition to other attacks around the world such as Paris attack on 13 November 2015. Ending the war is considered as the most transformative foreign policy of any Democratic president since World War II. Obama focuses on long-term goals of having a peaceful relation with the Middle East after almost a decade of war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Aftermath, Obama was criticized even by those who support his withdraw plans as this withdraw enable ISIS to drive chaos in Iraq in June 2014 (*Beshara*, 2018; Pasternak, 2015). Thus, Obama exaggerates the outcome of this war. During his presidency, Obama was successful in reducing the numbers of American troops in Iraq from 142,000 U.S. troops at the outset of his presidency, to zero by December 2011. After ISIS controlling huge territory in Iraq in 2014, US forces have returned to Iraq to defeat ISIL, but the number was less than 5,000 at the end of his term. (Jervis, 2017: 33).However, he states another achievement which is true that the American troops killed the head of AL-Qaeda Osama bin Laden. This is fact is a representative speech act.

6. Conclusions

In both speeches, Obama emphasizes the outcomes of the Iraq war. During the nine years, the American troops succeeded in eliminating Saddam Hussein, then fighting AL-Qaeda, and finally supporting the Iraqis in their first democratic election. These achievements support Obama's opinion for the necessity of ending the war as the war has achieved its aims. The Iraqis are no longer under Saddam dictatorship instead they have a democratic government chosen by its people. And since the head of al-Qaeda is also dead by the American troops, therefore, the US is safe now from any future attack like11 September attacks. This can be found with topoi of achievements in both speeches. Such achievements come at a heavy price. More than 1.5 million Americans served in this war. Among them, 30000 soldiers wounded, and over 4,500 died in addition to many financial costs. Mentioning

these details in the topoi of sacrifices is a positive representation for America efforts in establishing democracy in Iraq and its great role in keeping the world peace.

Obama tries to show his closeness to the Iraqis by using the mass noun 'people' specifying only the Iraqis. He also reflects his highly educational and respectable manner by mentioning other people full names with honorification such as *President George W. Bush* and *Vice President Biden*. Additionally, Obama tends to be very specific in mentioning his information, instead of using 'much', 'some, and 'more' he gives the exact numbers by using a lot of aggregation. Aiding his audience to understand his speech easily, Obama uses a lot of images in describing America struggles during the hard times of war via using a lot of metaphors; mainly water metaphors. Supporting his point that the war must end, Obama emphasizes two emotional sides in his speeches. The first side is the emotions of sadness, moaning, missing, and lost addressing the families who lost loved ones proving that the war must end since a lot of sacrifices have already given to achieve this war's goals. The second side is the emotion of proud that Obama expresses due to the Iraqis rejected the sectarian war that threatened to tear their country apart. Accordingly, the Iraqis do not require American's protection any more as they have rejected the sectarian ideas, the Iraqi troops fought the AQI, and now they have a democratic government. Conclusively, these two emotional sides dominate the entire speeches and help president Obama to make his point.

7. References

1. Abdelaal, N., Alisood A., &Sase A. (2015). Investigating Obama's ideology in his
2. Speech on Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL). *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2* (7).228-246.
3. Alterman, E. & Green, M, (2004). *The Book on Bush: How George W. (mis)leads America.*
   a. USA: Penguin Group.
4. Aschale, A. (2013). *A Critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches vis-à-vis*
   a. *Middle East and north Africa.* Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
5. Beeson, M. (2006). *Bush and Asia: America's evolving relations with East Asia.* New York:
   a. Routledge.
6. Beshara R. K. (2018). A critical discourse analysis of George W. Bush's 'War on
   a. Terror' speech: the rhetoric of (counter) terrorism and the logic of Islamophobia. *Journal of Language and Discrimination,2* (1). 85–112.
7. Collins J. (2008). *Choosing war: The Decision to invade Iraq and its aftermath.*
   a. Washington: National Defense University Press.
8. Davidson, W. J. (2011). *America's sllies and war Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq.* USA:
9. Palgrave and Macmillan.
10. Ghareeb, A. E. (2004). *Historical dictionary of Iraq.* USA: The Scarecrow Press.

11. Hehir, A. (2008). *Humanitarian intervention after Kosovo: Iraq, 861arfur and the record of*

12. *global civil society*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

13. Independent Institute (2011). *Iraq, Afghanistan, war, and money: A Look at two presidencies*. Independent Institute Working Paper Number 77.

   a. Jervis, D. (2017). Obama and the Middle East. *TekaKom. Politol. Stos. Międzynar. 12 (*2). 31–57.

14. Jiménez, L. (2017). *Trabajo de Fin de Grado: Discourse analysis*. Spain:

   a. Universidad deCadiz.

15. Kaválek, T. (2015). from al-Qaeda in Iraq to Islamic State: The Story of insurgency in Iraq

16. and Syria in 2003-2015. *Turkish Journal of international relation*, *14* (1).

17. Machin, D. &Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A Multimodal*

   a. *Introduction.* Los Angeles: SAGE.

18. Mance, A. L. (2003). *Iraq*. USA: Chelsea House Publishers.

19. Manning M. & Clarke K. (2009). *Barack Obama and African-American*

   a. *empowerment: the rise of Black America's new leadership*. USA: Palgrave and Macmillan.

20. McCormick, J. M. (2011). *The Obama presidency: A Foreign policy of change?* USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

21. Moore, J. (2004). *Bush's war for reelection: Iraq, the White house, and the people*.

   a. USA: John Wiley & Sons.

22. Naylor, D. H. (2009). *Al-Qeada in Iraq*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

23. Pasternak, R. (2015). O*bama's foreign policy: a long game harried by tactical politics.* The Finnish Institute of International Affairs.

24. Pedersen, C. (2009). *Obama's America*. UK: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

25. Post, M. D. (2009). *Representations of meaning within textual personas: An Analysis of 2008 US presidential Campaign Speeches*. Unpublished manuscript.

26. Ryan, D. & Kiely P. (2009). America and Iraq: Policy-making, intervention and

27. regional politics. London: Routledge.

28. Shimko, K. L. (2010). *The Iraq wars and America's military revolution*. New York:

   a. Cambridge University Press.

29. Slim, R. (2019). *Iraq: A conflict over state identity and ownership*. Washington:

30. The Middle East Institute.

31. Tekaya, F. (2016). Discursive violence in Obama's legitimization of military

   a. intervention in Syria: a CDA Perspective. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 3* (2). 163-168.

32. Tucker, Spencer C. (2010). *The encyclopedia of Middle East wars: The United States in*

33. *the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, and Iraq conflicts,* Santa Barbara: ABC- CLIo.

34. Unger, D. (2016). The Foreign Policy Legacy of Barack Obama. *The international spectator*, *51* (4), 1-16.

35. Vasconcelos, A. (2009). Introduction – Responding to the Obama moment: the EU and the US in a multipolar world. *The Obama Moment: European and AmericanPerspectives*. Paris: The European Union Institute for Security Studies. 11-24.

36. Van Dijk, (1988). *News as Discourse.* Amsterdam: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

37. Van Dijk, (1993). Elite Discourse and Racism. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

38. Van Dijk, (1995). "Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse,* 1, 17-27.

39. Van Dijk (1998). Critical discourse analysis. In Schiffrin, D. Tannen, D. & Hamilton,

H. E. (Eds.) *the Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-371). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

40. Wang, J. (2010). A Critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches.

41. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3). 254-261.

42. Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis,* London:
    a. Sage publications.

43. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publication.