Jabr Saad Abdel Wahab Ahmad

The representation of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Obama's speeches: A systemic functional approach

Jabr Saad Abdel Wahab Ahmad
Helwan University

Abstract

This study tackles systemic functional analysis of three speeches delivered by Obama on the Iran's nuclear program 2008-2011 within the framework of critical discourse study. It investigates the implicit meanings and hidden assumptions beyond these speeches using Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). Context is the shared feature in Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) which may help overcome some of the weaknesses of critical discourse analysis. Obama, the African-American president of the US, is deemed one of the most persuasive and effective speaker. His rich cultural background and various travels decorate the message. Media is the most manipulative way in the world of politics. Politicians exert their efforts to convince the audience. The results of the study show that Obama uses material, mental and relational processes to physically and cognitively gather the audience around him and to create his positive image in the minds of people.

Key words

Discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, political speech, systemic functional grammar and interpersonal features.

تناول صورة الجمهورية الاسلامية الايرانية في خطابات أوباما السياسية : تحليل وظيفي

الملخص العربي

هذا البحث الذي يبنى نظريًا على التحليل الوظيفي لهاليداي يتناول مقتطفات لثلاثٍ من خطب أوباما السياسيةٍ بغية تحليل الملامح اللغوية لهذه الخطب من منظور براجماتي-نحوي. يشير البحث إلى وجود توترات كبيرة بين الجمهورية الإيرانية والولايات المتحدة الأميركية منذ الثورة الإيرانية في سبعينات القرن الماضي. فأمريكا التي كانت أول دولة في العالم تساند إيران في بناء المفاعلات في خمسينات القرن الماضي غيرت توجهها بشأن البرنامج النووي الإيراني وباتت تعارض هذا البرنامج بشدة إلى أن اتخذت إجراءات أكثر صرامة ضد طهران تمثلت في فرض عقوبات اقتصادية. وقد تولى أوباما رئاسة أميركا وهو أول رئيس ذو أصول إفريقية مسلمة وكان من المتوقع أن يكون لأوباما توجهًا مغايرًا لتوجهات الإدرات السابقة وخاصة فيما يتعلق بالعالم الإسلامي وقضاياه والتي من بينها الملف النووي الإيراني. هذا ويعد أوباما متحدثًا بارعًا يحسن استخدام اللغة لتقنيع الأيدولوجيات الاجتماعية والسياسية والاقتصادية. فمثل هذا الاستخدام اللغوي البارع من شأنه تسهيل إقناع الجمهور ومن ثم تغيير عقولهم واتجاهاتهم واهتماماتهم.

الكلمات الاساسية

تحليل النص ، الخطاب السياسي ، علم النحو الوظيفي ، والتحليل النقدي للخطاب

The representation of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Obama's speeches: A systemic functional approach

Jabr Saad Abdel Wahab Ahmad
Helwan University

Introduction

President Obama has been using opinionated language to be supported. This study aims to uncover implicit meanings in Obama's speeches on the Iranian nuclear program and to reveal what he really wanted audiences to know and believe. This study, which is theoretically based on Halliday's SFG takes three political speeches under different historical backgrounds as the samples to analyze the features of political speeches from the perspectives of ideational, interpersonal metafunctions.

Theoretical background

Obama is one of the America's top speaking coach as Weissman stated (2009). In this book, he specifies a chapter entitled "What every speaker can learn from Obama". It is stated that Obama as a great American speaker has some important techniques, such as keeping eye contact with the audience, gestures, physical movements, using rhetoric language, intertextuality and above all his talent as a good speaker and so forth.

Iran initiated its nuclear program in the mid-1960s under the authoritarian and pro-American regime of Shah Muhammad Reza Pahlavi with U.S support for the program. In 1967, the U.S supplied Iran with a 5-megawatt nuclear research reactor to establish the Tehran Nuclear Research Center (Tarock, 2005). Iran signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT on 1 of July. 1968, the first day the treaty was circulated for signature. Iran subsequently ratified the treaty on March 5, 1970, the same day that the treaty was ratified by the U.S. From then, the U.S rejected and opposed the Iranian peaceful nuclear program.

Aims of the paper

The study aims to reveal implicit meanings and ideological assumptions in Obama's speeches on the Iranian problem. These implicit meanings may exert great influence not only over the Iranians, but also over Muslims all over the world to the extent of coaching their attitudes and interests. Then this research aims to identify how the Iranians are misrepresented and marginalized. Language as a means of communication among people from different districts, different countries

and different continents is the key to such marginalization. Such marginalization may be indicated as result of choosing specific words and phrases. To reach these objects, the research questions can be formulated as follows:

Research Questions

1- How are political speeches structured and exploited to persuade and manipulate the audience and to create an atmosphere of unity?

2- How are the others misrepresented and marginalized?

With these questions, the research findings may help develop strategic functions of processes and presupposed language used in Obama's speeches. It does reveal hidden power relations and opinionated language used to misrepresent the powerless "other". It does illustrate different strategies of manipulating the minds of the audience. These findings may tackle the similarities and differences in Obama's speeches toward different political partners.

Tenets and aims of CDA

Many theorists in CDA present the general principles of CDA in their own terms (van Dijk, 1993; Wodak, 1996; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Meyer, 2001). van Dijk (2001) discusses the main tenets of CDA of Fairclough and Wodak's (1997) as follows (1) CDA addresses social problems, (2) power relations are discursive, (3) discourse constitutes society and culture, (4) it does ideological work, (5) it is historical, (6) the link between text and society is mediated (7) discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory, and (8) discourse is a form of social action.

A crucial objective of CDA is its contribution to addressing the social 'wrongs' of the day (such as injustice, discrimination, marginalization, exclusion and so forth) by analyzing their sources and causes, resistance to them and possibilities of overcoming them. CDA analysts should highlight the usage of such social inequalities and tools used to maintain that power (Fairclough, 1995). The aim is to go beyond textual analysis to uncover hidden meaning and messages as well as possible interpretation.

There are several approaches to critical discourse analysis. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) acknowledge up to eight different theoretical approaches within the field of Critical Discourse Analysis. Three of them have, however, been more influential than others; the social cognitive approach of Van Dijk, the discourse-historical approach associated with Wodak, and finally, the approach advocated by Norman Fairclough and his "orders of discourse" theory.

Political speeches are a kind of frequently used public discourses, which are always exploited to advocate politicians' standpoint, and are considered as a symbol of democracy. A speechwriter should seek answers to a number of questions about the audience. Who are these people? What do they think, if anything, about the topic to be discussed? What are their backgrounds and cultures? Why are they listening to this speech? How does one reach them effectively? The importance of a speech dictates preparation. Duranti (2006) states that the language of politics has been presented and studied in terms of its ability to persuade an audience to go along with the speaker's view of the world and his or her proposal

. Methodology
Data Collection

Three different speeches of Obama representing four different years are collected from the internet. The speeches on the Iranian nuclear program from 2008-2011 are selected to identify the Obama Administration's attitude on this issue. Those speeches are given at different contexts regarding the situation, period and people. White House.gov is considered the leading website for getting such data. They are selected from other sites, such as Sunday Times, Washington Post, Rueters and so on. It's a purposive sample as it is selected purposively.

Tools of analysis
Systemic Functional grammar

There are two strands of thinking regarding studying grammar. Concerning the first strand, language is seen as a set of rules for specifying structures. The traditional theories, such as Generative Grammar, Transformational Grammar and so on, are based on this strand. Grammar learners should follow such conventional rules. For instance, following word order is a key example to clarify studying grammatical structures conventionally. As for the second strand, language is considered a resource for making meanings. Therefore, text is the basic unit and sentences are studied in its discourse environment. This strand concerns studying grammar functionally.

A British-born linguist who mainly worked in Australia, Halliday founded the field of social semiotics and developed systemic functional grammar (sometimes called systemic functional linguistics or SFL). SFG is made up of two components, i.e. systemic grammar and functional grammar. Functional grammar aims at prevailing that language is a means of social interaction. In this approach, meaning is equal to function. Analysts seek to conduct a grammatical description that

includes an explanation of the meanings of whole messages rather than just individual words. The aim of functional analysis is to uncover the reasons why the speaker- writer produces a particular wording rather than any other in a particular context.

In Functional Grammar, analysts break up the sentences and label the parts with main concern on the particular functions which each part serves. Clause is considered the key to sound functional grammar analysis. In Halliday's view, almost all the languages perform simultaneously three metafunctions:1) ideational function, through which the speaker or the writer embodies in his language his experience of both the real world and his inner world; 2) interpersonal function, which reflects the social and personal relations; and 3) textual function, which is the tool of the above two metafunctions and through which the speaker or the writer can produce a text and the listener or the reader can recognize one.

According to Thompson, language has three primary functions: 1- to talk about experiences of one's surrounding world (experiential function), 2- to explain how language is used to interact with other people (interpersonal function), and 3- to organize messages so that they fit with other messages around them, (textual function) (2004, p. 30). He also adds a fourth metafunction called logical metafunction. It explores the types of relationships that can be established between clauses.

The interpersonal meanings relate to the fact that the clause is interrogative, that it expresses the writer's assessment of probabilities and his attitudes, and that it explicitly signals the writer's negotiation with the reader. In a verbal exchange, interactants exactly seek giving and demanding information.

The third function is textual that is concerned with binding linguistic elements together into broader texts. Textual metafunction seeks to answer "whose job is to package ideational and interpersonal meaning as waves of information" (Martin, 2004, p. 323). Logical metafunction, the fourth one, manages the similarities and differences. It explores the types of relationships that can be established between clauses, only when clauses are combined into clause complexes. Connectors such as, despite, although…etc are used to formulate the logical relationship between parts of the clause.

Transitivity System

Transitivity is important in discourse analysis as clause patterns can represent different ways of viewing the world or constructing reality, for example, by representing some people as actors and others as goals. Transitivity is "the key analytic component of ideational metafunction

and provides us with the potential for categorizing the infinite verity of occurrence or going on into a finite set of process types" (Teo, 2000). Transitivity is a system for describing the whole clause where the analysis focuses on processes, participants, and circumstances. The two main elements of transitivity by which reality can be rendered intelligible are process and participant. The process is realized by a verbal group. The participants are realized by a nominal group with some exceptions. Circumstances are realized by adverbial group or prepositional phrase.

The process centers on the part of the clause that is realized by the verbal group, but it can also be regarded as what 'goings-on' are represented in the whole clause. The participants are the entities involved in the process. They are mostly humans. However, not all the participants are human or even animate. The term process is used in two senses: (i) to refer to what is going on in the whole clause, and (ii) to refer to that part of the proposition encoded in the verbal group. Every major clause normally includes at least one participant, which is normally realized by a nominal group. A clause can either be a sentence or a phrase or a paragraph. I typically envelopes one or more processes and also contains one or more process participants.

Main Processes

There are seven major processes types, which generally are dependent on the languages. The important job of determining the processes is carried on by the verbs but other component of the text such names and adverbs help to form a special kind of process or when there is an overlapping of two or more processes, they help to distinguish and differentiate between them.

Material processes refer to doing, happening, creating and changing. A material process, a process of doing, is usually indicated by a verb expressing an action. Two coherent participants are usually found in this process, actor and goal. Actor is the logical subject (those who do), whereas goal is the logical object (those unto whom things are done). In this process, the action may be physical, e.g. He ran 5 miles, or transformative, e.g., the accident killed the man. Halliday (2004) states that 'material' Processes are of a 'doing' type, and can be tested by asking 'what did it do?' or 'what happened to it?'

There are different sub-categorizations for such type, creative and transformative; or intentional and involuntary. In creative material process, goals are being brought into existence and such type process has only an actor, e.g. 'War broke out'. On the other hand, transformational ones relate to some change of state of the actor, e.g., she has stated ….. .

All material processes have an actor, but the actor may not appear explicitly in the clause. One of the main ways in which this can occur is by the choice of a passive clause, 'The oil is added drop by drop'. Material verbs are such as, add, murder, disappear, buy, sell, make, get, happen, aid, destroy and so forth.

A mental process, process of perception, cognition, emotions and desideration facilitates persuading the audience. Mental process clauses normally have at least one participant representing the one who thinks, sees, likes, and wants, and so on. This participant must always be animate and usually is human. Mental clause also has phenomenon, the thing, idea, or fact which is seen, liked, wanted and so forth. It represents the inner experience. Mental process clauses contain four subtypes of processes. They are called perception, affection, cognition, and desideration. The first, perception, includes processes such as seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, and smelling. Emotion is the second type of mental process which includes processes such as loving, hating, fearing, wanting and regretting. Cognition, the third type, has processes of thinking, realizing, deciding, remembering, and forgetting. The last type, desideration, includes processes such as wanting, needing, desiring, wishing, and hoping. Halliday classifies cognitive and desiderative processes as higher type of sensing, and perceptive and emotive processes as lower types of sensing (2004 p.209).

Relational processes are typically realized by the verb be or some verb of the same class(known as copular verbs) ; for example, seem, become, appear or sometimes by verbs such as have, own, possess. Relational processes refer to being and having an attribute or identity, with participants as the 'carriers' or 'identified' and attributes as the 'identifiers'. Relational processes are not 'happenings' but rather states of affairs. The key terms are attributes being related (or carried) by an entity, known as the Carrier. An Attribute may be a quality, an entity, a circumstance, a possession or even a process. Verbs of this process are such as seem, appear, deem and so on. A relational process can be divided into attributive mode and identifying mode. While the first means what properties an object possesses, the other identifies an entity and is used widely in describing people and objects. In relational processes, nothing is happening, and thus it may be argued that they are not true processes.

Existential processes concern existing and being there, such as in the sentence 'There are great pyramids in Egypt'. Existential processes are similar in that nothing can be said to be happening, but simply existing (being there). The principal distinctive grammatical feature is the

unstressed there with the verb be. The entity that is said to exist is called the Existent and is typically associated with a circumstance. For example, there is a cat in the kitchen. Verbal processes are those referring to all those actions that are about saying something (promising, talking and warning). Those who say things are 'sayers' and those who are addressed are 'targets'. Verbal processes are concerned with delivering a message. Participants in this process are sayer, receiver, and verbiage. Social relations are kept in this process. It identifies how the speaker formulates his message to convince the audience. For example, I thanked her for the tea. The speaker may use verbs like tell, thank, congratulate, keep, and so on.

Behavioral processes express behaving (laughing, smiling and singing). Those who perform such processes are called 'behaviors'. Behavioral process is concerned with bodily actions. So it indicates human psychological actions. Behavior and range are the participants. He breathes calmly, is an instance of behavioral processes. This process is not very common. Behavioural process is the grey area between material and mental processes.

Ergative is the final process type which happens by itself. The agent is not mentioned and there is only medium (affected participant). For instance, the door closed. In this case, we don't know who shut the door. The focus is only on the action itself rather than the doer of actions. This type of transitivity system has put its bases on the mode of participants and on the effect that the participants have on each other. It seems that even the notion of transitive in the classic grammar refers to a similar idea, which is restricted to the material process – where a special role is needed to complete the meaning of a material process. Here the main point is that if the Actor has an impact on the other roles or not.

Circumstances are the third topic in grammar – and their realization as adverbs, adverbial phrases, prepositional phrases and subordinate clauses. When we talk about happenings, we often need to refer to their relative timing, location, manner (quality; means etc), causes, conditions, accompaniment (e.g. together, with / without me; by myself), addition (e.g. too, also; as well as me; nor do I), substitution (e.g. instead; in place of …..; instead of going home), exception (e.g. otherwise, else; except for, matter (e.g. about food; advise someone of their rights), role (e.g. as a friend; for a youngster) and viewpoint (e.g. technically; morally; in my opinion, according to experts). In certain processes, a circumstance is obligatory and thus acts as a participant of the process.

There are relatively few studies that deal with Obama's speeches on the nuclear program of the Islamic Republic of Iran in light of SFG within the framework of CDS. Previous studies on Obama are associated with education, reforms and Iraq. Therefore, most available studies investigate ex-American presidents or cover some of Obama's discourse other than the Iranian issue.

Based on Wodak's DHA, there is a study that aims to illustrate the significance of George W. Bush's (2001) declaration of a "war on terror" (Graham, Keenan & Dowd, 2004). Four examples are presented, "call to arms" speeches by Pope Urban II (1095), Queen Elizabeth I (1588), Adolf Hitler (1938) and George W. Bush (2001), to exemplify the structure, function, and historical significance of such texts in Western societies over the last millennium. It's argued further that such texts typically appear in historical contexts characterized by deep crises in political legitimacy.

van Dijk (2005) examines some of the properties of the speeches by Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar held in the Spanish Parliament in 2003, legitimating his support of the USA and the threatening war against Iraq through a multidisciplinary CDA approach relating discursive, cognitive and sociopolitical aspects of parliamentary debates.

The results have pointed out that Aznar uses different strategies to capture the attention span of the audience such as positive-self presentation and negative other- presentation. Such linguistic tools trace back to van Dijk's model of analysis. Great politicians always tend to exert influence on their addresses. At the end of the study, it's stated that Aznar makes use of linguistic features to portray the Iraqi issue negatively.

Using Halliday's SFG framework, Dunmire's study (2005) demonstrates how representations of the future were embedded in and projected through political discourse. He focuses on President Bush's speech on 7 October 2002, which presented his rationale for war against Iraq to a lay, public audience. The analysis shows that the nominalization 'threat' functions in multiple ways to construe a particular vision of future reality. Systematic contrasts in modality serve to privilege that future reality over alternative visions and, simultaneously, to implicate the public in the Administration's vision.

Fairclough (2005b) examines the discourse of a new regime of international relations and international security from a discourse analytical perspective. This study is based on Fairclough's dialectical approach. The data selected are related to doctrinal speeches given by Bush from 1999-2003. It's discussed how Blair contributed to the

emergence of a new hegemonic discourse of international relations and international security in his speeches. It is found out that Bush's speeches are too effective to the extent that they indicate how Bush's third way politics elaborate a new doctrine of international community which in turn has attracted criticism.

Al Sharoufi investigates how journalists use language to manipulate the mentalities of their audience (2006). A thirty one article corpus taken randomly from Al Thawra, Teshreen which are both issued in Syria and Al Quds Al Arabia issued in London between 1998 and 2005, is analyzed. It is found out that these editorials express their ideologies which are pro-Al Ba'ath and anti the West. This is reflected in lexical choices and manipulative strategies. It is very obvious in the era of mass communication that journalists make use of language to change their audience minds. They may change their ideologies and attitudes. Manipulation is regarded as a strategy exploited by the speaker to accomplish public support.

Another relevant study draws on Said's concept of orientalism and van Dijk's concept of the ideological square, analyses three elite American newspaper editorials about the case of Iran's nuclear program (Izadi and Saghaye Biria, 2007). It's pointed out that the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post and the New York Times repeatedly attempt to change people's mind. They tend to exert ideological influences over their audience in the USA or overseas. They emphasise on the idealization of the American decisions and character assassination of the Iranians regarding the case of nuclear weapons. It is found out that the last two newspapers draw more on Orientalist argument than does The New York Times. The sample could be varied to contain other editorial newspapers outside the USA. The sample represents one side and therefore the results couldn't be generalized. The editorials mentioned representatives of the American administration.

Erjavek makes a comparison between Bush's strategies and Serbian Leaders strategies to misrepresent Muslims using CDA (positive-self presentation and negative-other presentation from van Dijk's approach) (2007). This study draws the attention to recontextualizaion as a linguistic concept to frame Muslims and Westerners. It's concluded that Muslims are misrepresented in both cultures (American and Serbian). Both Muslims and Serbians are misrepresented as powerless groups. Both Bush and the Serbian leader not only depict the other groups negatively, but also formulate injustice accusations.

Ferrari (2007) examines George W. Bush's public speeches to the nation in April, 2001 by presenting a framework for a metaphor-based critical analysis of persuasion in political discourse. More specifically, the analysis concentrates on the persuasive strategy enacted to promote the preventive war in Iraq.

Rojecky (2008) who analyzes commentaries and editorials in the New York Times and the Washington Post prior to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq uses a frame analysis to diagnose media elites' analysis of post-9/11 American foreign policy. It's aimed to isolate the mechanism underlying the success of Bush administration's appeals and the implications of its success for media elites' support of USA foreign policy in the aftermath of September 11 attacks. The New York Times and the Washington Post are two of the most influential newspapers in the USA. The findings demonstrate that elite groups reconceptualize the world picture through highlighting the influence of Al Qaeda and the Iraqi regime.

Duran (2008) investigates Functional grammar analysis of Bush and Kerry debates. While Bush begins with them, Kerry places them at the end of his introduction. Bush resorts to utilize more relational of his great effect on the audience. Duran explains that Bush uses 49% material processes and 19% mental processes. On the other hand, Kerry's speeches points out that material processes represent 38% and mental processes represent 13%. Bush rendered himself to be the candidate of actions who healed the world and will continue to do so. At most levels, Bush comes first and thus he is able to persuade the audience of politics easily.

Post conducts a dissertation on "Representations of meanings within textual personas: An analysis of 2008 US presidential campaign speeches" (2009). This study investigates Obama and McCain presidential campaign speecheFs within the framework of CDA. It's based mainly on Van Leeuwen' model of multimodality. It's found out that both nominees make use of their linguistic talents to shape representations and recontextualization which embody the principles which the whole society utilizes within discourse. It's concluded that Post thinks that the Americans are aware of how actually language can manipulate linguistic elements and socio-sematic categories to facilitate presenting cognitive perspective that alters the identity of the audience.

Another study tackles the investigation of the selected Iranian and American printed media on the representations of Hizbullah-Israel war Yaghoobi (2009). This research draws basically on the systemic functional linguistics and the transitivity model developed by Halliday and Matthessein (2004). The results of the textual analysis demonstrate

that the representation of the same news actors, Hizbullah and Israeli forces, by two different and ideologically printed media oppose each other.

There is another study by Aghagolzdeh and Bahrami-Khorshid (2009) entitled "Language as a puppet of politics: a study of McCain's and Obama's speech on Iraq war, a CDA approach". This study aims at investigating the speeches of the two American nominees in the U.S.A and particularly their speech on Iraq war in terms of Fairclough's approach. It's found out that the two senators have shown two opposite stands on the same event. It also indicates that language is used not only to represent the superficial aspects of thoughts and the relation of language to power and ideology, but also to crystallize the deep layers of human's mind and aims.

Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010) conduct a study on the discourse of debates between the Republicans and Democrats in the USA over the war against Iraq. This study is based on van Dijk's model (2004) in which the USA versus Them is tackled. Van Dijk's (2004) framework, as a cognitive approach out of which the 27 ideological discourse structures arise, proves to be an appropriate design which pays attention to many of the techniques by which political figures try to control and penetrate into the mind of their audience to reach their goal. It's found out that discourse plays a crucial role in the reproduction of dominance and inequality and this is obvious through highlighting positive-self presentation and negative-other presentation.

There is another study investigates Obama's campaign speech from the CDA perspective (Brozin, 2010). The main concentration of this study is on persuasive strategies and positive-self presentation and negative-other presentation. It's found out that the use of the pronoun 'we' and its variant 'us' are to represent all those who want to change the political system and to unite the nation. The findings of this study reveal that Obama makes use of inclusive 'we' to unify and convince the audience of the creed and policies of his administration.

Wang (2010) analyses Obama's speeches in terms of Halliday's functional grammar, so transitivity and modality are taken into account. Two speeches are selected to conduct this study; Obama‟s Victory Speech on November 4, 2008 and Obama's Inaugural Address on January 20, 2009. It is stated that Obama depends more on material process to convince the audience of his achievements. He also focuses on modality and particularly on modal verbs, tense and personal pronouns to express his attitudes and new policies.

Horvath conducts a study on the persuasive strategies of President Obama's public speaking as well as the covert ideology of him, enshrined in his inaugural address (2011). This study investigates a corpus of Obama's inaugural speeches from Fairclough's perspective of ideology. Horvath has used Fairclough's approach which is based on investigating Obama's inaugural address in light of description, interpretation and explanation stages. It's found out that Obama uses the inclusive 'we', to unify the nation in the time of global financial crisis and the threat of global terrorism. Obama, as afro-mentioned, is considered one of the top coaching speakers in the USA. The discursive event shaped the text which through interpretation shaped Obama's discourse practice.

Naz and Baseer (2011) investigate three popular speeches given by Obama during October 2002 to February 5, 2008 from a Hallidyan perspective. They state that the ideational function is quite suitable for the analysis and interpretation of political discourse. The results show that Obama uses material processes of action and as well as mental process of affection to physically gather the people around him. Relational processes are used to create his positive image in the minds of people.

Another study tackles Obama's speech "Ending Iraq War", February 27, 2009 (Naz et al: 2012). Naz, et al- investigates the linguistic choices made by Obama through Halliday's model of Transitivity. The findings of analyzing this speech show that Obama uses more material clauses of action to identify the need of American military action in Iraq. He also uses mental processes to touch the emotional side of the audience. Relational attributive processes are employed to create a sense of relativity and authenticity.

There is a relevant study to this thesis by Jahedi and Abdullah (2012) entitled " Post-September 11 discourse: the case of Iran in the New York Times". It examines how the discursive strategies and related linguistic devices are employed by the New York Times to portray Iran after the attacks in the U.S.A on September 11, 2001 and how the media representation may have contributed to negative and or positive outcomes in terms of geopolitical relations. The analysis is composed of 171 front-page TNYT news articles from 2001 until 2009. It's found out that TNYT emphasizes the concepts of violence, threat, etc and highlights negative representation of Iran. Iranian social actors have been misrepresented and associated with fundamentalism, violence and threat.

Peralta conducts a dissertation, concerning a critical discourse analysis of the Obama Administration's Education Speeches (2012). The research is based on qualitative analysis of forty-five speeches delivered by Obama and other leaders from the US Department of Education. One

third of the speeches are given by Obama. The speeches are selected based on their high relevance to education. NVivo (a computer based qualitative research program) is used in the analysis process.

Obama's speech in Cairo University is investigated from a critical discourse analysis perspective (Obaid & Fahad, 2012). Obaid and Fahad's investigation is based on Fairclough's multidisciplinary approach to CDA which was introduced in Language and Power (2001). They focus on the textual level to reveal hidden and implied ideologies behind Obama's speech in Cairo. The findings show that language generally is greatly utilized to achieve Obama's targets to show his clear and plain intentions of peace towards all the global communities and the Islamic world in particular. He seeks to present a new attitude towards the Islamic Republic of Iran because he exploited devices such as his experiential understandings and his expressive comprehension of human reality. Both devices help Obama to present an ideology of change which is based on mutual partnership. Therefore, America's policy is presented favorably.

Moreover, Obama's political speech in Cairo is examined from a Hallidyan model of Transitivity (Al Saaty & Khalaf, 2013). The main concern of this study is on the relationship between the traditional ideas and modern beliefs that the new American administration has presented. Through the relational process, he aims to create a very positive image of himself in the mind of the audience. He is also more interested in using the circumstances of location, both spatial and temporal and circumstances of reason to make his account more objective. The findings show that Obama uses verbs which express a relational process, a process of being, more than other verbs.

Out of the previous investigations of available research studies related to the current study, one can say that most of these studies tackle Obama's discourse which is not related to the Iranian problem either in light of CDA or SFG alone. However, other studies investigate Bush, or even Obama's presidential debates in terms of SFG or rhetoric.

Data Analysis
Material process: AIPAC Speech 2008

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
Iran	posed	a grave threat	to Israel
the Iranian regime	Supports	violent extremists	in the region
it (Iran)	pursues	a nuclear capability	
Iran	supported	terrorism	in 2002
Iran	has stockpiled	150 kilos of low enriched uranium	reportedly

Table 2: Negative Other-Presentation

Obama states that the Iranian regime which supports terrorists could cause a danger arms race through its program. For Obama, the Iranian nuclear power is a critical issue which concerns the national security of his nation. Therefore, his nation opposes severely the Iranian desire of obtaining this technology. Obama, who adds that Iran could transfer this energy to other nations in the region which in turn may hurt the US interests, is the person who undertakes to do everything to prevent Iran from acquiring this power. He goes on to accuse Iran of enriching uranium, a distractive technology that could lead to the transfer of nuclear power in hands of the US enemies.

Iran is the actor of all bad actions such as supporting terrorism, the pursuit of obtaining a nuclear weapon, enriching uranium and posing a grave threat to his nation. Although the verbs "support, pursue, raise, strengthen and abandon" indicate positive attitude towards the speaker, Obama uses them to present negative deeds. Although these verbs indicate doing actions that have positive consequences, Obama associates them with negative goals such as "threat, violent extremists and nuclear capability". These verbs combined with other verbs such as "pose, challenge, spark, threaten, fan, tight, enrich and stockpile", are used to present Iran's negative actions. All these verbs have a negative connotation in their context.

As long as they are negative actions, they lead to negative goals that are preceded by negative adjectives and followed by bad circumstances. These lexical items are negative goals associated with negative doers representing Iran negatively. This negative presentation implies out-casting and isolating Iran which in turn is a way to internationalize the issue.

Obama's selection of verbs such as "support, pursue, enrich, and strengthen" which imply positive actions, gives a negative connotation. Obama emphasizes this impression by choosing adjectives such as "grave, nuclear, less secure, low enriched, dangerous and violent". The two modifiers secure and enriched imply positive thing but they are preceded by less and low to correspond with the negative presentation of Iran's program. All these modifiers of goals play a crucial role in presenting Iran negatively.

Circumstances also support this negative presentation of Iran. Obama states that Iran supports terrorism "in **2000"** to show the audience the long history of sponsoring terrorism. The adverb "reportedly" implies that Obama has reports that Iran is enriching uranium.

The use of first person pronouns is rare in this extract. Obama concentrates on the use of third person and addressee pronouns to

represent Iran and its nuclear issue negatively. He seeks to explain the context of Iran's nuclear weapon rather than expressing his viewpoint.

The negative verbs, adjectives and circumstances are associated with Iran. All these lexical items give the audience an impression that Iran is an enemy of the US. Through this negative description, Obama seeks to pave the way to sanctioning and isolating Iran in the coming future.

AIPAC Speech

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
my goal	is to eliminate	this threat of extremism	
we	will use	all elements of America's power	to pressure Iran
I	will do	everything	to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon
We	will open up	lines of communication	with appropriate Iranian leader
We	should work		with Europe to isolate Iran

Table 3: Positive- Self Presentation

Obama explains that the US will use all elements of American power, even imposing sanctions, to prevent Iran from obtaining the nuclear energy for military purposes. In his AIPAC speech, Obama uses language of accusation and threat against Iran to satisfy the American and Israeli audience who are addressed. Obama and his country are the doers of all good actions that are carried out to humiliate Iran. Leading tough diplomacy against Iran and following an aggressive approach towards Iran are positive achievements from the American perspective.

As a powerful doer, he'll use all elements of power to prevent Iran from having this nuclear energy. Obama uses verbs that give him and his nation power and to weaken Iran as an out-group. These verbs are "eliminate, invade, occupy, pressure, prevent, strengthen, outsource, use, do, open up and weaken". The use of these verbs indicates that the US, as a great power, does all good actions that benefit it and the whole world. He attempts to send a message to Iran that the US has the right to (can) do everything possible in order to prevent Iran from obtaining the energy.

The goals that are associated with Obama and his nation have positive connotations; all elements of America's power, an approach, sustained work, tough diplomacy, threat of extremism, occupying Iraq, lines of communication, interests of the US. All these goals demonstrate America's power to advocate its position. Reading Obama's speech gives

the reader an impression of America's power which does its best to make Iran stop its nuclear energy.

Obama states "we will use all elements of America's power to pressure Iran". In this example, Obama demonstrates the upcoming measures that will be taken to prevent Iran from obtaining the energy. The inclusive "we" refers to sharing responsibility with the audience and at the same time it glorifies his position. The phrase "all elements" makes clear that all elements of America's power are available and are taken seriously.

It is added that "I'll do everything to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon". Obama states that he personally will not do his best but he will do everything available to him to prevent Iran from getting this weapon. These two examples draw the attention to the great danger of the Iranian program on the American interests. In spite of the graveness of Iran's nuclear weapons, the US represented by Obama will do everything and will use all America's power to vanish this program. Therefore, Iran is presented negatively through highlighting the Iranian danger.

Obama uses first person pronouns in this speech. He uses the pronoun 'I' and its possessive pronoun 'my' as a means of praising and approving his actions. This usage also assures the audience of the attitude of the US administration under the rule of Obama. The use of 'I' and its variant 'my' illustrates his obligation personally and institutionally to do everything and to isolate Iran and therefore to isolate it. Using 'we' inclusively weakens the American responsibility and makes an international union against Iran.

Using 'we' inclusively is obvious throughout the investigation of this extract. He says we invaded and occupied Iraq, we will do everything to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. He includes the Americans and Israelis who occupied Iraq. For instance, Obama says "We occupied Iraq. We invaded Iraq". Although Obama approves the process of occupying and invading Iraq, his rejection is related to how and when they occupy Iraq. In these two examples the pronoun 'we' is used inclusively to combine the US and Israel in this process of occupation and invasion.

The choice of lexical items implies that language which humiliates the actions of others and self-glorifies his achievements or actions is used. Verbs of doing, which are prominent, reflect the change in the flow of events as taking place through some input of energy. They state what have been achieved personally or institutionally. Obama seeks to present his nation positively through the use of verbs denoting his achievement.

Actor	Material process	Goal	Circumstance
an Iranian regime	sponsors	terrorism	
Iran	pursues	nuclear weapons	
Iran	threatens	Israel's existence	
a nuclear Iran	would pose	a grave threat	

Table 4: Negative Other Presentation

The message of this speech is the same as that of the previous one. Obama describes Iran and its program as a grave theat. Therefore, he keeps solidarity with the audience and gain their support and clapping. This helps him to isolate Iran and impose sanctions against it in the near future. Iran is the bad doer of bad actions; "threat, threatening Israel's existence, terrorism and nuclear weapon". Iran seeks to get the nuclear energy which is rejected and opposed in the US. The verb sponsor, for example, implies that Iran not only supports terrorism temporarily. However, it sponsors it permanently and in different areas.

Obama repeats using the same verbs that give a negative impression about Iran such as "sponsor, pursue, threaten, face and pose". Although these the verbs "sponsor and pursue" indicate that what comes after them should be positive, Obama associates these two verbs with bad achievements. All these verbs are associated with negative goals such as terrorism, nuclear weapon, Israel's existence, grave threat and all of us. Besides this number of verbs that imply negative connotation supports presenting Iran negatively, Obama's selection of adjectives supports his idea of presenting Iran negatively. The adjectives 'grave and nuclear' give this impression of negative-other presentation.

To portray Iran negatively Obama states "an Iranian regime sponsors terrorism". Obama accuses the Iranian regime frankly of sponsoring terrorism that has negative connotations in America and has destructive consequences as well. He completes this negative presentation of Iran when he says "Iran pursues nuclear weapons". Iran does not only sponsor of terrorism but also it pursues to have dangerous weapons, nuclear weapons that represents grave threats to the US and Israel. He

uses Iran and its program as a negative doer of bad actions that hurt Israel and the US. This negative representation paves the way to impose sanctions against Iran and therefore its isolation.

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
the world	must prevent	Iran	from obtaining nuclear weapon
we	will not involve	ourselves	in any diplomatic negotiations
They	should take	advantage of the shift	in the Bush's administration approach

Table 5: Positive- Self Presentation

As a representative of the US administration, Obama will pressure Iran to stop its program through sanctions and isolation. He states that "the world must prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapon". He attempts to unify the world to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. America and Obama have the power to reject any diplomatic negotiations with Iran but rather they seek to impose sanctions.

The Americans are the actors of all powerful measures to prevent Iran from having the energy. America is the doer which has the right to reject holding negotiations with Iran unless the latter stop its program. It's a conditioned and restricted consultation. Mobilizing more serious sanctions is another positive action that is associated with a negative target goal, Iran. These sanctions are to be more serious to have a great effect on the Iranian part. All these examples show Iran as a nation out of power. Achieving the goals represents the US positively.

The world is the main actor that must prevent the negative object Iran, from having this weapon. It's not only the US that has this right but also the whole world should take part in this process. Obama expresses the American approach through the use of 'I' will take no options off the table. The US will not involve itself in negotiations with Iran about its program. This self-glorification lowers the distance between Obama and his audience and helps him to be supported as well.

Obama draws more on verbs of action that advocate his position as a president of the great power. These verbs are such as "prevent, sent, avoid, mobilize, and will not involve". These verbs give the reader an impression of the great power of the US which may prevent Iran from obtaining the nuclear weapon. He praises the approach and policy of his nation on Iran's nuclear power through highlighting these verbs that present his nation powerfully and positively. This kind of verbs implies

self-glorification. This powerful position gives the US the right to carry out whatever it decides.

The goals "Iran, sanctions and ourselves" which are to be passive recipient of the effects of these active verbs, are associated with this kind of verbs. Obama who states "I'll take no options off the table" says "we will not involve ourselves in any diplomatic negotiations". These two examples show the American attitude towards solving the Iranian problem. The US that doesn't favor setting on the table and involving itself in any diplomatic negotiations seeks to deliver a message that it will impose severe sanctions against Iran. The US and its president have the power to determine its new approach as a means of presenting himself positively.

Positive-Self Presentation is associated with portraying the message of Obama and his nation as a powerful group that has the right to decide which nation can acquire the nuclear power.

Obama speech in Cairo University 2009

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
Iran	has played	a role	in the middle of the Cold War
Iran	has defined	itself	by its opposition to my country
Iran	has played	a role	in acts of hostage-taking and violence against us

Table 6: Negative Other Presentation

Obama's language starts to be improved towards the Islamic world and towards Iran particularly in his speech in Cairo. He starts with praising Iran because of its role in the middle of the Cold War. On the other hand, as usual, Iran is the doer of most bad actions that are to hurt not only the US and Israel but also the Arab World and the world as whole. Iran defies the US and it plays a role in negative and critical acts against the US which is the victim of Iran's dangerous acts. He tries to draw the attention of his audience in the Muslims World that the Iranian program will affect their existence negatively in order to approve his future measures against Tehran.

Obama states that "Iran has played a role in the middle of the Cold War". However, he completes the series of acussing Iran in supporting acts of hostage taking against the US and pursuing to get the nuclear energy which leads this region and the world down a hugely dangerous path. Iran is the actor of only one positive action, its support to the US in the Middle of the Cold War.

Although the verb "play" (a role) that implies both positive and negative actions, is connected with negative goal, "acts of hostage-taking

and violence against us" and positive goal, "role in the middle of the Cold War". This use of the same verb with different goals reveals Obama's talent as an excellent speaker who makes use of words to convince the audience of his idea. Other verbs such as "defy, lead and comply" present Iran negatively.

The goals are imply negative connotations to affect the target audience. These goals, "role, the region and the World and its responsibilities" imply positive events. However, Obama relates them to negative actions and in a negative way. This is obvious through his selection of circumstances such as "by its opposition to my country, to nuclear weapons and down a dangerous path". He attempts to put in the minds of the audience, as Arab and Muslim people, the critical effects of the Iranian energy on their interests and security.

It's stated that "Iran has defined itself by its opposition to my country". This is a kind of presenting Iran negatively as an opponent to America. He adds "that weapons could lead this region and the world down a hugely dangerous path". In this example, Obama warns that the Iranian nuclear weapons will lead to the spread of these dangerous weapons in the Middle East and the whole world. The word "path" is preceded by the modifier "dangerous" that was preceded by the adverb "hugely" to show the audience the negative consequences of this weapon. The adverb "hugely" implies that these weapons are too dangerous. Throughout these examples Iran is presented negatively.

Obama speech to the Muslim World 2009

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
the US	has played	a role	in the overthrow of a democratically elected government in Iran
we	will proceed with	courage, rectitude and resolve	
my country	is prepared		to move forward

Table 7: Positive Self Presentation

Obama attempts to keep solidarity with the audience since he addresses Iran as the Islamic Republic of Iran. Other lines are open to prevent Iran from obtaining the nuclear energy. It isn't the language of threat that is sought to be highlighted. The audiences are different and therefore he changes his language to language of diplomatic discussions.

He and his country are the actors of positive actions such as "preparing to move forward". The US could settle any issue diplomatically with the exception of Iran's program that is a decisive

point for his nation. The US, we and his country are the doers of good actions such as "proceeding with courage and preparing to move forward". Verbs such as "proceed, prepare and overcome" are associated with positive achievements such as "role, courage, rectitude and resolve". Obama states "his country is prepared to move forward". This will be through diplomatic discussions which in turn help to overcome decades of mistrust between the two nations. The actor that does all these good actions in a good manner is assumed to convince the audience easily. Obama depends more on self-glorification as a feature to persuade the target audience.

The use of circumstances supports his Positive-Self Presentation. The circumstance, "to move forward", implies this positive presentation. Therefore, the use of verbs denotes positive actions associated with positive goals in a positive way that makes the audience clap and favor his approach.

The lexical items associated with Obama and his country indicate some kind of lexical bias because he attempts to praise the American role in all good actions even though in the election of a democratically elected government in Iran. The American adminstration will work with courage to stop the Iranian program.

G-20 Speech

Actor	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance
the Islamic Republic of Iran	has been building	a covert uranium enrichment facility	near Qom for several years
Iran	has concealed	information	about its nuclear program
Iran	must be prepared		to create confidence
implied (Iran)	take concrete steps		to cooperate fully with the NPT

Table 8: Negative-Other Presentation

In his G-20 speech, Obama accuses Iran of enriching uranium in a site that deepens the US concern. He says "Iran's concealed information about its program". Iran's facility underlines its continuing unwillingness to meet its international obligations for decades. There are treaties among nations whose rules are to be followed to prevent the spread of nuclear power.

He attempts to make Iran obliged even orally to cooperate fully with the international treaties and to take concrete steps to create

confidence with the international community and the US particularly. It's a language of threatening and obligation to force Iran to cope with the US claims and this language reflects use of powerful language to exert great influence over the minds of the addressees. He says 'Iran must be prepared to cooperate fully with the international community about its program'. This agrees with the US claims on Iran's nuclear power.

Iran is the actor of all bad actions such as enriching uranium, concealing information and refusing to cooperate with the international organizations. The actors, Iran, its nuclear site and the existence of nuclear facility, have negative goals. They do all the bad actions such as "build, underscore, deepen and conceal". The verb "build" implies positive achievement. Obama uses this verb to present a negative issue from his own perspective, Iran's nuclear weapon. These verbs that imply negative attitude are associated with negative goal such as uranium, unwillingness, concern and information. These goals are "enriching uranium, hiding information and growing concern".

Obama states "the Islamic Republic of Iran has been building a covert uranium enrichment facility near Qom for several years". He accuses the Islamic Republic of Iran of building not only a uranium enrichment facility but a covert one that existed several years near Qom. Although he says "the Islamic Republic of Iran", as an address term that shortens the distance with the Iranian people, Obama presents evidence about the truthfulness of the Iranian program while highlighting the place and time of building this facility.

To complete this negative image of Iran, Obama adds "this site deepens growing concern". The US worries about the Iranian program. It's added that "Iran has concealed information about its nuclear program". Obama, who accuses Iran of building a covert enrichment facility, does also accuse it of concealing information about its program. All these examples indicate a negative presentation of Iran.

This speech is a new trend in Obama's discourse on Iran. It is time for internationalizing this issue in order to impose sanctions against Iran and to isolate it internationally through associating it with these negative actions that lead consequently to negative consequences from his point of view. Obama paves the way to more serious measurements against Iran.

There are no examples in this speech associated with Positive-Self Presentation of Obama and his nation. Highlighting Iran as a bad doer and a negative goal in Obama's speech to the G-20 refers to the new American policy towards Iran through internalizing its issue. As a means of discrimination against Iran, Obama presents various accusations to it rather than presenting his nation positively.

Mental processes

Sensor	Mental Process	Phenomenon	Circumstance
we	knew	that Iran supported terrorism	in 2002
we	knew	that Iran had an illicit nuclear weapon	
we	knew	Iran posed a grave threat to Israel	

Table 11: AIPAC Speech

Obama transfers from language of achievements to the influence of cognition. He admits they as Americans and Israelis knew that Iran had illicit nuclear weapons. These alleged weapons represent a grave threat to Israel, the major ally to his nation. He warns the audience from the graveness of this threat on the existence of Israel and on the US interests. He also admits of the failure of Bush's policy toward the Iran nuclear power.

Obama, his nation and the audience are the sensors who knew that Iran had illicit nuclear program which in turn represents a grave threat to the US and Israeli security. This sensor gets also that Iran supported terrorism in 2002. Most phenomena are associated with Iran. They are negative phenomena. Obama and his audience are able to know and understand the graveness of the Iranian energy. This is a kind of excluding the other even mentally which leads to presenting this out-group negatively. Obama draws more on cognitive mental verbs such as "know, understand and think" to present himself and his nation positively.

Obama depends on cognitive verbs to facilitate convincing his audience. He states '"we knew Iran supported terrorism in 2002". In this example, Obama describes Iran negatively as a supporter of terrorism in 2002. He attempts to convince his audience of the Iranian role in supporting terrorism which is to be considered as a fact.

The use of cognitive verbs is a feature in this speech to present Iran negatively through linking it to negative phenomena and highlighting these negative phenomena. For example, "we knew that Iran supported terrorism in 2002". "We knew that Iran had an illicit nuclear weapon". In these two examples "we" is the sensor who knew that Iran supported terrorism and had an illicit nuclear weapon, the phenomenon. Supporting terrorism and having an illicit nuclear weapon imply negative presentation of Iran. All other examples tackle the same issue, presenting Iran negatively in order to approve any feature policy towards it from the American perspective.

In this speech, he talks as a presidential candidate who seeks to be supported. Therefore, inclusive we is exploited to shorten the distance with audience and to keep solidarity between him and them. Through this way, he seeks to present himself positively. He is the only person who can judge well so the audience is to trust what he says. They all as a speaker and hearers knew some alleged views about Iran's energy. These claimed ideas are an introduction to impose severe sanctions against Iran.

Sensor	Mental Process	Phenomenon	Circumstance
I	know	my goal is to avoid the hypothetical	
I	want	the Iranians to understand that they should take advantage of the shift	

Table 12: Sderot Speech

He addresses the Israeli and American audience. It's stated that his goal is to avoid the hypothetical. Obama asks the Iranians to benefit from the shift in the American policy. He needs to understand the nature of the Iranian program as he claimed. He sought to discuss the effects of this power with the Israelis. The Iranians decided to stand down on their nuclear weapons. Verbs of cognition and desiderdation are used more than others of affection and perception. Sensors are mostly Obama and the pronouns "we" and "they" that refer to the Iranians.

Obama is the sensor who looks forward to continuing diplomatic discussion about Iran's power. He is the only sensor who wants the Iranians to benefit from the shift in the US policy. He has the right to understand that the Iranians as a phenomenon should make use of the shift in the US. As an intelligent speaker, the use of cognitive and desiderative verbs facilitates persuading the audience.

Cognitive verbs such as "know" imply that Obama has the sound knowledge which entitles him to judge well and therefore his thoughts are to be trusted. For example, he knows that his goal is to avoid the hypothetical and he understands that the Iranian should benefit from the shift in the approach of Bush's administration towards Iran. Obama and his nation are the 'two sensors' who think, know, look forward and understand. These verbs indicate the validity of what comes after them which are to be considered facts.

He expresses his wishes and hopes to continue discussions with his allies in Israel on this issue. Americans and Israelis are the sensors who don't want Iran to start enriching uranium. They share the same desideration concerning the enrichment process. Sensors are "I" and "you" pronouns and "the Iranians". However, "you" refers here to the

Israeli audience and some Americans who live in Israel and are to support him. All these verbs and sensors support Obama's self-glorification.

Like the situation in AIPAC speech, Obama uses cognitive verbs such as "know, understand and think". Desiderative verbs come second in this extract after cognitive ones. Obama states "I want the Iranians to understand that they should take advantage of the shift". Obama wishes the Iranian to benefit from the shift in the American policy. Most desiderative verbs illustrate his personal or institutional wishes and hopes regarding the Iranian program.

Cognitive verbs present Iran negatively while desiderative ones highlight the great role of America. Obama also talks directly to the audience saying, "you don't want it to get started". He addresses the audience who are hoped to prevent Iran from obtaining the nuclear weapon that is disapproved in the US. He addresses his audience as if they also reject the Iranian program. Both cognitive and desiderative verbs followed by a phenomenon either present the US policy positively or present Iran negatively. Obama highlights the Iranian nuclear weapons, bad phenomenon.

Sensor	Mental Process	Phenomenon	Circumstance
I	recognize	it will be hard to overcome decades of mistrust	
I	understand	those who protest that some nations has weapons	

Table 13: Cairo Speech

In his speech to the Muslim world, Obama asks Iran about what future it wants to reach or build as regards its relations with the US through this new beginning. Obama states "I recognize it'll be hard to overcome decades of mistrust between our two nations easily". However, he seeks diplomatic consultations which are based on mutual interests to overcome this chronic problem of mistrust and to settle the Iranian issue peacefully as he alleged in this speech.

Obama is the sensor who recognizes, understands, and makes clear the American point and Iran is the sensor who is asked about what future it wants. Obama focuses on cognitive verbs such as "understand and recognize". This helps him to present his policy positively and therefore to be represented well.

There are three examples in this extract, one desiderative and two cognitive. He states "I recognize it'll be hard to overcome decades of mistrust between our two nations". He explicitly expresses a great concern over that said chronic crisis of deep mutual mistrust between Iran

and the US. He implies the fact that overcoming such a bad history of negative relations is not an easy move, at all. The phenomenon "decades of mistrust" implies a negative attitude towards Iran. The difficulty of settling decades of mistrust between the IRI and the US is taken into account as a fact which would typically require exerting greater efforts.

In his desiderative example 'what future it (Iran) wants'. Here, Obama inquiries blaming Iran about its future. For him, Iran that will succeed if it approves and caries out the American policy, is supposed to approve the American approach. The future of Iran is conditioned with approving the American perspective.

Obama states "I understand those who protest that some nations have weapons that others don't have". He attempts to assure the audience, the Arab and Muslim addressees, which some nations like Iran has nuclear weapons which are disapproved and he agrees with them.

In mental process, cognition is the primary subcategory of process types and desideration ranks second which is followed by emotions. The findings of this investigation agree with Halliday's view (2004). Both cognitive and desiderative verbs support Obama's negative presentation of Iran and its program that is described as a nuclear program.

Relational process

Carrier	Relational	Attribute	Circumstance
the danger	is	grave	from Iran
and my goal	will be	to eliminate the threat	
Iran	Has	an illicit nuclear program	
the US and Israel	Are	less secure	
we	Have	no time	to waste in discussions
the Iranian regime	is	the author	of its own isolation

Table 16: AIPAC Speech

Obama describes the Iranian threat to be grave to both the US and Israel. As a presidential nominee, his aim is to eliminate this threat. It's stated that the Iranian illicit nuclear power is the only source of this threat. The US opposes neither Iran nor the Iranian people but rather it challenges its nuclear energy which makes the US and Israel less secure. This energy is the source of Iran's isolation internationally. Both nations have no time to waste investigating this issue without passing this into law.

Iran, a carrier, possesses things which hurt the US and Israel. Iran's energy as an attribute makes the US and Israel less secure. Obtaining nuclear weapons is in itself positive for Iran, but it is a threat to the US.

Obama states also that "the Iranian regime is the author of its own isolation". From the American perspective, the attitude of the Iranian regime in acquiring this energy is the real source of its isolation.

He uses Iran's danger, Iran and the Iranian regime as carriers which have or are serious and dangerous for America. Another example, Iran has an illicit nuclear program. It isn't an ordinary program but it's an illicit one. Obama states "Iran has an illicit nuclear program". Iran, a carrier, possesses unknown and secret nuclear program, attribute. For him, Iran has a critical program which makes the US and Israel less secure. This is an example of possessive relational process in which Iran is presented negatively. Concerning intensive relational process, Obama adds "the Iranian regime is the author of its isolation". The identifier, the Iranian regime, is the source of its isolation, the identified. These examples illustrate negative-other presentation of Iran. Iran is presented as a carrier that possesses only negative attributes, nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, Obama presents himself and his nation positively. He admits "we must be clear about the failure of today's policy". This implies that the US has to prepare for more serious measurements against Iran. He states also that "they have no time to waste in traditional solutions like discussions or even to sit down with their adversaries". To describe Iran as a threat, Obama states "the danger from Iran is grave". Iran is not only described to represent an ordinary threat but it has a grave threat. Iran, an identifier, is really a grave threat, an identified. The adjective "grave" implies that this threat will hurt the US's interests.

To challenge the Iranian grave threat as stated, Obama says "my goal will be to eliminate the threat". Obama's goal is the carrier that is associated with an attribute, "the threat", that gives the audience negative implications. As one of his main goals, the Iranian energy is considered a threat which is to be overcome. He gives himself the right to take into account Iran in this way and at the same time to view his goal in this manner. This gives the reader an impression of change in the US approach with Iran. His policy is presented well to assure the audience the US will prevent Iran from obtaining the energy.

After presenting the Iranian threat that is grave, Obama shows his goal, to eliminate this grave threat, through preventing Iran from having this nuclear energy. He seeks to present his nation in a way that is to be favored.

Carrier	Relational Process	Attribute	Circumstance
a nuclear Iran	would pose	a grave threat	
we	Have	to do it (make Iran stand down on its nuclear weapons)	now
a nuclear Iran	would be	our single - most important threat	both to Israel but also the USA
many of these countries, including Iran	have	ties	to terrorist organizations

Table 17: Sedrot Speech

Obama talks to the Israelis and describes his discussions with the Israeli leaders as productive talks on the Iranian issue. Since he has become president, his aim is to avoid the hypothetical regarding the grave threat of the Iranian program on both the US and its major ally. Iran is accused of having ties to terrorist organizations that seek to harm the US interests.

He presents Iran as a carrier which has or possesses grave program. Iran is preceded by the modifier "nuclear" and threat as an attribute is preceded by the adjective "grave". He says Iran is one of the countries which have ties with terrorist organizations which the US fights. These organizations are modified by a negative adjective "terrorist". All these examples deliver a message that Iran is misrepresented as an out-group.

He states "I had a series of productive discussions with many of Israel's key leaders". Obama as a carrier had discussions, as attribute. This attribute is modified by the adjective "productive" to show the audience that they are to gain its fruits. These discussions are with many Israel's key leaders. The reader understands that these discussions are serious and critical so it'll have its consequences. Obama's goal is to avoid the hypothetical about Iran's threat that is grave. He asks his nation and its ally to stop Iran's nuclear weapon. This is to present himself and his nation positively.

Concerning the relational, Iran is identifier as the only signatory of NPT whose nuclear ambitions are related to musk a secret project. It's the Carrier and Attribute of readiness and possessor of military program. Most relational clauses are intensive. It clarifies the importance of being. They are in active voice and have two inherent participants, carrier and attribute. Possessive clauses are used while talking about Iran's nuclear weapons. So it's real that Iran has nuclear weapons. Therefore, Iran is presented negatively through highlighting the great effects of its nuclear program.

Carrier	Relational Process	Attribute	Circumstance
this history (of mistrust between the US and Iran)	Is	well known	
It	will be	Hard	to overcome decades of mistrust
this issue	has been	a source of tension	between the US and the IRI
and any nation including Iran	should have	the right to peaceful nuclear power	
this (right to peaceful nuclear power)	is not	simply inevitable	

Table 18: Cairo University speech

Iran is depicted as an opponent nation to the US. The history of their relations is well known that Iran is against America as he claimed. Obama admits of the difficulty of overcoming decades of mistrust between the two nations due to the Iran's nuclear power.

This issue has been the source of tension between them. The day to have a new beginning with Iran wasn't evitable but it requires great efforts. The commitment of the IAEA is to prevent nations of the third World from obtaining nuclear energy. He claims that Iran as most nations should have the right to peaceful nuclear power which the US determines.

Iran and its program are the attributes of all bad actions that harm the US interests. Iran's program as a "carrier" has been the source of tension between these two countries. Obama presents the history of mistrust between his nation and Iran as a well-known history. All these carriers are related to negative attributes such as tension, well known history of mistrust. Iran's nuclear program as a carrier is associated with peaceful purposes as an attribute. The US will not allow Iran to get this energy in this way. Therefore, America opposes that and it's the right to determine the nature of the program as for peaceful purposes or for military intentions.

He seeks to present Iran as the author of the tensions between the two nations. Although they had decades of mistrust and tensions due to Iran's nuclear program it's possible to overcome this dilemma only if Iran complies with the rules of the AIEA. Obama addresses Muslim and Arab audience whom are to approve his attitude towards Iran. Obama states 'any nation including Iran should have the right to peaceful nuclear weapon'. This manifests that Iran's program which is to be determined by the US is still for military purposes.

Obama also says that "more nations acquire the World's most deadly weapons". It's known that more nations acquire the World's most deadly weapons and America does not accept Iran to join this group of nations. A carrier "more nations" is linked to "the world's most deadly weapons", an attribute that has a negative connotation. This example implies that it isn't allowed for Iran to be one of these nations which have the World's most deadly weapons.

Iran is depicted negatively because it doesn't have the ability to determine that its energy is for peaceful purposes. This historical background is to present Iran negatively. Iran's role is passive and will not be effective.

Conclusion

The main features of Obama's speeches on the Iranian issue can be summarized as follow. It's found out that material, relational and mental processes have been used in these speeches. Iran as an actor is associated with bad goals "threat, concealing information, violating its obligation and enriching uranium". For Obama, these are bad goals so he modifies them by negative adjectives through selecting circumstances that present Iran negatively. Obama took many steps to convince the audience that Iran's program isn't for peaceful purposes. Iran is accused of seeking to obtain nuclear military energy. Material processes are represented eighty-five times out of one hundred and fifty-six. This large proportion of material processes reflects the importance of language of achievements and deeds in the extracts under examination.

Obama makes use of cognitive verbs from the mental process to facilitate persuading the target audience of his viewpoints. Verbs such as "knew, know, understand, recognize", and other cognitive verbs are used to support him. These verbs, which indicate that what comes after them are to be considered facts, are supposed to believe these points. Using verbs of cognition enhances the possibility of persuading the audience through addressing their brains and at the same time it weakens the Iranian position internationally.

Iran and its energy are bad carriers which are associated with negative attributes such as "threat, nuclear arms race, nuclear weapon, deadly weapons and mistrust". All these negative attributes are modified negatively because he uses adjectives which have negative connotations. These modifiers are such as "most deadly, grave, first, strong, true and our single-most important threat". All these carriers, attributes and adjectives have negative connotations. Therefore, Iran is negatively presented.

Through the analysis, it could be found out that: Firstly, in political speeches, the speakers aim to describe the objective fact and to persuade the audiences to accept their political viewpoints. So from the perspective of transitivity system, the material processes account for the largest proportion in political speeches; the relational processes and relational processes rank the second place; and behavioral processes and verbal processes are seldom used. Secondly, the speakers' communicating purpose is the publicity of their main thoughts so as to make the audiences do what they want them to do. So the declarative mood is often used in political speeches. Meanwhile, the imperative mood is used sometimes. In addition, the first personal pronoun "we", which is used frequently, reflects the close relationship between the speakers and the audiences.

References

Aghalgolzadeh, F & Bahrami-Khurshid, S. (2009). Language as a puppet of politics: A study of MacCain's and Obama's speech on Iraq War, a CDA approach. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory 2(1):* 218-219.

Al Saaty, N & Khalsf, A. (2013). A critical discourse analysis of Obama's political speech in Cairo University. *Al Hadaba Un. College. Future Studies Centre. 41:1-30.*

Al Sharoufi, H. (2006).Critical discourse analysis of political editorials in Arab newspapers. *Proceedings of The 11ᵀᴴ Conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics. 8-27.*

Brozin, M. (2010). The intentions behind Barrack Obama's strategic use of pronouns.

Dunmire, P. L. (2005). Preempting the future: Rhetoric and ideology of the future in political discourse. *Discourse &Society 16 (4):* 481- 513.

Duranti, A. (2006). Narrating the political self. *Language in Society 35:* 467-497.

Eggins, S. (2004). An introduction to systemic functional linguistics. (2ⁿᵈ Ed.). London: Continuum.

El Hussari, I.A. (2007). President Bush's address to the nation on U. S. policy in Iraq: A critical discourse analysis approach. In U, Okulska and P, Cap. Perspectives in politics and discourse. John Benjamins, 99-117.

Erjavec, K. (2007).War on terrorism as a discursive battleground: Serbian Recontextualization of G.W. Bush's Discourse. *Discourse and Society Journal 18 (2):123-137.*

Fairclough, N. (1995a). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Harlow, U K: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995b). Media Discourse. London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Language and power. (2nd Ed). London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2005a). Critical discourse analysis. *Marges Linguistiques (9): 76-94.*

Fairclough, N. (2005b). Critical discourse analysis in transdisciplinarry research. In R. Wodak, & P. Chilton (eds). A new agenda in (Critical) Discourse analysis: theory, methodology and interdiscipliarity (pp.58-70). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fairclough, N. (2009). A Dialectical-Relational Approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), Methods of critical discourse analysis (pp. 162-187). London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A.van Dijk (Eds.), Discourse as social interaction (discourse studies: A multidisciplinarry introduction (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.

Ferrari, F. (2007). Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: Investigating a 'preventive war' persuasion strategy. *Discourse & Society, 18(5)*: 603-625.

Graham, P., Keenan, T. & Dowd, A. (2004). A call to arms at the end of history: A discourse-historical analysis of George W. Bush's declaration of war on terror. *Discourse & Society, 15(2-3):* 199-221.

Halliday, M.A.K (1994). An introduction to functional grammar. (2ⁿᵈ Ed). London: Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K (2004). An introduction to functional grammar. (3ʳᵈ Ed). London: Arnold.

Hart, C. (2010). Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science new perspectives on immigration discourse. University of Hertfordshire, UK.

Horvath, J. (2009). Critical discourse analysis of Obama's political discourse. Language, literature and culture in a changing transatlantic world international conference proceedings. *University Library of Prešov University, 22-23.*

Izadi, F & Saghaye-Biria, H. (2007). A discourse analysis of American elite newspaper editorials: The case of Iran's nuclear program. *Journal of Communication Inquiry 31(2):* 140- 165.

Jahedi, A & Abdullah,A. (2012).Post-September11 discourse: the case of Iran. *International Journal of English Linguistics 2(1):140-167.*

Locke, T. (2004). Critical discourse analysis. London: Continuum.

Machin, D & Mayr, A. (2012). How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction. Sage publications: New Delhi and Washington DC.

Mashiri, Z. (2001). Managing face in urban public transport: Polite requests strategies in commuter omnibus discourse in Harare. *University of Zimbabwe Publications*.

McKenna, B. (2004). Critical discourse studies: Where to from here? *Critical discourse studies. 1(1): 9-39.*

Meyer (2001). Between theory, method and politics: positing of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), Methods of critical discourse analysis. London: Sage.

Naz, S & Baseer, A (2011). An investigation of the political discourse of Obama's selected speeches: A Hallidian perspective. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. 1(16): 150-160.*

Naz, S, Alvi, D & Baseer, A (2012). An analysis of Obama's speech "Ending Iraq War, February 27, 2009": A Hallidian approach. Interdiscip. *Journal of Contimporary Research in Business. 4(8): 211-240.*

Obaid, A & Fahad, A. (2012). Obama's speech in Cairo "New Beginning": A critical discourse analysis. *Adab Zikar Journal. 2 (6):165-190.*

Peralta, K. A. (2012). A critical discourse analysis of the Obama administration's education speeches. Loyola Marymount University.

Posta, M. D. (2009) Representations of meanings within textual personas: An analysis of 2008 US presidential campaign speeches. University of Birmingham.

Reisigl, M & Wodak, R. (2001). Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and anti-Semitism. London: Routledge.

Reisigl, M & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), Methods of critical discourse analysis (pp. 87-122). London: Sage.

Richardson, J. (2004). (Mis)representing Islam: the racism and rhetoric of British broadsheet newspapers. Philadeliphia: John Benjamins.

Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. Mahwah, New Jersy. London.

Rojecky, A. (2008). Rhetorical alchemy: American exceptionalism and the war on terror. *Political Communication, 25(1): 67-88.*

Sheyholislami, J. (2001): "Critical Discourse Analysis". Retrieved June 10, 2007, from http://www.carleton.ca/~jsheyhol/cda.htm. Pp. 17-33.

Tarock, A. (2005).The Superpowers' involvement in the Iran-Iraq War.

Tarock, A. (2006). Washington: To engage or change the rejime in Iran? *New Political Science 28 (1): 81-99.*

Thompson, G. (2004). Introducing functional grammar. (2nd ed). New York: Oxford University Press.

Titscher, S., M. Meyer, R. Wodak, & E. Vetter (2000). Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis, London: Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society 4(2): 249-283.*

Van Dijk, T.A. (2005). War rhetoric of a little ally political implicatures and Aznar's ligetimization of the war in Iraq. *Journal of Language and Politics 3(2): 145-177.*

van Dijk, T.A. (2006). `Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society 17(3): 359-383.*

van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A socio-cognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis (*pp. 62-85). London: Sage.

Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research 1 (3): 254-261.*

Weiss, G., & Wodak. (2003). Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weissman, J. (2009). The power presenter, Technique, style, and strategy from to America's speaking coach. Ltd.

Wodak, R. (1996). Disorders of discourse. London: Longman.

Wodak, R. (2001a):"What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments". In: Wodak, R. / Meyer, M. (eds.): Methods of critical discourse analysis (pp. 1-13). London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2001b). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (eds.). Methods of critical discourse analysis (pp. 63–95). London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2009). Politics as usual: The discursive construction and representation of politics in action. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). Methods of critical discourse analysis (1st ed). London: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: history, agenda, theory and methodology. In Wodak, R., & Meyer, M (eds) Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (2nd ed). London: Sage.

Yaghoobi, M (2009). A critical discourse analysis of the selected Iranian and American printed media on the representations of Hezbollah-Israel war. Tabriz University, Iran.

Young, L & Harrison, C. (2004). Systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis: Studies in social change. London: New York, Continuum.