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ABSTRACT

Thesis Title: Power Relations and Hegemony in Global Politics: A Critical Discourse Analysis

This qualitative study explores the power relations and hegemony in the global political discourse by utilizing the theory of Critical Discourse Analysis. The study is backgrounded in the situation created after the YouTube release of the movie trailer *The Innocence of Muslims* in September 2012. The video of the trailer containing blasphemous content against Islam and the Prophet Muhammad (SAWW), received protests by Muslims throughout the world culminating in destructions and deaths. The main concern of the study was to explore the construction and reconstruction of power relations through discursive practices of the world political actors in a particular context. I chose 67th United Nations General Assembly Meeting 2012 as setting of the study. I selected six speeches which were delivered in the meeting as data for this research. The data has been analyzed utilizing Fairclough’s (1992a) framework of intertextuality and hegemony. The analysis is based on the study of various intertextual references present in the selected speeches. The detailed analysis of the data shows that power relations are exposed in discursive practices of the world political actors. The study concludes that the discursive strategies of the political actors disclose the construction, sustenance and fracture of the power/hegemonic relations in the context of global politics. The dominant political actors use different discursive strategies to construct powerful self-image and intensify the negative aspects of the subordinate group. The subordinate political actors struggle to construct positive self-image and assist the dominant group in constructing and sustaining the power relations and hegemony. However, their economic status and political situation lead them to assist or resist the dominant ideologies. The study adds to the field of knowledge by highlighting important issue of the present time i.e. the divide between the issue of blasphemy and freedom of expression.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Language is a social phenomenon that is used as a tool for interaction and communication by the social actors in a social set up. The two factors, interaction, and communication are influenced by a number of factors including age, gender, social status, knowledge, rank etc. Language operates in every institution of the society and is incorporated in the social world of its users that makes it “irreducible part” of their social life. It is “dialectically interconnected” with the social structures in such a way that it cannot be excluded when society is the subject of study or social life is to be examined (Fairclough, 2003).

These aspects of language are usually discussed under the heading of discourse that sees language in its context and holds that language use is determined by the context called “dialectical relationship” (Fairclough et.al. 2011, p. 257) between discourse and context. Context is created by the situation, institution and social structures in which a discursive event takes place. The context for discourse is provided and shaped by social norms and values, culture, religion, social institutions and situations in which language is used.

Discourse in a specific context restricts and controls the language usage. This control varies from person to person and is determined by the position of a person in the social context of the discursive event. Discursive power is not stable or permanent rather it shifts in accordance with the role and position of the social actor as well as the context of discourse. Powerful social actors in a context, dominate and control the discourse of other social actors but with the change of context, they might lose their power. For example, the chief minister of a province enjoys power in the provincial
assembly but he/she does not have a similar level of power in the national assembly to enjoy because the change of the context changes his/her position and change in his/her position changes his/her status in the binary of power relations. This is also exposed in his/her discursive choices that are different in both the contexts. Hence, the relationship between the dominant and the subordinate social actors is constructed and is reflected in the discourse that they use, and that is how discourse relates to power and power relates to discourse.

The Foucauldian concept suggests “power is not possessed by a dominated agent nor located in that agent’s relations to those dominated but is instead distributed throughout complex social network” (Gutting, 2005, p.110). The relationship between discourse and power is all about unveiling the binary of power relations where social actors are associated with each other in different social institutions of a broader social set up. Discourse in a power set up also exposes the struggle of the social actors to construct and sustain the power relations (Fairclough, 1992a, 2003). It is used as a tool to structure and restructure the ideologies of the individuals and groups which is observable in the power relations at every level in a society, i.e. from a most basic unit of the family to the larger units like religion and politics. The job of Critical Discourse Analyst is to examine the discourse of the social actors to unbury their hidden ideologies and intentions that can eventually lead to exposing the power relations in the institutions they belong to.

Politics is one of the institutions of the society that is based on the binary relations of dominant and dominated (subordinate). It is a continuous struggle of the political actors to achieve their power goals. They strive for power to either attain or maintain power position to establish their political, economic as well as social identities (Hart, 2004). The relations between the dominant and subordinate political actors are communicated through discourse. Therefore, discourse is a vital part of the power structure that helps the political actors to take a power position or maintain an already attained position.

Dominant political actors through their discourse dominate others or sustain their own power positions in the world politics. Power relations between the dominant and the subordinate political groups are discursive because dominant and subordinate
ideologies are structured through discourse which exposes their position in the power set up. (Fairclough, 1992a, Van Dijk, 1989). The discourse of the dominant political actors reflects the power they exercise on the subordinate political actors while the subordinate political actors through their discourse not only expose their subordinate position in the political set up but also their struggle to resist or support the dominating powers. In this way, there are three aspects of power in the discourse of political actors: resistance, sustenance, and support (Fairclough, 1992a). Political actors strive to construct the power relations through their discursive strategies.

Their discursive strategies are aimed at structuring positive image to “Us” and the negative image of “Them” (Van Dijk, 1995). The struggle for power can also be seen in a global political context where binaries of power relations are created due to socio-cultural, regional, economic, ethnic as well as religious differences. I believe these aspects of power can also be studied when the world political actors are involved in sensitive and crucial issues which relate to the emotions or values of the people from both the sides. The present study addresses one of these issues, that is, the issue of blasphemy which created a binary between the Muslim world and the West.

1.2 Background of the Study

In the world of politics, hegemonic relations are exposed in the discourse of the political actors. These relations are formed, suppressed and sustained through discourse. Political actors use different discourse strategies to maintain hegemonic relations. These relations are structured, sustained and fractured on the basis of the events which occur in the world and get political importance. The reaction of the political powers on such events results in the nature of the hegemonic relations they support. Recently, the release of the controversial movie trailer *Innocence of Muslims* on YouTube has given rise to the issue of blasphemy and created a difference of opinion between the Muslim world and the West.

This difference was already there after the military actions of the Western powers against some Muslim countries in the name of war against terrorism. Some Muslim countries support the western powers in this war ignoring the criticism of their religious groups who are against such actions of the West but for the issue of blasphemy
the whole Muslim world is united. Muslim leaders can convince their public to support the war against terrorism, but they cannot convince them to stop reacting on the issue of blasphemy because it is a matter of religion and is related to the feelings and emotions of the Muslims all over the world. Muslim leaders not only have to satisfy their people who expect them to get an answer from the Western powers but also have to maintain a good relationship with the world political powers for political and economic reasons. On the other hand, Western powers also have to satisfy the Muslim leaders keeping in mind their own position and the situation which is created after the issue of blasphemy.

The nature of hegemonic relations between the two world political groups in the background of the situation created by the issue of blasphemy presented a room for my study. The context for my study is the 67th United Nations General Assembly meeting, September 2012 because it provided a strong background to the world political leaders for expressing their views about the issue in front of the whole world and in the context of the global politics. I felt the context like this would expose the hidden intentions and the ideologies behind discursive strategies and intertextual references of the world political leaders.

1.3 Recent History of the Issue of Blasphemy

The word “blasphemy” is Greek in origin that means bad or damaging reputation of someone/something. It is opposite to euphemy i.e. saying good about someone/something. Blasphemy is to profane, abuse or to insult the sacred personalities like God and Prophets or sacred beliefs of a religion (McCruen, 2008). Blasphemy hurts the religious emotions of the believers and it is considered a religious crime in many countries of the world. However, the emergence of modern politics has divided the religion and democracy into two halves and the punishments for blasphemy and other religious crimes are not being practiced in most of the Western/Christian countries. For example, the last corporal punishment for the crime of blasphemy in Great Britain was given in 1697 (Guidere, 2012).

Modern politics has created a divide between church and state in the West but it has failed to change the strong laws of blasphemy followed in the Muslim world because blasphemy is a very serious crime in Islam and punishments for blasphemy are
clearly stated in the Islamic law. Therefore, democracy is unable to take away the severity of blasphemy in the Islamic world the way it has done in the West. In the West, blasphemy is in a clash with the freedom of expression of individuals, but the Muslim world sees it as a serious religious crime that should be punished. This situation creates a divide between the West and the Muslim world on the issue of blasphemy. The divide is evident in some of the events which portrayed the de-shaped picture of Islam. These events occurred in the West and were taken as an example of the freedom of expression, but the Muslim world reacted to them because they were in a contest with the Islamic law of blasphemy. The difference of opinion on this topic resulted in protests by Muslims throughout the world. In the last few decades, blasphemy and freedom of expression were seen in the clash at global level due to some publications and other events violating the basic tenets of Islam which are discussed as below.

1.3.1 Satanic Verses

In 1988 Salman Rushdie, an Indian-British writer shook the Muslim world after the publication of his novel Satanic Verses. The novel had offensive content about the authenticity of the Holy Quran as a book revealed by Allah. Rushdie (1988) implied that the Holy Quran is a historical document rather than a revealed book on which the Islamic tradition is based. This was a question mark on the existence of Islam so, it injured the religious emotions of the Muslim world. The writer was accused of blasphemy against the Prophet of Islam as well as the whole religion as he challenges the basic foundations of Islam (Teigen, 2014). The protests in reaction to the novel were made and consequently it was banned in many countries including Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iran, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tanzania and Thailand on account of the blasphemous content against Islam (Bald, 2006). British parliamentarian Keith Vaz (1989) demanded a ban on Satanic Verses and another member of the parliament Norman Tebbit (1989) found Rushdie an “outstanding villain” because he betrayed his own religion and nation.

The Muslim World including the Muslim organizations in the UK demanded the trial of Rushdie while Iranian spiritual leader Ayatollah Khomeini issued a fatwa for his blasphemous writing and his execution (Mcsmith, 2011). The West was taking
the publication of the novel as freedom of expression but the Muslims could not be satisfied with this definition of the profane against their basic beliefs. Many people were killed in the reactional protests. The writer was under the police security because his life was in danger. This was the first major clash between the West and the Muslim world on the issue of blasphemy. It was a piece of literature but was taken as an attack on the basic beliefs of Islam. The reaction from the Muslim world proved that for them nothing in any shape and form is acceptable against the Islamic faith, Islamic values, and sacred personalities.

1.3.2 The Cartoon Controversy

Islam does not allow the pictorial depiction of Allah Almighty and the Prophet Muhammad (SAWW) and if it is done, it is considered to be blasphemous. The cartoon controversy started when a Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* published the cartoons depicting Islam and the Prophet of Islam in September 2005. The publication was repeated in the same newspaper followed by an editorial that supported the depiction and found it necessary because they believed “a hoard of imams and mullahs, who feel entitled to interpret the Prophet’s word, cannot abide the insult that comes from being the object of intelligent satire” (Boe and Hervik, 2008, p. 216). The cartoons and the editorial led to demonstrations and protests that showed anger among the Muslims on blasphemy against their religion. The Muslim leaders called for a meeting with the Danish prime minister which was declined. In 2006 same cartoons were published by the Norwegian Christian paper *Magazinet* which heightened the intensity of the conflict against both the countries. The Norwegian foreign minister made an apology on injuring the religious emotions of the Muslims in the name of freedom of expression (Eriksen, 2007). The cartoon controversy resulted in demonstrations and protests throughout the world.

1.3.3 The Innocence of Muslims

On 1st July 2012, a Hollywood director Sam Bacile released the trailer of a movie named *Innocence of Muslims* on YouTube. Muslims throughout the world protested against the release of the trailer. The reason for the protests was the content of the video that showed the image of the Prophet Muhammad (SAWW) against the
concept of Islam. The video depicted him as a negative person and womanizer. Muslims found this hurting and blasphemous, so they demanded the imprisonment of the director and the actors who played different roles in the video. The West named it as freedom of expression and no action was taken against the responsible people. For this reason, the protests in the Muslim world became violent and many official places, embassies and other buildings which belonged to the West were damaged by the protesters. This situation made blasphemy a sensitive issue for the world. The video was controversial because it had material against the Prophet of Muslims Muhammad (SAWW) that wounded their religious emotions. The demonstrations and protests against the video caused hundreds of injuries and deaths. Western political powers criticized the protests and took them as an attack on the freedom of expression. In this way, a rift between the two groups was created because the matter that was crucial for the Muslims as it was blasphemy against their faith was a matter of freedom of expression for the west.

1.4 Problem Statement

Global politics is based on power relations among the political actors participating in the broader political discourse. The dominant political powers through their discourses dominate the subordinate groups. On the other hand, the discourses of the subordinate political actors are not only reflective of their position in the global politics but are also introspective of their support or resistance to the powerful political actors. These hegemonic relationships among the world political powers can be studied in an effective manner through intertextual analysis of their discourses in a particular context. Intertextuality is actually the presence of multiple discourse representations and interdiscursive elements in a single text. These discourse representations and interdiscursive elements can be explicitly present or implicitly grounded in the texts. Whether it is explicit or implicit, the hegemonic struggle and power relations are observable through Critical Discourse Analysis of the text. Intertextuality is one of the aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis that is most suitable to find out hegemony and power relations. The concern of the present study is to find out the power relations and hegemony in world politics as exposed through the intertextual references present in the speeches of the world political leaders which were delivered in the UN General Assembly in the background of the divide between the freedom of expression and the
issue of blasphemy. The study intends to investigate the constructing, sustaining and fracturing of the power relations through the intertextual elements present in the speeches of the world political leaders on the issue of blasphemy.

1.5 Significance of Study

The present study is a contribution to global political discourse with special reference to intertextuality and hegemony. It is also helpful in understanding the manner in which texts and discourses are presented or used not only to suppress but also to attain power and then sustain it. The study also contributes to the theory of hegemony and intertextuality in the genre of political discourse where discursive practices contribute to construct, sustain and fracture the power relations. The study can help students especially the students of linguistics to understand the ways in which the presence of the intertextual elements in a discourse influence the meaning of that particular discourse by making it a discourse of power and hegemony. The study adds to the knowledge of the students of political science by providing an insight into the power relations of the world politics and the role of linguistics in enhancing the knowledge about the political strategies in a better way. The study could be beneficial for the common individuals to understand the use of different discursive strategies by the politicians to attain their political goals in the power structure of the world politics. It can also inspire the future researchers to conduct their studies on the same theoretical grounds in different power setups.

1.6 Objectives of Study

The objectives of this study are as follows:

- To explore multiple discourse representations and interdiscursive elements present in the texts under study as a source of constructing and sustaining of power relations in the world political set up.
- To examine how implicitly present voices in the texts under study reflect the struggle between the dominant and the subordinate political actors to maintain or fracture the power relations.
To scrutinize how the subordinate political leaders through their discourses play their role for the world political powers to maintain their positions or otherwise.

1.7 Research Questions

1. How are the power relations created and recreated through the linguistic strategies in the world politics?
2. How does the presence of the other texts in political texts influence the construction and sustaining of the power relations for the world political actors?
3. How do the intertextual linguistic choices of the subordinate political leaders play their role in constructing and sustaining the hegemonic relations?

1.8 Organization of the Thesis

The first chapter is based on the introduction of the study. It opens with the background of the study and describes the basic concepts. This is followed by the problem statement, significance of the study, research objectives and research questions. The chapter concludes with the organization of the thesis.

The second chapter of the study reviews the related literature. It is an account of the previous works carried out in the field and helps the researcher to establish a strong background for the present study by highlighting the gap in the previous studies that is filled by the present study. It exposes different aspects of the theory and method of the study with the help of the works already done in the fields by different researchers.

The third chapter discusses the methodology used to conduct the study that is the theoretical grounds on which the study is based. It also provides information about the context and setting of the research, data, method of data analysis and definitions of related terms. It also highlights different aspects of the theory and method of the research and rationale for using them.

The fourth chapter is a rich description of the intertextual references in the speeches of the world political leaders. It consists of three parts. The first part of analysis discusses intertextuality as present in the dominant political discourse, the
second part is about the intertextual references as present in the subordinate political
discourse and the final part describes the intertextuality with reference to both the
groups. The investigation of intertextual reference is aimed at finding out power
relations and hegemony as present in the text.

The final chapter presents the conclusions and findings that are drawn on the
basis of the data analysis that followed Fairclough’s theory of intertextuality and
hegemony. It also answers the research questions which are set in the first chapter and
presents some recommendations for the future researchers.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an extensive review of the literature in the backdrop of the theoretical framework of the present study. In order to meet the objectives of my study, I needed to incorporate the concepts of power, hegemony, political discourse and intertextuality. These concepts are interdisciplinary in nature, therefore, are studied from different aspects in different fields of knowledge. My focus was to select the most relevant literature in these areas in order to prepare a sound theoretical framework for my study that falls in the field of linguistics. This chapter discusses the related literature in the areas of power, discourse, political discourse hegemony and intertextuality.

2.2 Historical Development of the Theory of Power

Power is conceptualized in variable and well-established ways by different theorists (French & Raven, 1959; Lukes, 1974; Giddens, 1984; Morris, 1987; Bourdieu, 1991; Foucault, 1972, 1976, 1980, 1984, 1986). I have selected some of them to cite here on the basis of their relevance to the study at hand.

Modern thinking about power begins in the writing of Machiavelli (16th century) and Hobbes (17th century). Machiavelli (as cited in Bireley, 1990) sees power as a means through which strategic/military advantages are achieved. He does not see power as a source to achieve goals. Hobbes (as cited in Newey, 2008) finds power as sovereignty which is centralized i.e. power as hegemony. The contrast between both the concepts is the idea of total power which according to Machiavelli is rarely possible. However, Hobbes believes in a single unit of power. Weber (1947) links power with authority and rules and defines it as “the ability of an individual or group to achieve their own goals or aims when others are trying to prevent them from realising them.”
He is interested in power as domination which is based on economic and authoritarian interests. Dahl (1961) continues with Weber’s approach to focus on the actual community. He concentrates on the ruling elite which came to the fore after World War II.

Lukes (1974) conceptualizes power as an ability to control, influence and resist the interests, actions or thoughts of others. He also sees power as a capacity of getting things done according to one’s own interests and an agency which creates cause and effect relationship between the individuals/groups. The cause and effect relationships are connected to the analogy of dominant and subordinate individuals/groups. Morris’ (1987) views on power differ from Lukes’ (1974) idea. He observes power as a disposition which may or may not be activated or actualized. He established his concept of power by differentiating it from influence. He believes power and influence are synonyms to an extent but are not interchangeable. Influence for him is not potential rather it is continuous. Morris (1987) defines power as “the ability or capacity or dispositional property” (p. 287). He differentiates potentiality and actuality to enhance his concept of power. For him doing something or accomplishing a goal is called potentiality. While, potentiality, when exercised as power is an actuality. He concludes power is neither a thing nor an event rather it is a capacity. Powerful does not possess something which makes him powerful nor he is involved in some action rather it is his capacity which makes him powerful.

2.2.1 The Concept of Bases of Power

French and Raven’s (1959) concept of five bases of power is included here due to its relevance to the concept of power in the Critical Discourse Analysis. Fairclough (1989)’s concept of power in discourse, power behind discourse and Media power has basis in this theory.

French and Raven (1959) describe power as an influence of an agent on a person where the agent can be a person, a norm, value and idea and the person affected under the influence of the agent. The influence can be psychological, sociological and political. Psychological influence controls the person’s thinking, ideas and beliefs which make him think and react in a manner that is formed under the effect of the agent.
Social influence changes the person in accordance with his position in the society that encompasses his role in the society, norms that he follows or a group or part of a group he belongs to. Political power is the sovereign power that a person can exercise on a group and a group can exercise on another group due to his/their position. Psychological influence is related to the concepts of ideology and mental model of van Dijk (1995). Social and political influence match with the third dimension of Critical Discourse Analysis where power relations are examined in the socio-cultural and political context of the social actors.

French and Raven (1959) have covered different aspects of power from individual to the group. These concepts enhance the concept of power by covering three aspects collectively known as psychological, social and political power. Psychological power is individual power, but it can also be collective. The influence of a phenomenon or a person on the psychology of a person may differ from the psychology of the other person of the same group in the same situation. However, the influence on the psychology of a group may be equal (socio-cognitive model of Critical Discourse Analysis). Social power is not individual because it relates a person to the society he belongs to and then studies his position in the structure of power of that society. In the society, he can be influenced by norms or values he has to follow and the group or class he is a part of. Political power also goes for collective study and focuses on a person according to his position in a group that makes him a part of the power structure.

French and Raven (1959) suggest five bases of power related to both an individual and a group. The detailed description of the five bases of power is as follows

a. Legitimate power is focused on the binary of dominant and subordinate social actors. It comes under the concept of authority and is about a person’s power due to the position he has in a group e.g. manager, director etc.

b. Reward power also has the binary of dominant and subordinate and it is the influence of a person on others particularly about giving incentives and rewards. It is the power in the hands of the teachers, managers and others in the same status.
c. Expert power is individual in nature. It is the influence a person has on others due to his abilities or skills which are not possessed by the others. Example of such power can be the people who are expert in certain fields.

d. Referent power is the individual influence of the people on others because they are famous celebrities, sportsmen or others whom people admire and follow.

e. Coercive is the power gained by force and it has the binary of dominant and subordinate. People who have the authority to punish others possess coercive power i.e. policemen.

Among these types legitimate power, reward power and coercive power are related to the binary relations of dominant and dominated while referent and expert power are the influence that gives the people power. There is a relation between the person who is an expert and the person who is influenced by him but it is different from the other three bases of power. In referent and expert power, the expert does not have an authority; it is just his quality that influences the others. Referent power is explicit in the showbiz and other fields like sports and games. Here a celebrity influences the audience and they admire her/him. This admiration changes into the influence that affects the admirers. These five bases of power can overlap in different situations, for example, a dominant group or individual may have coercive power as well as referent, legitimate and expert power. French and Raven (1959) discuss power as an authority and influence using which the individuals fulfill their purposes.

Many of the studies related to power relations focus on the powerful i.e. the person who has authority and influence to oppress others and to investigate the ways in which they exercise power as an intentional influence over the beliefs, emotions and behaviours of people (French & Bell, 1999). This perspective of power primarily focuses on the dominant figure in the power structure and the other party as a secondary focus.

2.2.2 Foucauldian Concept of Power

Foucault (1971, 1974, 1982) has great contribution in developing the understanding of power in different social spheres. His work on power, knowledge and
discourse is followed and further developed by the researchers in different fields. Foucault (1974) focuses on power from a perspective that shows a shift from the actors in authority and takes into consideration the oppressed as a part of the power structure. He believes in the relational value of power and finds power everywhere in the social set up.

His views advocate the relations of power as a focus instead of the persons themselves as symbol of power. He finds that power is exercised through a “netlike organization” where individuals are the “vehicles of power” instead of its “points of application” (Foucault 1976, p. 98). The term “netlike organization” indicates the social value of power and rejects its individual nature. This shows that for Foucault (1976) society is the platform where social actors get involved in the game of power. It is not an indoor activity between two persons having differences. Rather it sees the position of individuals in the society they belong to because it is their social set up that decides who in a specific span of time is powerful and who is powerless or oppressed. This proves that power is relational.

He further explains his idea by using the term ‘vehicles of power’ that describes power as an entity which is possessed by the individuals, not on a permanent basis but is relevant and depends on the structure of the society and is influenced by the changing nature of society. Therefore, individuals who exercise power in the first stage are a source of transferring power to others in the next stage instead of remaining in the first stage and holding the power forever. This aspect of power made Foucault (1976) use the term “point of application” that shows the permanent possession of power in one hand and he declared it as not the reality.

In a society, individuals have their respective roles in the power structure but the moment their roles change their position in the social set up also changes. For example, a father is very powerful when at home but in front of his boss in the office he loses the authority and becomes the subordinate actor instead of the other dominant figure and thus power works in a network. This is the way in which Foucault’s (1976) concept of power network works and declares both dominant and the subordinate actors as part of a single social set up where power is present and exercised by both but in different contexts and in different roles. The term network focuses on the value of the
social set up where people are connected to each other in different types of power relations and societal roles; the society contributes in constructing, maintaining and fracturing these power relations.

He emphasizes the relational value of power which is based on the role of both the oppressor and the oppressed who with their practices can change their positions in the structure of power. He believes power is exercised and not possessed “it is not the privilege acquired or preserved of the dominant class but the overall effect of its strategic positions” (Foucault, 1979 p.26). The important aspect of his theory is the decentralization of power. Here he differs with the other theorists and presents power as an overall effect rather than the capacity of the dominant. For him, power relations cannot be understood by looking at “monarchies or states” or “the top chains of command. Rather it develops in specific conditions i.e. local choices, individual choices, behaviour and interactions. These combine in various ways and constitute larger social patterns. These social patterns eventually yield the concepts which we typically think of whenever we think about power.

Another important aspect of Foucault’s (1976, 1982) theory of power is the connection of power with language. He sees language as a source of power which is used by the social actors in a power set up and it helps them to achieve their goals in the power structure of the society. He sees language as a social phenomenon instead of individual possession and it enhances his views on the role of social set up in the power relations. Foucault (1971, 1976, 1982) used the term discourse for the language with reference to the society to differentiate it from other concepts of language. He introduces the idea of bottom-up power that comes from the lowest level. He believes power on a group cannot be achieved through domination over the leader of the group because killing a leader cannot change the ideologies and beliefs of the individuals. However, power is inculcated within the group which cannot be controlled through the capture of the group leader (Foucault, 1979).

2.3 Theory of Discourse

The term discourse as declared by Mills (1997) can be defined in various ways but it is commonly restricted to the spoken or written language. Griffin (2005) defines
discourse as written or spoken language that can be in the form of words or utterances or some other way of communication specifically the one which is limited to a specific subject like religious discourse or setting like discourse in a courtroom. Griffin’s (2005) definition considers the role of context in discourse along with the text and specifies both the aspects of language written and spoken separately van Dijk (1977) finds discourse as an entity in which text and context both are at work and are in a relationship with each other. In this relationship, context can be taken as an environment where text occurs.

Discourse is considered as a part of the social structure due to its relationship with the micro level of the social order. This level deals with different situations and in these situations, the interactions among the social actors occur. These interactions occur through discourse and they are part of the social structure (van Dijk, 2008). The term “social structure” here means the context in which language is used: “Context is the physical environment in which a word is used” (Yule, 2000, p.128) but it is also the relationship between different aspects of the text including situational, social, cultural and political aspects and the situation or environment where language is being used.

Context has many forms including linguistic context, situational context and cultural context and it eliminates ambiguity, indicates towards the referents and detects conversational implicature (Song, 2010). These forms and functions of context influence the language users when they talk about a topic. This suggests that context is more than just a physical environment of the language use; it has many dimensions. The studies in conversational analysis and discourse analysis find context an important aspect that helps to examine different aspects of language and the way it is used in different situations and conditions. Along with conversational analysis and discourse analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis sees context as inevitable for research.

In Critical Discourse Studies, discourse refers to language in use as a social practice (Fairclough 2003). This view of discourse is in contrast with the structuralist formalist view that finds language as a system of close/restricted structures. According to van Dijk (2009), discourse is multi-dimensional. He believes
Discourse is at the same time a linguistic (verbal, grammatical) object (meaning sequences of words or sentences), an action (such as an assertion or a threat), a form of social interaction (like a conversation), a social practice (such as a lecture), a mental representation (a meaning, a mental model, and opinion, knowledge), an interactional or communicative event or activity (like parliamentary debates), a cultural product (like a telenovela) or even an economic commodity that is being sold as bought (like a novel). (van Dijk, 2009, p. 67)

He believes discourse is a linguistic object as well as a social interaction which has multiple meanings, functions, dimensions, roles and effects. His definition enhances the meaning and the scope of the term discourse by covering multiple aspects within social, cultural and cognitive context. The present study is restricted to the social aspect of discourse and focusses on discourse as a social practice (political speeches).

2.3.1 Discourse in Social Context

Discourse as a broader term considers every aspect of interaction among the social actors while being members of a social group due to which usually it is defined as a social practice instead of the individual possession. It is a way of acting and interacting with people not just for the sake of sending and receiving the message but also feeling and thinking, valuing things even the ways of dressing and believing (Gee, 1999). This concept goes beyond the traditional boundaries of discourse that limit discourse to a source of communication spoken or written and finds discourse as an expression of emotions, thoughts and even a source of self-expression and beliefs. Gee (1999) finds discourse as a comprehensive term that covers both verbal and nonverbal communication. The way of thinking and feeling is reflected in the discourse of a person. It is neither written nor spoken language but communication that can be reflected in the channels other than language. The way of dressing, believing and valuing establishes the social identity of the individual that is another concept adding to the meaning of discourse. This concept is taken as a point of departure for the studies in the field of discourse and identity.
Fairclough (1989) considers discourse as a whole process of interaction that holds text as just a part of it. The process of interaction can be taken from a broader perspective like that of the whole society as well as from the specific point of view that can be restricted to different institutions of the society individually like educational, religious or social institutions. In these institutions discourse works through the texts (spoken and written) considering their production and distribution and their dialectic relationship with the social and cultural norms of the particular institutions. All these aspects of the text are included by Fairclough (1989) in his three-dimensional approach towards Critical Discourse Analysis. Fairclough (1989, 1995a) suggested three levels model that contains three inter-related processes of analysis tied to three inter-related dimensions of discourse. These three dimensions are

- The object of analysis (including verbal, visual or verbal and visual texts).
- The processes by means of which the object is produced and received (writing/speaking/designing and reading/listening/viewing) by human subjects.
- The socio-historical conditions which govern these processes.

2.3.2 Theory of Discourse and Theory of Power

Discourse is a way to express oneself using language and it can also be used for asserting knowledge as well as power and resisting or criticizing power. This is eventuated by expressing ideologies through discourse and is visible in the choice of linguistic forms or texts of the social actors. These texts are actually formed and structured by the ideological organization of the specific part of the social life (Dellinger, 1995). Discourse in this way has a strong association with the ideologies of the people. Discourse in its broader sense is defined as language either written or spoken (Mills, 1997; Fairclough, 1989) and is further explained in different ways by different theorists. One of the dimensions is its relationship with semiotics.

Fairclough (1989) introduces discourse as a written or spoken language and further describes it in association with semiotic practices. These practices include things like printed information and non-verbal communication as part of the discourse. Here, he includes signs and symbols in the definitions of discourse which enhance its scope and take it a step further from just being language written or spoken in its simplest form.
Semiotic practices are socially relevant in most of the cases like language signs and symbols are not universal and their meanings vary in different societies. Therefore, use of such semiotic practices outside the social set up may create problems. This signifies the social value of semiotic practices and by including semiotic practices in the definition of discourse, Fairclough (1989, 2003) enhances the social nature of discourse. It also proves that Fairclough (1989) sees language as a form of social practice. It is implied here that language is a type of social action which is creative in nature because it is created by social actors. It is also reproductive because social actors reproduce it according to their social norms and positions they have in the social set up they belong to (Fairclough, 1995a).

These aspects highlight the role of discourse in the social set up where power structures exist in different forms. Foucault (1982) relates discourse with power and finds that it is a source of achieving goals in power structure. He finds power in discourse and discovers that the power in discourse is more effective than the power by force. He refuses the idea of sovereign power rather he believes that power is associated with the social networks where it is exercised and shifted from one point to the other. He finds power defused in the discourse of the social actors that helps it to shift from one to the other agent instead of permanently possessing a central figure of a social set up. In other words, he disagrees with the concept of absolute power and believes in relational power that exists in the discourse of the social actors. He believes that power is everywhere, and it comes from everywhere, that is, it can move from the central figure to the lower part of the power structure and from the lower part towards the central figure and so on.

The position of the social actors as a member of a social set up is expressed in their discourse and they are a part of the power network which is penetrated into the society. All the social actors mutually participate and perform their roles in the power structure, however, the role may change according to the situation and the values of the society. These ideas of Foucault (1982) have given a new dimension to the theory of power that is more comprehensive and multi-faceted. Consequently, his concepts have raised many theories in different fields related to philosophy, sociology and discourse. His concept of power relations and discourse has opened new dimensions in the field of linguistics (van Dijk, 1993) too.
2.3.3 Power Relations and Discourse

A great bulk of research in the field of linguistic is carried out in the area of language use including the studies on discourse. The focus of discourse is the language as present in a society at different levels and used by the social actors in a context where their social life and other elements of society are closely connected (Fairclough, 2003). Therefore, when discourse is studied in association with the power it means the social power that is “a property of the relationship between groups, classes, or other social formations, or between persons as social members” (van Dijk, 1989, p.19). This relationship is based on control of one group or individual on the behaviour of the other group or individual. The relationship between groups and classes can be collective and is influenced by the collective social behaviours of the group members, however, it can also be individual and influenced by the behaviour of the individuals. Contrary to that, individuals can influence one another within a group. van Dijk (1989) sees these relations in the interaction of the social actors where one individual or group has control over the actions or wishes, desires and beliefs of the other. The control is visible only in the interaction of social actors and only then the power relations work.

In the relation of power, there is necessarily the possibility of resistance, for if there were no possibility of resistance (of violent resistance, of escape, of ruse, of strategies that reverse the situation) there would be no relations of power (Foucault, 1997, p.292).

Thus, the relations of power are the relations of domination as well as subordination. Domination is resisted, escaped and reversed from the subordinate side. Power relations are social as they are determined by the society. They are influenced by the systems and traditions of the society they are associated with. Most of the time they are similar, but they may differ from one or the other perspective when social context changes. They work in every domain of the society from the basic unit of the family to the broader levels of politics, law and academic institution.

Foucault (1982) argues that power relations are the relations among the free individuals. The subordinates are free to their will whether to follow the dominant or not. They are not at all the slaves of the powerful but they are influenced by them. He
believes that power relations cannot be present in slavery because slaves are bound to follow their masters in any case. Here the question of coercion and consent arises. The relationship between master and slave is based on coercion or power by force. Master forces the slave to follow him in all conditions. While power with consent is related to the persuasion of the oppressed by the oppressor to make him follow or accept certain things. Fairclough (1989) discusses both; power based on coercion (power through force or physical violence) and power through manufacturing the consent (persuasion through language). In the later situation, discourse is an important aspect which shows the power relations in the society. These views are the basis of Fairclough’s (1989) study of power and language and helped him to form a theory that is Critical Discourse Analysis.

2.3.4 Fairclough’s Concept of Power and Discourse

Critical Discourse Analysis takes into consideration both language and power in relation to society. Fairclough (1989) explains and elaborates on Foucault’s concept of power in discourse. He divides the concept into the power behind discourse and the power in discourse. The power behind discourse is the power of a person who might not have a high status in the society to dominate others but his current situation makes him powerful that is the position on which he is working. This can be a part of disciplinary power; the power held by the government institutions.

The power behind discourse is also an authoritative power which is possessed by the people selected by the governments and other authorities. Power in discourse is related to the people who have an influence in the society which can be authoritative and ideological. Authoritative power is enjoyed by the rulers, army officers and other individuals related to the government. Ideological power is the possession of the religious leaders and teachers who are powerful due to the knowledge and a respectful position they possess in the society. Ideological power can be associated with the expert power and the referent power of French and Raven (1959) while authoritative power relates to their concept of coercive power and legitimate power. Referent power and expert power are similar because admiration for the certain skill and ability differs from person to person, group to group and class to class which implies that ideology and
power are closely related to each other and people having different ideologies are influenced by different norms, ideas, thoughts, and agents.

Fairclough et al. (2011) critically examine power which is exercised through discourse in multiple including inter-disciplinary and multidisciplinary contents. They work on various subjects related to linguistics and social sciences. They find power discursive in nature which can be negotiated, challenged, exercised and reproduced through language/discourse. The present study focuses on the discursive nature of power relations and attempts to find out the ways in which the relations of domination and subordination are constructed and sustained through power.

2.3.5 Ideologies and Power Structure

Ideologies are beliefs shared by a group in a social set up. They initially appear in the form of ideas, values, norms or thoughts but consequently, they become common among the group members to such an extent that they convert into common sense for the individuals of the group. This only happens when ideologies are naturalized in the group.

Ideologies have an important role in the power structure in a social set up. They are part of a power structure where power is achieved through consent of the subordinates. They are naturalized and accepted as “common sense” by the social actors. Fairclough (1989) believes ideology has the most important role in manufacturing the consent. After being naturalized ideologies become part of the beliefs of the social group. He implies that beliefs are taken as norm first and then get the status of shared knowledge in a society. This status of ideologies helps them to play an important role in a power structure. They are utilized by the dominant to win the consent of the individuals having them in naturalized form.

The dominant struggles to maintain this position in the power structure and to sustain his/her power, he/she uses ideological discourse. Ideological discourse reflects the ideologies of the subordinate which are influenced by the dominant ideologies. Under the dominant influence, the subordinate follows the thought and action of the dominant. Thus, the power of the dominant is sustained. This is how discourse practices
play a role in constructing and sustaining the dominance in the power structure of a society.

Demonstration of such ideological reference is seen in political, religious and media discourse. Politicians exploit the ideological beliefs of individuals for their political purposes. Through their discourse, they transfer their ideas in the minds of the people by using ideological references. This makes people believe whatever the politicians say and present. This is how their discourse practices play an important role for them to sustain their dominance in the political structure. The discourse of political actors becomes powerful due to ideological references present in it and the way they are naturalized. Once the ideologies are naturalized in it, the discourse of the political actors becomes persuasive (Fairclough, 1989).

2.3.6 Ideology, Identity and Power Relations

Ideology is about ideas and beliefs of the social actors while identity is the association and the belongingness of the social actors to a certain group. In a social power structure, identity determines the power relations by working in association with ideology. The relationship between ideology and identity is very close because ideologies are responsible for determining the identities of individuals or groups. Ideologies are comprised of the representation of a group in a social structure where the identity of the group is defined through these representations (van Dijk, 2006). Ideologies are revealed in the ideas and beliefs of the group and through these ideas and beliefs, the identity of the group is determined. Consequently, ideologies are responsible for constructing the identity of the group. Identities are defined by representations of the individuals or groups and thus, social representations define the social identity of a group. Social identity means the shared beliefs of a group of its fundamental conditions and the ways of existence and reproduction (van Dijk, 1989).

Social identities play important role in the power structure. They determine the position of groups in social set up and their role in the power structure as a social entity. Social identities are therefore responsible for construction and sustenance of power relations in different nature of groups where the main bond is social identity. The nature of group can be social, political and religious i.e. political parties, religious groups,
different professions and classes of the society. Identities are based on the ideologies of the groups and both are not only closely related to each other but also play role in determining each other. They are the important elements of a power structure because they help to determine the power relations.

Power relations in a society are present in different shapes and they might differ from institution to institution. Religious relations are based on religious ideologies and identities of the individuals and they are formed because of the attachment of individuals to a certain religion or sect. Power in the religious context is ideological which is achieved by the religious figures with the assistance of ideological beliefs of the group. People having religious knowledge, that is the interest of a certain group, influence the group members and the knowledgeable person dominates the group without resistance. Religious relations are less commonly shifted as compared to the political relations because the emotional attachment of people to the dominant figures make people follow them without challenging their power. Political structures are built on the power relations among the political actors. They are based on dominance and control. Political leaders dominate people to sustain their power position in the certain political structure. Political power is shifted from one to the other person. In both the contexts, ideologies and identities of the social actors stay side by side and influence the power structure. Fairclough (1989) has studied both ideologies and identities together while constructing his theory of Critical Discourse Analysis where identities, ideologies and discourse are linked with each other at every level.

2.4 Theory of Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis is a means to access the point of domination and oppression in a social set up in general and in its linguistic form and a resource against people who are struggling in the context of domination and oppression (Fairclough, 1995a). In Critical discourse analysis, power is considered in terms of irregularities between social actors and discursive events and the control over the production, distribution and consumption of the texts. Social actors are participants in the discourse events and they are in a binary relation with each other in the social set up they belong to. The power of one group over the other group determines the control on the text and talk of the social actors. Fairclough (1995a) explains it in the following words: “Power
is conceptualized both in terms of asymmetries between participants in discourse events and in terms of unequal capacity to control how texts are produced, distributed and consumed (and hence the shapes of texts) sociocultural contexts” (p. 1-2).

The discursive power for Fairclough is concerned with the status of the participants and their capacity to hold the discursive event according to their own choice. In both the cases, social context is important because it enables the discourse to become a power discourse and determines the identity and the position of the participants in a discourse event. The interplay of power and context determines the difference between language and discourse. The context mostly determines the language use of the social actors by facilitating or restricting them to choose or leave certain linguistic patterns. The focus of Critical Discourse Analysis is the study of language the way it is used in the society with special emphasis on the power structures present in the society.

As a multi-disciplinary approach, Critical Discourse Analysis covers linguistics through sociology, philosophy and other disciplines including political science and in all these disciplines it finds the task of discourse to study the relationship between language, its users and the context where it is used. It “studies real and often extended, instances of social interaction which take (partially) linguistic form. The critical approach is distinctive in its view of the relationship between language and society” (Wodak 1997, p.173).

Wodak (2001a) finds the focus of Critical Discourse Analysis in the social interactions made through language and the relationship between the language and society. Critical Discourse Analysis extends the boundaries of language from mere written and spoken text to the discourse that considers the broader sense of interaction and actions of the social actors. Power relations as a part of social relations work in the society and are visible in discursive practices, studying these relations is the aim of Critical Discourse Analysis. Power structure as a part of the social structure is present at each level of the society. The concern of Critical Discourse Analysis is to find out the relationship of language with ideology and power (Janks, 1997). Discourse analysis is aimed at the study of language and society with a focus on their relationship with each other and the ways they determine and influence each other. Critical Discourse
Analysis is a form of discourse analysis with a similar base but an additional focus on power relations in the society is a feature of the framework. van Dijk (2001a) describes it in the following words “Critical Discourse Analysis is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (p. 352).

This definition implies that Critical Discourse Analysis primarily studies the relations of power among different social structures and finds out the ways in which these relations are structured and fractured through discourse. In a society, power structures are present in different units. These units are structured on the basis of different ideologies and identities of the individual group members and the group overall. Basically, power structures are explicit in the three main units of the society. They are social structures, political structures and religious structures. Social structures include different units of the society on which the social set up is built. Social structures start from the very basic unit of a family where different family members have power relationships with one another. The status and rank are determined by the position and role of the person in the unit of the family. At the broader level, they can be discussed in different social settings outside the boundary of the house like the workplace and other social encounters that are made by the social actors in their routine life.

Critical Discourse Analysis is studied at two levels that are text and context. The text is related to the linguistic analysis of the discursive structures while contextual analysis takes into consideration the social setting in which discourse occurs. van Dijk (2001a) suggested two levels of analysis for Critical Discourse Analysis, micro and macro. At the micro level discourse of the individuals, as social actors is studied while at the macro level their discourse as a member of a particular group is studied. Micro-level of analysis is concerned with the linguistic analysis of discourse while the macro level of analysis takes into consideration the contextual analysis of discourse. Discourse in context is related to the social and cultural setting in which it is produced. The aim of Critical Discourse Analysis is to study discourse in society at both levels and unveil social problems, discrimination and inequality with reference to discourse. Discourse reflects the society, therefore, social problems are also reflected in the discourse. Critical Discourse Analysis examines and suggests solutions to the problems in the
power structure of the society. Power relations are explicit in the discourse of social actors and they are responsible for determining the discourse of social actors. Similarly, discourse determines the power relations among the social actors. Discourse represents society, culture and vice versa.

2.4.1 The Concept of Discourse in Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysts prefer to use the term discourse instead of language because they study the language in a social set up and for that particular context the term ‘discourse’ is more suitable. Discourse is the language with reference to the society and it becomes a discursive practice when it enters the stage of production and consumption. These stages are related to the practical action of the discourse in a society where social actors produce and consume discourse according to their position and social status. The process of production and consumption of the discourse is responsible for structuring, breaking and sustaining the power relations. Production and consumption are the terms used by Fairclough (1989) in his three-dimensional theory of Critical Discourse Analysis. He suggests that three dimensions are text, processes and social conditions. When language is considered as a social process and not just the text but discourse then the analysis should be of these three dimensions. In the first stage, the text is analyzed, in the second the cognitive processes of participants are analyzed and in the third stage, the relationship between transitory social events and the social structures are analyzed. The stages are named as production, consumption and explanation of the text. The social structures shape the social events and are shaped by the social events. Fairclough (1989, 1993) explains the relationship between discourse and society as dialectic where social structures determine the discourse and are determined by the discourse. His concept is the basic framework of the theory and method of Critical Discourse Analysis. van Dijk (1989, 1997, 2001a) also believes in the social nature of language and analysis of discourse at multiple levels but his views differ somehow from the views of Fairclough (1989, 2003) because van Dijk (1989, 1993, 2001a) adds cognitive aspect of discourse in his theory of Critical Discourse Analysis. He talks about personal cognition and social cognition as important phenomena in the power structure. He finds that the power structure is built on two levels, that are, micro and macro level.
At micro level individuals and their actions, thoughts and ideas as social actors in a power structure are studied, on the other hand, at macro level ideas, thoughts and actions of social actors are studied as members of the certain group. Similarly, personal cognition encompasses the memories, knowledge and opinions of individuals while social cognition involves the sharing of knowledge, opinions and memories of the individual within the whole group they belong to and the whole culture (van Dijk, 1993). According to van Dijk (2001b), Critical Discourse Analysis is a field of research that is concerned with studying and analyzing written and spoken texts to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias. It examines how these discursive sources are maintained and reproduced within specific social, political and historical contexts. He believes that Critical Discourse Analysis is a multi-disciplinary approach as it has a relationship with many fields of knowledge. It focuses on the relationship between “text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 253). ‘Text and talk’ is discourse, that for van Dijk (1993) works through cognition in the social and cultural contexts to explore the power structure. The main focus of Critical Discourse Analysis is the discourse that is a source of constructing, breaking or sustaining the power relations in a society.

2.4.2 Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis is a new field of study as it emerged in the 1980s with the development of discourse studies by Fairclough (1988, 1989). It is grounded in the theory of power, critical theory and systemic functional grammar. It accentuates the linguistic relationship of discrimination and power as explicit in the language use of the social actors. Critical Discourse Analysis is a multi-disciplinary field of study that takes into consideration different disciplines of knowledge like psychology, sociology, anthropology, cognitive science, education, political science and others while having the main focus on linguistics. Fairclough (1989, 1992a, 2003), van Dijk (1993, 2001a, 2001b) and Wodak (2001a, 2001b) are architects of Critical Discourse Analysis. Their studies have made it the most prominent and influential subfield of discourse analysis (Jaworski & Coupland 1999); however, many other researchers have contributed to the theory and method of Critical Discourse Analysis like Fowler, 1991; Richardson, 2007; Hart, 2011; Chiton 2004; Gee 1990; Rogers 2004; Locke, 2004; Bloor & Bloor, 2007; Lazar, 2005; and Hart & Lukes, 2007. These studies further
explain as well as explore and suggest the application of Critical Discourse Analysis in different disciplines including politics, education, cognitive science, feminist theory and media.

Critical Discourse Analysis can be divided into three approaches which share the similar base but slightly differ in the focus.

- **Socio-cultural Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis**

  Fairclough (1989, 1992a, 2001, 2003) concentrates on the socio-cultural aspect of the power relations. He finds Critical Discourse Analysis as "a contribution to the general raising of consciousness of exploitative social relations, through focusing upon language" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 4). This definition exposes the agenda of Critical Discourse Analysis that is to raise awareness against the exploitation that occurs through language and works in the social relations of the individuals. Social relations are established on the basis of power relations that can be obvious or obscure. Critical Discourse Analysis studies the structure and formation of social relations and the way these relations express dominance, discrimination or control through discursive strategies and the way they influence cultural and economic relations and change that occurs with the change or shift of these relations in a society. The relation between economic, social and cultural change and discourse is elaborated in the following lines.

  It is an important characteristic of the economic, social and cultural changes of late modernity that they exist as discourses as well as processes that are taking place outside discourse and that the processes that are taking place outside discourse are substantively shaped by these discourses (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 4).

  This exposes the dialectic relation between the processes outside discourses and discourses of economic, social and cultural change. This is the way discourse influences the social, economic and cultural aspects of the society and structure, restructure and fracture the power relations in a social set up.

  The concept that power relations exist in the discourse and if outside discourse they are influenced by discourse is the building block of the socio-cultural approach to

- **Sociocognitive Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis**

  The second approach to Critical Discourse Analysis is van Dijk’s (1993, 1995, 1997, 2001a, 2001b) socio-cognitive model that focuses on the relationship between discourse, cognition and society. It has the characteristics of text linguistics that incorporate psychology and cognitive science. The psychological aspect of this model takes into account the standard model of memory. van Dijk (1984, 1993, 1997, 2001b, 2005, 2006, 2008) has focused his investigation on ethnicity, prejudice, social stereotypes, power abuse by high classes of the society and resistance by the oppressed groups. He believed that the ability to control different dimensions of discourse is a source of getting an access to the power to dominate others (Tenorio, 2011).

- **Discourse-Historical Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis**

  Wodak (1995) finds the aim of Critical Discourse Analysis as to find out "Opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (p.204). She attempts to examine power relations in social as well as historical perspective in her approach to Critical Discourse Analysis named as Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). Wodak (2001b) elaborates on four aspects of DHA analysis.

  - Text and co-text
  - Intertextuality and interdiscursivity
  - Social and institutional context
  - Sociopolitical and historical contexts

  She uses DHA to explore power relations in the social and political context of the society.

### 2.5 Political Discourse

The term ‘politics’ can be defined as a continuous struggle to gain power. In politics, power is important because it makes the politicians able to practice their economic, political and social ideas (Hart, 2004). They need proper language use to achieve their goals because language plays an important role in all the political
processes. There are some other factors like physical coercion that are a part of politics but without language use political processes are impossible. Political actions, in fact, are prepared, guided, controlled, evaluated and influenced by language (Schaffner, 1997). In recent years, language study has become important for other disciplines including politics. On the other hand, political scientists are focusing on the role of language in the political decisions and processes. The basic linguistic analysis of political discourse has an effect on the broader political frameworks. Therefore, the study of political discourse is significant for linguists as well as political scientists.

Political discourse according to Schaffner (1996) is a subfield of discourse and is both functional and thematic. Political discourse is functional when it deals with different political actions, reactions and processes. It is thematic because it focuses on different areas of the main theme that is politics. Political discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis are related to the power structure of a social institution and study the power relations and the way they are constructed and demolished with the use of language. Power is an ability that makes the individuals directed and obedient to the will of the power holder. The person who holds the power can maintain the influence on others in their real lives (Edelman, 1977) and this is possible only by using language because language is a perfect tool that transfers the ideologies. Politics is commonly associated with power because it is concerned with making decisions and their application. People follow the rules formed by politicians. So, politics is a struggle for power that can be achieved through language and the win and loss in the political context are dependent on the proper use of language.

Political discourse can broadly be defined as text and talk of the politicians from different levels of the political structure. It takes into account all the contexts where politics is at work through the use of language from the assemblies to the media (Bayram, 2010). The emergence of modern media has increased the challenges faced by the politicians. Media campaigns and the discussions of political issues in media have made politics more open and more public. The participation of the general public in the political matters and their presence is made possible by the media politics. This makes the job harder for politicians to defend their policies and convince the public because media has got access to the parliamentary problems and has opened the door for discussion for masses. Politicians need more strategies to maintain their power.
They have to participate in interviews, live debates, talk shows, speeches, press conferences as well as their coverage in print media and above all the physical presence of the political leaders in front of masses. All these sub-genres of political discourse have been studied and are a major concern of both political science and linguistics disciplines. Sometimes theorists in Critical Discourse Analysis categorize such studies in Political Discourse Analysis. Power is a great concern for politics and politicians use power to make new decisions, to change the behaviour and values of other people (Bayram 2010).

2.5.1 Critical Discourse Analysis and Political Speeches

Political discourse studies are interested in the struggle for power visible in the language of the politicians. It is a consequence of the political affairs and is determined by the history and culture (Sharndama, 2015). Historical factors of the state and its cultural background shapes the politics and it is reflected in the discourse related to it. Politics is about persuasion and negotiation for the reconciliation of differences among the political groups using different strategies like arguments, threats, manipulation and even bribes and entreaties (Hague et al. 1989; Jones, 1994). Politicians persuade the public to legitimate their political claims (Chimbarange et al, 2013) and to achieve their goals in the political structure of power and dominance. Politicians interact through media with the public in different ways including interviews and speeches.

2.5.1.1 Some research studies on political speeches and Critical Discourse Analysis

Political speeches hold an important space in politics as they are the instruments in the hand of politicians to convey their point of view, transfer ideologies and persuade the public. Political speeches are delivered in different contexts in a democratic setup. Most politicians start their career with and hold particular positions in the government on the basis of their skills of influencing the public by delivering effective speeches. The studies in politics and linguistics, for this reason, examine the speeches of political leaders to find out different facts about them. Political speeches are used as data in many studies in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis.

One of such studies is conducted by Post (cited in Chimbarange, et al. 2013). He in his unpublished thesis has analyzed the speeches of Obama and McCain delivered
during 2008 presidential election campaign. He used Critical Discourse Analysis to find out the selection of social actors and social actions in the speeches. He exposed the way Obama manipulated the social actors and social actions to shape his identity. Many studies of political speeches take into consideration the theory of rhetoric. Alvi and Baseer (2002) have studied the use of rhetoric and persuasion techniques in Obama’s speeches. They have investigated different rhetoric techniques used by Obama to convince his audience to change their view about the Iraq war. Obama’s inaugural speech 2009 was analyzed by Horvath (2009) using Critical Discourse Analysis to find out the persuasive strategies used by the president. He has examined Obama’s ideologies exposed through his discourse and the way he supported his ideologies.

Wang (2010) has studied modality and transitivity in Obama’s presidential speeches and investigated the use of discursive strategies to transfer the ideology of power and to show closeness to common people to win their confidence as president. Hoyer (2008) has studied speeches of Tony Blair on Iraqi war to examine discursive strategies used to legitimize the Iraq war by expressing his ideologies. He has also studied the role of media to help Blair convey his ideological stance. Bayram (2010) has investigated the political ideology of the Turkish Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan to find out the role of language in an individual group relationship. Bayram (2010) has also found out that an instance of written or spoken discourse can have its roots in the power structure and it is backgrounded in the cultural, religious and social institutions. Sarfo and Krampa (2013) have studied selected speeches of Bush and Obama on terrorism. They have concluded that terrorism has been projected by Bush and Obama in a negative way which is visible in their speeches but anti-terrorism has been projected in a positive way. Both have picked emotionally charged expressions and words while discussing anti-terrorism. They have attempted to gain power and control over the audience by using such vocabulary.

All these studies on political discourse (Alvi & Baseer, 2002; Horvath, 2009; Bayram, 2010; Wang, 2010) have focused on different aspects of political discourse while examining speeches of the political leaders. Most of the studies are focused on textual and contextual aspects of the political discourse and ideologies of the leaders. They attempt to expose the discursive strategies of politicians in their struggle to construct and maintain power relations and dominant position in the political structure.
2.5.2 Critical Discourse Analysis and (Global) Politics

Fairclough (1993) explains that Critical Discourse Analysis is aimed to explore the relationship of “causality” and “determination” between the discourse and society. The factors which influence the discourse as a social practice and in response how discourse influences the social structures make the basis of this approach. This idea elucidates that discursive practices are products of the social structure. Similarly, the social structures are responsible for determining the discourse (Fairclough, 1995a). Critical Discourse Analysis studies these relations in the political structure of the society.

The institution of politics is based on the binary relation between the dominant groups and the subordinate groups. Dominant political groups exercise power that is exerted in different ways. Apart from the direct exertion of the power of the dominant groups, it may be integrated into laws, rules, norms, habits and even a quite general consensus and thus take the form of hegemony (van Dijk, 1993). Hegemony is a form of dominance that seems natural until it is challenged. In hegemonic relations, the dominated group acts in the interest of the dominant group at its own free will. Global politics can be considered as a single institution with members from different parts of the world. It has a power structure and members are in hegemonic relations with each other. They struggle to attain, maintain and resist dominance. The powerful states are in hegemonic relation with the other states where they assist and support them and achieve their goals with persuasion and consent of the other states. In the hegemonic relations there is always a room for a power shift, therefore subordinate states are always in a struggle to attain power.

2.6 Hegemony

The term hegemony is derived from ancient Greek ‘hegemonia’ which was used to express the domination and oppression of one entity over the rest. Gramsci’s (1971) concept of hegemony suggests that the power is not always coercive; it can be with the consent of the oppressed. He has contributed significantly to understanding the present political world. His contribution to the concept of hegemony has benefited many disciplines including international relations, political science and linguistics. He added
to the ancient concept that was based on the coercive power. Gramsci (cited in Yilmaz, 2010) believes “hegemony represents the status of the most powerful country in the international system or the position of a dominant state in a specific region” (p.3).

The modern political world is structured on power and this power is attained through different long-term and short-term strategies. The most powerful country in the world has to win the consent of the other countries to sustain its position. Political discourse is used to persuade the other groups to support the political ideologies of the dominant and to win their consent for achieving a dominant position. Superpower develops good relationships with everyone and gives the feeling that it works for the benefit of the subordinate groups. These aspects are exposed in the discourse of the superpower and research studies in the field of discourse have attempted to find them out.

2.6.1 Hegemony and Critical Discourse Analysis

Hegemony is an important element in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis. A bulk of research has been conducted in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis with a focus on hegemony. Hegemony is a shape of power relations, dominance and control that has a spirit of manufacturing of consent of the oppressed (van Dijk, 1993). Hegemony also highlights the power structure in social institutions. Therefore, it has a great value in the field of political studies. Most of the studies in Critical Discourse Analysis and hegemony are done on political discourse. Politics is an important forum for hegemony because the birth of the concept of hegemony has taken place on the basis of politics. The relation of politics and hegemony makes it practical for the researchers of Critical Discourse Analysis to take them into consideration. Politics has got a greater place for the researchers of Critical Discourse Analysis because of the importance of power relations in politics.

2.6.2 Hegemony in the Present Political World

Hegemony is not stable, and it moves from one state to the other. It helps the dominant state to sustain its position as well as gives chances to subordinate states to take their position in a hegemonic structure that can shift from the subordinate to the dominant position. Hegemony helps the dominant to convince the other to follow the
moral, cultural and political concepts in the society preferred by them. They use different strategies for this purpose. According to Cox (1981) theories of Realism and Neorealism were formed in the field of international relations by the elite western countries to give the feeling to the world that international order is natural and therefore unchangeable. The establishment of civilian society institutions helped them to extend their views throughout the world and structure the hegemonic relations.

Similarly, in political context hegemony helps the politician to produce political systems and implement on the target nations with their consent. The difference between dominance and hegemony is the consent and persuasion of the others by hegemonic powers. In this process hegemonic powers through persuasion make the other groups believe and accept their interests as common interests (Nye, 2002). Hegemonic power needs strength and capability to convince others. Strange (1989) mentions that two types of powers are required by hegemony i.e. relational and structural strength. Relational power is the capacity of the hegemon to force or convince the other groups. Structural power is to have knowledge and awareness of the norms and desires of the other groups in the institution. In the present hegemonic structure in the international politics, both relational and structural powers are used to dominate other nations. The modern concept of the global village is an example of the structural power where through interaction and participation, the superpowers get knowledge about the norms and desires of the people and shape their policies accordingly. Therefore, the policies of the dominant look like familiar and in the favour of the people. So, the subordinate accepts them with spontaneous consent.

2.6.3 Hegemony and Dominance

Hegemony is based on persuasion and consent. It is the leadership as well as domination in different domains of the society including cultural, religious, economic and ideological. Undoubtedly, hegemony is power and it dominates the society overall but the dominance is always partial and temporary just like an ‘unstable equilibrium’ (Fairclough, 1992a). The unstable nature of hegemonic relations demands the construction of alliance by the powerful group rather than simply dominating of the other groups. The alliance and integration with subordinate groups are achieved by utilizing ideological means to win their consent. Once subordinate classes are
persuaded the dominant group achieves the dominant position in the society. According to Gramsci (1971)

The spontaneous consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group; this consent is "historically" caused by the prestige which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production (p. 12).

He uses the word spontaneous which gives the sense that the dominant group influences the other groups in such a way that the later spontaneously accepts the former’s views i.e. without resistance. The dominant groups impose their views but it is not done through coercion, rather, through persuasion.

Similarly, in the current political world, powerful countries make an alliance with other nations and offer concessions. The subordinate political groups accept them, and the dominant political groups achieve their political goals with their consent. There is neither absolute power in the political world nor power is consistent. This proves the presence of hegemonic relations among the political groups in the world.

The shift from dominance to hegemony is very much dependent on the ideology. Hegemonic forces manipulate ideologies of the other groups to convince them and win their consent in the political context. Ideology is present in the discourse of the political actors through which they transfer their views and win the consent. Their ideological discourse assists them to dominate the subordinate groups.

Gramsci’s (1971) concept of hegemony can be applied in many disciplines where power is studied as a variable. Many theorists have utilized this concept of hegemony to investigate the cultural dominance of a social group. Gramsci’s (1971) observation of hegemony in relation to culture is very helpful in this regard. He believes hegemony exists in a society for a span of time that is historically specific and brief because it is continuously contested. The group that wins it loses it soon as the nature of hegemony is not long lasting. The term used for this type of hegemony is cultural hegemony. The main focus of cultural hegemony is an investigation of the relationship between culture and power.
2.6.4 Hegemonic Setup and Ideology

Gramsci (1971) described two levels of society which are involved in the hegemonic setup. One is public or civil society and the other is state or political society. Both the societies make the hegemony function in the broader social setup where the dominant group dominates the whole set up with the consent of the other. On the other side, juridical aspects of the government dominates people by force.

Here two elements of Gramsci's model are state and civil society. First, he separates the civil society and political society or the State. Civil society in a country is grounded in the institutions such as the family system, educational set up, mass media and religious beliefs and so on. These institutions have their root in ideological beliefs of the society and they work on that function largely on the grounds of ideology. They shape and reshape their ideologies that are influenced by their experiences and their views about the world whether these experiences and views are stable or shifting. The second element is political society or the State. This system is not ideological as it consists of the police, the army and the judiciary; therefore, it is a system of coercion. It forces on a system of beliefs which is imposed on the masses. In this situation, spontaneous consent could not be achieved by the dominant group. This discussion highlights the fact that hegemony in a state is not present in its political system but it is at work in the public or civil societies. However, it can also be exercised by the government although the basic system of government is based on coercion. The worldview produced by hegemony is actively supported by the allied/subordinate groups.

2.6.5 Hegemony and Politics

Hegemony is referred to as the domination in the social sphere. In politics, it is defined with reference to the relationship between states that is based on a political rule or dominance of one state on the other state in friendly relations. Gramsci (1971) used the term ‘hegemony’ to refer to social cultural and political dominance.

Hegemony in social classes is focused on the ruling class of the society as it has power over the other classes. Gramsci (1971) defines it as a ‘spontaneous consent’ that is the power attained through consent of the dominated instead of the force of the
dominating bloc as in the words of Fairclough (1989) ‘consent rather than coercion’. Gramsci (1971) has studied the hegemonic relations in the political institutions and believes that struggle to achieve hegemony is a key idea for understanding the nature of political power. This view of power emphasizes that the ways to use the power by dominant people depend on achieving the active consent or at least passive agreement of the dominated people. He distinguished between rule and hegemony where the rule is associated with coercion and hegemony is linked with consent. Gramsci (1971) shaped the term ‘hegemony’ by defining it as the formation and organization of consent.

This view of hegemony is dominant in the present political world where political powers apparently are involved in the betterment of the dominated groups but actually, they are busy in getting their own benefits and this happens with the agreement and consent of the dominated. This shows that hegemony is the establishment and maintenance (and contestation) of the social dominance of particular social groups (Fairclough, 2003). The hegemonic struggle takes place on a broad front (e.g. World politics) with possible unevenness between different groups and domains. Laclau and Mouffe (2001) have linked the concept of hegemony to discourse theory. They find hegemony involved in a struggle between different discourses, each one of them to be accepted as universal. This view specifies the hegemonic struggle to the discursive practices of the groups (e.g. world political leaders). Fairclough (1992a, 1992b) suggests that the theory of hegemony can be connected to intertextuality to relate the intertextual analysis to a larger social set up and to bring in the power relations and hegemonic struggle in the study of intertextuality which is the focus of the present study.

2.6.6 Hegemony and Political Discourse

Language behaviour associated with social set up is discourse and when this behaviour is limited to the political set up of a society it is called political discourse. In other words, political discourse is ‘text and talk of politicians’ (van Dijk, 2001c). Political discourse is commonly associated with the power relations and hegemony. It talks about the policies made by the authorities, debates in the parliament and other instances of discourse in the political set up. Critical Discourse Analysts study political discourse to find out power and hegemony in the political scenarios of different
countries individually as well as globally in the interaction of the politicians, policies, alliance, differences and issue at the global level. Global political discourse is generally taken as the discourse in the context of the political affairs that are in the interest of the world overall.

van Dijk (1989, 1995, 1996, 2001b, 2001c) studies political discourse from different aspects. He talks about ideology and political discourse, dominance and discourse. He discusses political discourse analysis and gives a concrete framework for the researchers who are interested in the different aspect of political discourse analysis specifically. He takes into account cognitive, ideological and social aspects with reference to political context.

Political discourse is also a part of media discourse as media provides a platform to politicians to convey their ideas to masses to win their consent. Political talk shows, news bulletin and other programs are mostly based on politics. They expose the political ideologies of the politicians and the way they utilize ideologies to achieve hegemony in their discourse. The transfer of ideologies and winning consent is all done through discourse.

2.6.7 Hegemony, Politics and Critical Discourse Analysis

Hegemony has been a focus for the researchers who studied power in any respect, be it the power of communication, politics or discourse. Mumby (2009) has studied hegemony in organizational communication studies and found that discursive practices can be interpreted in various ways which may contradict. This interpretation is hurdled by so many factors like political, social and economic context. Mikinori (2009) examines hegemony and assumption in news text and finds out how discourse becomes dominant or is ignored with the passage of time and how the sense of value is incorporated in the news texts about that discourse. Phillips (1998) focuses on hegemony in politics and has studied hegemony in relation to Thatcherism in the context of political parties in England. The study finds the discourse associated with Thatcherism discourse involved in a hegemonic project.

Hegemony is also discussed from aspects like cultural, political and social in different disciplines (Gramsci, 1971; Joseph, 2002). It is also explored by the theorist
of Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1989, 1995a, 1995b) in connection with the discourse. In Critical Discourse Analysis hegemony is seen through discourse and it is mostly studied in the context of politics. Critical Discourse Analysis theorist studies ideologies in political discourse to examine power and hegemony (Horvath, 2009; Viberg, 2011; Safro and Krampa, 2013; Cirugeda & Ruiz 2013; Abdelaal, 2015).

Hegemony is a point of research in the areas of society where the relation of dominance and description is present. That is the reason it is mostly a variable in the researches related to political, cultural and social aspects of society. Hegemony and discourse have been a topic of study in the field of linguistics. Specifically, Critical Discourse Analysis recently has utilized hegemony as a variable with discourse like Fairclough (1995a, 2003) and van Dijk (2001b) discusses the relation of hegemony and discourse with relation to linguistic theories.

### 2.7 Intertextuality

The commonplace idea of intertextuality says that texts are constructed based on some other texts. Text producer creates a text just because he has already heard or read another text. The term ‘intertextuality’ was introduced by Kristeva but the concept of intertextuality is actually developed by Bakhtin (1981) in his theory of dialogism. Bakhtin (1981) emphasized that texts are dialogic in nature because for the production of every new text the voices already present in other text are transformed and used in the new text (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986). Kristeva (1980) used the term intertextuality while discussing different ways in which text and talk are used to produce new texts. According to Fairclough (1992a) intertextuality is “the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo and so forth” (p. 84). Bakhtin (1981), Kristeva (1980) and Allen (2000) find texts as a meeting point of different other texts and composite of utterances each of which is a form of dialogue (Sheyholislami, 2001).

#### 2.7.1 Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis

Kristeva (1986) has categorized intertextuality as horizontal and vertical intertextuality. Fairclough (1992a, 1992b) in his theory of Critical Discourse Analysis has named these categorizations as manifest intertextuality and constitutive
intertextuality. Horizontal intertextuality denotes the explicit voices of other texts and clear manifestation of other references present in a text. Text producers usually do it to clarify the point under discussion and with its help, they develop new information in the text and the connection between both old and new points is clear and obvious. Vertical intertextuality does not demarcate the previous references in an explicit way; rather their relation is implicitly developed that is done by merging the old and new voices.

The hidden or implicit references in the texts keep information about the social, cultural and ideological beliefs and they are manipulated by the text producers to influence the text consumers. It reconstructs the existing ideologies; therefore, it influences and is influenced by the power structure and struggle for hegemony in a social set up. This category of intertextuality relates the texts with practices (Momani et al, 2010). Intertextual analysis can be executed from different perspectives of the texts because it takes into consideration the production as well as the reception and consumption of the texts. Production of the texts involves the reference the text producer uses while creating it and reception is related to the receivers of the text who consume it in accordance with social and cultural values and position.

Text producers utilize the prior texts to restructure the new one and to transform the existing conventions, assumptions and ideologies. The production process is socially restricted, and it depends on the power relations in the institution the text belongs to. Here, intertextuality combines with the theory of power with the help of which the ideology of the producer can be exposed. Intertextuality helps the receivers of the text to understand that only the text is not responsible for interpretation and transformation, but the other texts brought in by the text producer also contribute.

Production of the text can be targeted to a specific group of consumers and others might interpret them in a different way according to their knowledge of the brought in texts that might differ in different contexts. In fact, the text has a different mental representation for different text consumers (Chilton, 2004). The text is presupposed by the receivers and this is not in the control of the text producer because he/she is not aware of the presuppositions revealed and exposed by the text (Culler,
Intertextuality is a source of exerting power and hegemony which is proved by different studies conducted in different genres of political discourse. Gadavanji (2002) has studied intertextuality in the political discourse in the context of No-confidence debate in the parliament of Thailand. He shows how intertexts help the parliamentarians to talk against the policies of the government without breaching the parliament code of behaviour. Hodge (2011) examines the intertextual elements in the discourse of the US political leaders on post 2001 terrorism, Mikinori (2009) has studied print media, Oliveria (2004) has analyzed newspaper discourse and Bazerman (2011), Lemke (2004) and Khaghaninejad (2014) have examined the role of intertextuality in academic discourse.

Intertextuality in political discourse operates at two levels that are the text may exhibit intertextuality from its own cohesive characteristics e.g. morpho-syntactic elements like ellipsis, pronouns and conjunctions which indicate how a specific discourse is constructed and how it refers to other texts and the public knowledge from which that text has been drawn (Wafula, 2002). Momani et al. (2010) have examined the intertextuality derived by the ideologies of producers and receivers of the text in political discourse with reference to the Middle East. They exposed the ideological power struggle in the political discourse of Osama bin Laden and George Bush.

Fairclough’s (1988) analysis of the article ‘The Sun’ shows how the voice of ‘The Sun’ merges with the voice of the official document. This is evident in the fact that ‘The Sun’ supports the recommendations that the official document makes to ‘The House of Commons’ as if they are The Sun’s recommendations. But at the same time, ‘The Sun’ does not merely repeat the official document but rather rephrases things and expresses them in its own words and language. The paper manages to do this in two ways: by changing the formal language and legal jargon, using conversational vocabulary and speak the language and by converting the written monologue of the official document to a conversational dialogue. This example of intertextuality shows
that while ‘The Sun’ report is based on a previous text, it responds to the future utterances, expectations of its readers, by configuring the original text into its own discourse type.

Fairclough (1992a, p. 189) claims that intertextual properties of a text are realized “in its linguistic features” since it is assumed that texts “may be linguistically heterogeneous.” Intertextuality has an active dialectical relationship with the society. Not only does the history of discourse manifest itself in intertextuality, intertextuality also serves as a strategy to create the most effective discourse in that particular context (Gadavanji, 2002). The discussion shows that intertextuality facilitates the discourse by providing a chance to the individuals to say something which is not easy for them to say by adopting the intertexts according to the situation. Secondly, intertextual elements make a piece of discourse more effective by converting it into the discourse of power and hegemony.

2.8 Conclusion

This chapter has provided critical insight into power relations, hegemony in the context of the political discourse. It has elucidated the power relations and hegemony in the global political forum in the context of the divide between the freedom of expression and the issue of blasphemy. Power relations are present at every level of the society. Global political power relations are established through the political interaction at the global level. They are structured by the ideologies of the political actors. Studies conducted in the backdrop of power relation, hegemony and political discourse discussed comprehensively. Theory of hegemony and power relations provide a theoretical foundation for the present study and the relationship between power, discourse and politics have been explored. The next chapter is focussed on the methodological aspect of the study. It explicates the context and setting, theoretical underpinning, data collection and sampling and research method of the present study.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The present study is a qualitative analysis of the speeches of world political leaders. It is designed to investigate power relations and hegemony in global political discourse. It is aimed at critically analyzing the discourse of world political leaders to examine the construction and sustenance of power and hegemonic relations among them.

3.1.1 Context

The context of the study is the controversy of blasphemy that came into prominence in 2012 and created a divide between the Muslim world and the West. The specific event on which the study is based is the release of a video on YouTube that was a trailer for the movie *Innocence of Muslims*. The video contained controversial material about Islam particularly the Prophet of Islam Muhammad (SAWW). Muslims found its content blasphemous and against the philosophy of Islam. They considered it an attack on the Islamic ideology and protested against the video. The protesters demanded action against the maker of the movie and they became violent when their demand was responded to by the West with silence and no action was taken by the government of the United States. It was a matter of emotions and religious attachment that made the situation worse.

Historically the release of the video was, in fact, one of the series of events that took place during last few decades in the West against Islam and particularly the Prophet (SAWW) of Islam. The protests against these events that occurred in the West continued throughout the Muslim world and resulted in conflicts between the two. The events also became the reason for the wrath and hatred of the Islamic religious groups and the general public for the West. Major events provoking the rage in the Muslim
world were the publication of *Satanic Verses* (1989), Cartoon crises (2005,2006) and *Innocence of Muslims* (2012). The West has seen these events as an instance of free speech while for the Muslim world it was an attack on the religious freedom. The conflict between the two increased every time such an event happened in the West and ended up with protests in the Muslim World. The video was a personal attack on the character of Muhammad (SAWW) as well as Islam which resulted in almost 70 deaths and attacks on the diplomatic posts all around the world. The divide between free speech and religious freedom has caused a split between the West and the Muslim world. Cultural and ideological differences made these conflicts even worse (Lane, 2012).

The discourse developed between them in the background of the issue of blasphemy after the release of the blasphemous video and the divide created between the western world and the Muslim world are taken as the background of the study. Data selected for the study is based on the same discourse and it is restricted to the particular setting where the divide between the two groups was discussed with reference to the issue of blasphemy and its consequences.

### 3.1.2 Setting

The setting of the study is the 67th United Nations General Assembly session held in September 2012, specifically the session of General Debate from 25th September to 1st October 2012 where representatives from various countries took part in the discussion of various topics (General Assembly, n.d.). The study is restricted to the debate on the freedom of expression and blasphemy as well as the divide between freedom of expression and religious freedom of the Muslims.

### 3.1.3 Nature of the Study

The study is based on the qualitative research paradigm that can be defined as "an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants and conducted in a natural setting” (Creswell, 1994, p.1-2).
The social/human problem for the present study is the ways in which power relations and hegemony are established and maintained among world political leaders. Politics is an important institution of the society and it gets influence from the set norms of the society as well as influences the social values of the society. Political actors are firstly social actors and their identity as social actors reflect in their practices as political actors. Therefore, the problems or actions of the political actors are directly linked to society at each level. The study focuses on the intertextual analysis of the discourse of the political leaders to find out the hegemony and power relations in the global politics. The study is structured to find out the power relations among the political leaders in (natural) setting that is the UN General Assembly Meeting.

The qualitative research is flexible because it accommodates and helps the researcher to find out the complex realities in the disciplines of humanities and social science. It is helpful to find out the conflicts or contradictions in beliefs, attitudes, behaviours, emotions, (mutual) relationships and opinions of the individuals. The qualitative research has different options that lead to the single destination of qualitative inquiry. It gives the researcher the freedom to choose a research method according to the nature and requirement of the research problem he/she is dealing with. This becomes possible for qualitative researcher because “there is no single, (accepted) way of doing qualitative research” (Richie & Lewis 2003, p.1) and due to its flexibility and accommodation it “certainly is not a unified set of techniques or philosophies and indeed has grown out of a wide range of intellectual and disciplinary traditions”. (Mason 2002, p.2). Therefore, the followers of qualitative research enjoy the freedom of moulding their research study according to the problem, data and methodology of their research.

Qualitative paradigm is focused on interpretation, understanding, experiencing and production/constitution of the social world (Mason, 2002). The social world is the world of human behaviour, human experiences and understanding of one another and the society. Qualitative research paradigm is based on data generation methods which are flexible and sensitive to the social context in which it is produced rather than strictly structured or focused on the real-life context that indicates the highly objective nature of data.
“Based on methods of analysis, explanation and argument building which involve understandings of complexity, detail and context. Qualitative research aims to produce rounded and contextual understandings on the basis of rich, nuanced and detailed data. There is more emphasis on ‘holistic’ forms of analysis and explanation in this sense, then on charting surface patterns, trends and correlations” (Mason, p3-4).

The present study deals with the purely human problem in a real-life context and data collected for the study is context relevant as well as it has its social value. It does not take into account rigidly structured methods and tools to find out the reality, rather it is flexible to a great extent and is concerned with socially and contextually relevant reality. in terms of research philosophies, the study falls into relativist ontology with subjective or emic epistemology. Emic epistemology is focused on studying the experiences of people as interpreted by them e.g. interviews, speeches etc. (Olson, 2016). This is the reason emic perspective is considered to be the hallmark of the qualitative research (Fetterman, 2008). It reflects that multiple realities are present in the society, shaped by the context in which they exist. The researcher can study these realities by interacting with the social actors and examining their behaviours and experiences as an insider of the world in which they live.

3.2 Critical Discourse Analysis and the Present Study

Critical Discourse Analysis is the methodological stance of the present study which is a comprehensive and multidisciplinary approach. The research in Critical Discourse Analysis moves from one to the other discipline and this interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary nature of research is helpful for analyzing “complex social problems such as racism, sexism or other forms of discrimination and social domination” (Unger, 2016, p.1). Critical Discourse Analysis is an emerging tool for researchers in the disciplines that fall in the genre of social research and has a focus on the analysis of discourse with relation to socio-political and other related issues present in the society. As a multidisciplinary methodology, it concentrates on the issues present in the social world from different perspectives while being restricted to the boundaries of discourse.

Critical Discourse Analysis is multi-faceted in nature because it takes into account different levels of discourse to study the hidden ideologies and power relations.
The context of discourse is important for this approach because it holds that language is a social practice rather than individual possession and the social interaction depends on the context in which the social actors meet and communicate their ideas with one another. In this process of interaction and communication, critical discourse analysts see power relations between individuals and groups as the main focus. Therefore, all the versions of Critical Discourse Analysis have a particular interest in the relationship between language and power (Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, 2003, Wodak, 2001b, Van Dijk, 1993, 1997).

Critical Discourse Analysis studies the relationship between discourse and context at two levels. First is a macro-level analysis that studies the text in relation to the social context or order of discourse. This relation is described by Fairclough as “Discourses are diverse representations of social life which are inherently positioned – differently positioned social actors see and represent social life in different ways” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 123). He reveals the relationship of discourse with social life and identities of social actors that are based on the way they interact and relate themselves to the social set up to which they are associated. The order of discourse is the manner in which different discourses, as well as genres, are working together as a network (Fairclough, 2001).

Second is the micro-level of analysis and it focusses on the textual and intertextual analyses. Fairclough finds that the emphasis of intertextual analysis is on “broad lines” between text and discourse practice as it examines the traces of discourse practices in the text. Some researchers, however, put intertextuality in the third category that is mesolevel of analysis (Grewal, 2008) and separate it from the textual analysis. However, I believe intertextuality belongs to micro-analysis because it is also a type of textual analysis with a different focus that is the analysis of the text brought in by the individuals to create some effect. It has a strong connection with Fairclough’s division of textual analysis called semantic relations (Fairclough, 2003). Macro-level is the point where micro-level analysis is seen in the broader social institutions where power relations and hegemony are in action (Fairclough, 2001). My study is related to macro analysis in the second part where the intertexts are studied with reference to the position, identity and ideology of the political leaders which expose power relations and hegemony among them.
Political discourse has many forms and it dwells in different genres like electronic media, print media, political debates, policies, conferences, meetings, reports, agendas and speeches. Critical Discourse Analysis is aimed at finding out the instances in the political text which not only help to establish the text as an important tool to expose the politics but also goes deep down to find out ideologies and power relations as well as hegemonic structure exposed through the discourse of the political leaders. In the field of Critical Discourse Analysis, there are many sub-theories which are used to study political discourse like Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) and Ideological Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 2012). Most of the studies of political discourse in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis follow various concepts given by Fairclough while many of them follow the socio-cognitive approach and ideology theories (Rashidi & Souzandehfar, 2010; Bayram, 2010; Wang, 2010; Horváth, 2009; David & Dumanig, 2011). However, the present study is based on the theory of intertextuality and hegemony given by Fairclough (1992a, 1992b).

Critical Discourse Analysis is subjective in nature because while approaching it the researcher has to take an explicit position. The major interest of a Critical Discourse Analyst is being at one side of the binary of power relations, understand, expose and ultimately to “resist social inequality”. The research in this area is conducted “in solidarity and cooperation with dominated groups” (Van Dijk, 2001a, p. 353). The present study might also sound subjective. If so, it is not the researcher who is biased rather this is the way Critical Discourse Analysis is implemented.

3.3 Research Method

The study aims to examine the selected data through Fairclough’s concept of Critical Discourse Analysis that is a widely used approach in the field of linguistics to expose the nature of the power relations, dominance and bias between different groups (Van Dijk, 1995). The study specifically follows intertextuality as a method of analysis as suggested by Fairclough in his book *Discourse and Social Change*. Intertextuality is the relationship between texts and the nature of the relationship “is the shaping of a text’s meaning by another text” (Hallo, 2010). Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis sees the relationships between texts from the perspective of the context and co-text in which they occur, particularly the borrowed texts (Fairclough, 1992a).
Intertexts are actually the chunks of texts that belong to one text but are borrowed and used in the other texts for creating some effect. The present study through intertextual analysis studies the selected texts with reference to their histories has tried to find out the presence of alien texts (Bakhtin, 1986) in the texts under study and the ways these alien texts are re-contextualized and used to expose the structure of power.

Intertextual analysis or intertextuality is more interpretive than descriptive (Fairclough 2003). His definition of intertextuality explains that it is the characteristic of the texts that have “snatches” of other texts explicitly or implicitly present in them and they are used to communicate desired meaning in the discursive event. Fairclough (1992a, 2003) identifies two types of intertextuality, i.e. manifest intertextuality and constitutive intertextuality/interdiscursivity. Manifest intertextuality deals with the explicit presence of other texts within a text. Constitutive intertextuality refers “to the structure of discourse conventions that go into the new text’s production” (Sheyholislami, 2001). It is further explained by Fairclough (2003) as mixing of genres, discourses and styles. He explains intertextuality in comparison with the linguistic analysis in the following words.

“…linguistic analysis is descriptive in nature, whereas intertextual analysis is more interpretative. Linguistic features of texts provide evidence which can be used in intertextual analysis and intertextual analysis is a particular sort of interpretation of that evidence” (Fairclough, 1995a, p. 61).

Fairclough used intertextuality for the analysis of newspaper articles and provided two sample analyses (Fairclough, 1992a, p. 103 & 113). The researcher has utilized Fairclough’s model of intertextuality and moulded it in association with the data and context of the present study. The present study is based on the analysis of the political speeches which has a different structure and scope from that of the news reports. The intertextual analysis presented in the present study is more elaborate than the way it is used by Fairclough (1992a). The researcher has defined and extended the terms used in the method by Fairclough in association with her data. The terms are given at the end of this chapter.
Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis helps the researchers to interpret the references present in texts while considering their histories. It makes possible for the researchers to expose the hidden ideologies of the text producers. These ideologies are promoted by the text producers to construct and sustain the power relations. This makes intertextuality a suitable method for the study of political discourse and for this reason I have adopted intertextuality as a method for my study that is explained in the following lines

1. I have followed the division of intertextuality as suggested by Fairclough (1992a) that is the main categorization of intertextuality in manifest intertextuality and interdiscursivity and further division of manifest intertextuality into five categories that are
   a. Discourse Representations (direct discourse representations and free indirect discourse)
   b. Presuppositions
   c. Negation
   d. Metadiscourse
   e. Irony
   I have analyzed each category of manifest intertextuality under a separate heading

2. In order to avoid confusion in my analysis, I have divided the selected speeches (data for my study) into paragraphs and assigned them numbers. It has helped me to refer to the speeches while analyzing different parts of them.

3. While analyzing interdiscursivity my focus has been on mixing of different genres, discourses and styles in the speeches, as suggested by Fairclough (1992a, 2003) and here I have preferred to avoid separate heading to discuss genres, discourses and styles because I have found them intermingled and a separate discussion of them could have led to the repetition. However, I have followed my division of paragraphing and done an interdiscursive analysis of each paragraph separately. I have analyzed my data following the same sequence throughout (see Chapter 4)

4. I have divided my data analysis chapter into three sections. The first section analyzes the speech of President Obama and is named as intertextuality in
dominant discourse. The second part consists of the analysis of the speech of president Zardari and is named as intertextuality in subordinate discourse. The last part is intertextuality in dominant vs subordinate discourse and it examines the interplay of power relations and hegemony as exposed in the previous parts. Throughout the analysis, the focus is on the intertextual references present in the speeches.

5. Power relations in this study are incorporated in the concept of hegemony as suggested by Fairclough (1992a)

3.4 Rationale for Intertextuality as Method

I have preferred intertextuality as a method of analysis for my research because I felt that the background issue of my thesis is sensitive and historical. I expected to find intertextual references used by the political leaders while discussing this issue. My interest was developed in the intertextual analysis after studying Fairclough’s (1992a) concept of intertextuality, particularly, his idea of combining intertextuality with the theory of hegemony.

I believe the combination of both by using one as a theory and other as the method is an ideal way for analyzing my data which is based on the political discourse of dominant and subordinate groups of the world politics. Fairclough (1992b) used intertextuality to analyze an article from the British official magazine The Sun. However, I have attempted to use it as a method for the analysis of political speeches of the global political leaders. The level of formality of context and setting of the study as well as the sensitivity of the problem I selected, led me towards the intertextual analysis instead of textual analysis because there was a great chance that the speakers would convey their message in hidden clues rather than use direct language.

Additionally, I feel political discourse intertextually plays an important role in revealing the power relations and hegemony by concentrating on the snatches of other texts present in the discourse of the political leaders as these snatches of texts are used intentionally and to give a particular effect to their discourse. In political discourse, identities are constructed and on the basis of the constructed identities, social reality is structured. Intertextuality can play an important role in constructing and reconstructing
identities (Fairclough, 2003) of the political actors. The process of the construction of socio-political reality helps the political actors to construct and sustain the power relations and hegemony. I have attempted to study this phenomenon through intertextual analysis of the political discourse.

Finally, intertextuality has provided me room to examine the data minutely for intertexts and see the history of the intertext to expose the hidden ideologies and power relations between the dominant and subordinate political groups while the theory of hegemony (on which the study is based) has provided grounds to associate these intertexts with the power structure and hegemony and find out their function in constructing, sustaining and fracturing the power relations. In other words, intertextuality as a method has all the ingredients needed to investigate the political speeches in order to find out the nature of power relations and hegemony in political discourse around the world.

### 3.5 Theoretical Framework

The study follows the theoretical framework of intertextuality and hegemony suggested by Fairclough (1992a) in his book *Discourse and Social Change*. He has taken the concept of intertextuality from the French theorist Julia Kristeva (1986) and explained it with reference to the concepts of critical discourse analysis. According to Fairclough (1992a, 1992b), the theory of intertextuality reveals the history of the texts by exposing their origins. He argues that the theory of intertextuality alone is unable to expose the power relations in a social context which is the main core of the theory of critical discourse analysis. Therefore, he attaches it with the theory of hegemony to find out the interplay of power and hegemony through the intertexts present in a text. His concept approve that every text that is brought into another text has a role in constructing, sustaining and fracturing the power relations through discourse. He suggests the combination of hegemony theory with intertextuality because he thinks it can help to

list the possibilities and limitations for intertextual processes and the processes of constructing and restructuring orders of discourse as processes of hegemonic struggle in the sphere of discourse, which has
effect upon as well as affected by hegemonic struggle in the wider sense (Fairclough, 1992a, p. 103).

He followed this framework for analyzing different texts. In his analysis, he focused on two dimensions of the intertextuality: manifest intertextuality and constitutive intertextuality. He explains manifest intertextuality in terms of discourse representations, presuppositions, negation, metadiscourse and irony and constitutive intertextuality as interdiscursivity that is mixing of genres, discourse and styles in the text (Fairclough, 1992a). The concept of hegemony in the present study is based on the definition given by Fairclough (1992a) “Hegemony is a focus of constant struggle around points of greatest instability between classes and blocs, to construct or sustain or fracture alliances and relations of domination/subordination, which takes economic; political and ideological forms” (p. 92).

The point of instability for the present study is the divide between the concept of freedom of expression and blasphemy/religious freedom. The study has attempted to find out how political leaders through their discursive practice construct, sustain and fracture alliances and relation of domination and subordination. In the present study, the focus is purely on the political aspect.

3.6 Data Collection

The background for my study is the debate of blasphemy versus freedom of expression in the context and setting of United Nations General Assembly Session 2012. In this context, I have selected six speeches of the leaders from different countries who have some relation to this issue. My data comprises the speeches of President of the United States Mr. Barak Obama, United Nations Secretary General Mr. Ban Ki Moon, President of Pakistan Mr. Asif Ali Zardari, President of Egypt Mr. Hamid Karzai and President of Indonesia Mr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. It also includes various discourses incorporated within the speeches of the two political leaders. These discourses are directly or indirectly related to the issue under discussion. Their presence enhances the context of the problem, are helpful in understanding the background of the issue and aids to the comprehension of the present research. Their historical references make my data more elaborated and comprehensive than it looks apparently
and more suitable for the method of analysis I chose, i.e. intertextuality. I feel my data is appropriate to find out the power relations and hegemony between the two groups and the intertextual strategies used to construct, sustain and fracture these relations.

The speeches are selected in the written form rather than videos or audios because I felt for intertextual analysis, the written text would be more appropriate and convenient for me. Additionally, the theory did not have any problem with the type of data as its focus is on the intertexts rather than linguistic and pragmatic features.

3.6.1 Sample

I have followed the purposive sampling technique that comes under the division of non-probability sampling and also called non-random sampling. The purposive sample has other names like judgmental and selective sampling, and it refers to the data that is selected on the basis of the problem under study (Latham, 2007). My selection of the speeches of political leaders who are in the binary of power relations and hegemony and with reference to the context of the study too has made it an example of purposive sampling.

3.6.2 Delimitation

I have delimited my study to the speeches of the world political leaders who have relation with the issue of blasphemy. They discussed it at the 67th meeting of the United Nations general assembly. My intention has been to examine the power structure and the relations of power among these countries that could have been exposed in the best manner through the discourse developed after the release of the video. Methodologically, this study is delimited to the concept of intertextuality and hegemony in the theory of critical discourse analysis.

3.7 Definitions of the Terms as Used in the Study

3.7.1 Manifest Intertextuality

I followed the Fairclough’s (1992a) definition of manifest intertextuality which refers to the instances of the other texts present in the speeches selected for the study.
The presence of other texts is visible or manifest at the linguistic level of the text. The types of manifest intertextuality focused in the present study are following

3.7.1.a Discourse representations. Under the heading of discourse representations, direct speech, indirect speech and free indirect speech are analysed. Direct speech refers to the texts directly quoted in the speeches. Indirect speech refers to the examples where the text is used but not quoted rather used indirectly. Free indirect speech is when the speaker mixed his voice with the voice of the text brought in by him.

Discourse representation is a form of intertextuality in which parts of specific other texts are incorporated into a text and are usually explicitly marked such as, with devices like quotation marks and reporting clauses (Fairclough, 1992a).

3.7.1.b Presuppositions. Presuppositions are the assumptions of the speakers which they believe their audience already know about. In manifest intertextuality, these assumptions belong to some other text (Fairclough, 1992a). For example, the phrase “The Libyan Revolution” presupposes that Libya has gone/is going through a revolution and it is known to everyone present in the UN General Assembly meeting. The presupposition is taken from the discourse of the Libyan revolution and re-contextualized in his speech by President Obama.

Presuppositions become manipulative when the presupposed idea is not agreed upon or known by their consumers as well as they are imposing the point of view of the speaker (De Saussure, Schulz, 2005). In political discourse, political leaders hide the agenda they promote behind the ideologies presented in the presuppositions and many times the ideologies are not in the interest of the common people. The manipulation of ideologies is exposed through the analysis of the presuppositions and the assumptions hidden behind them. This study follows Fairclough’s (1992a) concept of presuppositions in intertextuality and finds presupposition, the assumptions that belong to some other text and they are used by one group manipulate the ideologies of the other group.

3.7.1.c Negation. It is a type of presupposition that is used to negate some assumption (Fairclough 1992a). Most of the time negation is explicit from linguistic markers like “no” or “not” but sometimes sentences can be semantically negative rather than
linguistically. For example, the phrase “Libyan revolution is a myth” negates the concept of revolution in Libya.

3.7.1.d Metadiscourse. This type of manifest intertextuality discusses the presence of other texts in a way that the speaker tries to be at a distance from the intertext. In this case, the speaker uses techniques like hedges (e.g. It is a sort of bad service) or paraphrasing to use the intertext (Fairclough, 1992a).

3.7.1.e Irony. Irony refers to the situation when a person says something while meaning the other thing. According to Al-Hindawi and Kadhim (2015), the irony is understanding the pretention of being naïve in a context where both the discourse producer and consumer are well-acquainted with the situation. Jorgensen et al. (1984), assume "that an ironist uses a figurative meaning opposite to the literal meaning of the utterance" (p. 112). In manifest intertextuality, irony occurs when the presence of the intertext creates the ironic effect. The present study takes into account the situational irony that is created when the statement of the speaker negates his/her own statement said earlier in the speech.

3.7.2 Interdiscursivity

Interdiscursivity is the type of intertextuality that involves the mixing of different genres, discourses, and styles (Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b, 2003). I have examined the ways in which interdiscursivity works in the power structure of the world political context by studying it in the data, I have selected for my study.

The study is focused on exposing the ways in which manifest intertextuality and interdiscursivity unveil the ideologies and power relations as well as the ways in which both the types of intertextuality are responsible for revealing hegemony in the data.

3.7.2.a Intertexts/ Intertextual references. They are the other texts or alien texts that are used in the speeches by the political leaders.

3.7.3. Video.

In order to avoid repetition, many times I have used the word “video” instead of giving the complete detail of what that video is about. Whenever I used the word
“video” I meant the YouTube video of the trailer of the movie *Innocence of Muslims* that has followed the violent protest by Muslims around the world because it has blasphemous material about the Prophet of Muslims Muhammad (SAWW).

3.7.4 Discursive Practice.

According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), discursive practice is the way texts are interpreted and received and the social effects they have. The present study finds discursive practice as the production and interpretation of the text by the social actors.
CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis of data pertains to the intertextual analysis of the political discourse that is the speeches of the world political leaders. The analysis is based on the theoretical grounds already discussed in the previous chapter (see chapter 3). I have taken the selected speeches one by one and analysed the intertextual references present in them according to the theoretical framework followed by the study. The analysis is divided into different sections adopted from the method selected for the study (Fairclough’s model of intertextuality). Under each category, excerpts from the speeches are analysed one by one. Full text of the speeches is given in the appendices. The speeches are divided into small paragraphs for the purpose of easy access to the referred text. This chapter is divided into three parts. The first part discusses intertextuality in the dominant political discourse, second part discusses it in subordinate political discourse and third part discusses intertextuality with reference to the dominant vs subordinate political discourse.

4.1 Intertextual Analysis of the Political Discourse from the West

Context

In the context and setting of the study the West is represented by the US President, Barak Obama. He belongs to the dominant group in the global political context. In the background of the study, he belongs to the US and is in favour of freedom of expression rather than freedom of religion or blasphemy. At the time of the speech under discussion his country was involved in different military actions against the Muslim countries i.e. Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Tunisia, Egypt. As a result, he was facing a lot of criticism from the world. It was the time when the Muslim world was protesting against the release of the video of the movie trailer The Innocence of Muslims and America was defending it as freedom of expression. This created
negative feelings in the hearts of the Muslims. The situation worsened because of the intrusion of America in Arab countries, situation in Iraq, drone attacks in Pakistan and presence of the western forces in Afghanistan which caused major disagreements between the Muslim world and the West/America.

4.1.1 Manifest Intertextuality

Obama used all the five elements of manifest intertextuality in his speech. i.e. discourse representations, presuppositions, negation, irony and metadiscourse.

4.1.1.1 Discourse Representations

Obama used discourse representations in the form of direct quotations and free indirect speech.

4.1.1.1a Direct quotations.

Obama quoted two historical personalities in his speech. These are Nelson Mandela and Gandhi (paragraph 16 & 37 Appendix A). They played their role for the freedom of their nations and made their people aware of the importance of freedom and peace. The president borrowed these texts from the discourse of the freedom of India and South Africa and inserted them within his own text to highlight the point of view he was advocating. In addition to the quotations from Mandela and Gandhi, he added some other texts from Arab Muslim countries to represent the positive aspect of the relationship between Christians and Muslims/Arab world and America.

To be free is not …….. freedom of others. (paragraph 16, Appendix A)

Obama has used the quotation to support his view on freedom of expression in the context of the reaction showed by the Muslim world against the blasphemous video. He fixed the quotation dexterously at the point where he is not expressing his views on the issue directly but bringing it in the context of the struggle for democracy of the countries affected by the Arab Spring. After that, he comes towards the elected governments that are corrupt and not truly democratic. Here, he is not focusing on the governments of the countries which came under the influence of Arab Spring (e.g. Egypt and Libya) or are still ruled by the dictators (Syria) but the nations where
democratic governments are present, but they are not following the democratic rules. Later he connects this concept with the political leaders of the countries (particularly Muslim) who exploit their people by declaring that West is their enemy; specifically, America and Israel. Obama’s purpose of using this quotation is well achieved as it implicitly clarified the point of view of Obama without his explicit involvement in the matter. The discourse representation helps him to criticize those who reacted violently to the release of the offensive video (Fairclough, 1992a, p.104).

The quotation from Mandela has two parts. Obama used the first part to address the protesters while the second part (after the comma) does not belong to them. Obama told us in the speech that they are opponents of America (paragraph 5,7, Appendix A). On the basis of this, it can be assumed that the second part of the utterance represents the opponents of protesters and that is America. It is concluded that it belongs to America, Obama and the western world. The first part has negative structure and is sarcastic in tone while the second part is a positive statement with a mild tone. The prominent words used in the first part of the utterance are “free” with a “not” and “merely” and “chains” a phrasal verb “cast off” while the second part of the utterance starts with “but” that indicates the contrast with the first clause and words used are “live”, “respect” and “freedom” with a positive sense given by “enhances” (van Dijk, 1995, 2001c). The contrast of the words “chains” and “freedom” makes this quotation and its reference to them and us, respectively, ideological (van Dijk, 1993). The ideologies associated with “chains” picture the people who are oppressed and dominated by some dictator or oppressor (van Dijk, 2001a, p 360). Obama believes they are the protesters as they are locked in chains, the invisible chains, because they think that they are living in a democratic country and their leaders are in favour of them but actually their leaders are using them for political benefits. They are roused against the West in the name of religion by their corrupt politicians to hide their corruption and ineligibility as true democratic representatives. Obama talked about this in his own words later in his speech (see paragraph 28-34, Appendix A). Ideology connected with the word freedom has a very positive picture that represents free people following their wills in an environment of peace and content. Obama represents this as the ideology of his country that believes in the free will of the people and respects their freedom of expression (Fairclough, 1992a, p. 86-91).
He is against the people who react violently on the matters that according to him, can be discussed and negotiated with speech and tolerance and against this view, he presents the image of America which is believed by him to be the supporter of the freedom of people all around the world. America wants to protect the rights of the people around the globe by setting them free from the “chains” of oppression and dictatorship and empower them through the democratic rule by helping them to establish the “government of the people, by the people and for the people” (paragraph 13; line 3-4 Appendix A). Obama wants to make people aware of the conspiracies and political exploitation of the political leaders and prepare them to cut the invisible chains off and protest for their rights (see paragraph 34 and 39 Appendix A).

Ironically, Obama is at the same time in favour of and against the protests by the people around the world. In his speech, he speaks against the protests that were made in the reaction to the video and on the other hand roused the people of Syria to protest against the government of Assad (see paragraph 39). The contrast in his views on the same thing is covered by the words like “extremism”, “violence” and “peaceful”. This is how Obama has merged his ideology, beliefs and aspirations in this quotation (van Dijk, 2008; Fairclough, 1992a). He associates positive note of the quotation with his group and negative note with his opponents. This is how the dominant group suppresses certain ideologies and establishes others to construct positive self-image and negative image of the other group that is also noticed by Fairclough (1989, 1992a, 2003, 2001) and Van Dijk (1984, 2001, 2006).

"Muslims, Christians, we are one." (paragraph 36, Appendix A)

This quotation refers to the event that took place in February 2011 in Egypt during Cairo protest against the president Hosni Mubarak when Muslims were offering prayers and Christians were standing hand in hand to protect them. The quotation depicts a pleasant picture of solidarity among the people of different religious groups. Obama fixes it in the background where after intimidating the Muslim world for the violence, he depicts an ideal picture of the world where everyone is respecting each other’s views. Obama has hybridized the identities which were once established by him at the beginning of the speech (Fairclough, 2003) where he talks about the extremists and violent protesters in contrast with Chris Stevens who is portrayed as a noble,
sympathetic, caring, peace loving diplomat of America (paragraph 1-3 Appendix A). The quotation says, “we are one” and “we” here includes the meaning of “we” as well as “they”. The hybridization is ideological (Fairclough, 2003, Part I) as well as an attempt to soften the intensity of the matter that was the main topic of the speech. Obama tries to come out of the discussion where binary of power was set and attempts to depict an equalized picture of Muslims and Christians to achieve the goals of establishing tolerance as the most peaceful phenomenon of the world politics. However, apparently, the quotation shows both the parties at the same level but its historical reference touches the violence that was posed on a sect of Christians that is Coptic Christians who were killed by extremists in Egypt. So, Obama in his speech said: “The future must not belong to those who target Coptic Christians in Egypt -- it must be claimed by those in Tahrir Square who chanted, “Muslims, Christians, we are one” (paragraph 36 Appendix A). This background of the quotation again splits “we” into “we and them” because Coptic Christians were assumed to be killed by the Muslims and on Tahrir Square Christians were protecting the Muslims while they were offering their prayers. This is how Obama has established his ideology and implicitly kept the dividing lines between two groups (van Dijk, 1995; Fairclough 1989, p.93). He has finished those divisions through discourse representation. Direct discourse representation taken from the Egypt revolution has given him room to establish his point while distancing himself from it.

"Intolerance is itself a form ......democratic spirit." (paragraph 37 Appendix A)

Obama highlights and condemns the sectarian violence among different sects of the Muslims while inviting other members of the United Nations’ General Assembly to do so and there he puts this quotation from Gandhi that talks about intolerance, and violence as obstacles to the growth of the true democratic spirit. The quotation has a presupposition that “a true democratic spirit” that assumes all the democratic spirits might not be true. Secondly, the democratic spirit Gandhi knew about or practiced was true and a democratic spirit grows, and for its growth, intolerance and violence are fatal. In these assumptions, one point gets clear that the idea of democratic spirit, as well as the idea of violence and intolerance and tolerance, can be relevant and vary from group to group, nation to nation and country to country. However, Obama selects it to expose and condemn the violence against referent sects in the Muslims and the background of
this discussion has been set by the main issue of the time, i.e. the reaction of Muslim countries against the blasphemous video. He slammed the responsible people and within this slam he included the people who hurt the feelings of the Christians by desecrating Churches, damaging the image of Christ and denying the Holocaust. All these instances refer to the Muslim countries where Christianity and the emotions of the Christians were injured by the Muslims. He turns towards the religious sectarianism and discusses it with reference to Gandhi’s statement about democratic spirit. The context of the quotation as presented here makes the word “intolerance” controversial because intolerance shifted from the people who created the video to the protesters and extremists and then to the people who incite against Sufi Muslims and Shiite pilgrims (Obama probably referred to attack on Shiite pilgrims in Iraq in January 2012). The discourse of intolerance has two aspects here: first is inter-religion and second is intra-religion. Obama mixes them together and represents the situation as “violence” and “intolerance”. He has not talked about any of the instance in particular but the direct discourse he inserted within his discourse represents all the three instances of discrimination. He apparently associates the terms “intolerance” and “violence” with the incitement of the Muslim sects but the association of these terms with the above mentioned inter-religion discrimination cannot be denied. This shows the degree of distance Obama kept while discussing these sensitive issues. He might have censured people (violent protesters for killing the Americans and destroying places related to America or Christianity), defended people (who created the video that is taken by him as freedom of expression) or sympathized with people (Shiites and Sufis). The quotation is able to cover all these aspects using words like “violence” (for censuring), “democratic spirit” (for defending the right of freedom of expression) and intolerance (for sympathizing). In a nutshell, Obama has re-contextualized the statement of Gandhi in the discussion about the religious extremism and violence that helped him to imply his ideologies about the matter. The direct discourse representation helped him to comment on the sensitive issue without any subjective note (van Dijk, 2001c).

"Chris Stevens was a friend to all Libyans." (paragraph 48, Appendix A)

This instance of direct discourse represents the feeling of Libyan people after the death of American ambassador. Obama has added this quotation in the concluding remarks of his speech while discussing the aspirations of America where he brings in
Chris Stevens as a model American who represented the best of America. The statement refers to the Libyan protesters who came out in the streets to condemn the Benghazi attacks and death of Americans including Stevens. Obama has assumed that Stevens was killed by the people who were protesting against the anti-Islamic video and people who were against that protest came out to support America. Obama in his speech emphasizes the story of Stevens and many times he has used him as a symbol for himself and America and sometimes the whole western world. In this instance Stevens symbolizes America. As Obama says “Stevens embodied the best of America” (paragraph 4 Appendix A) so, here as well, he discusses the aspirations for which America is working and then came back to Stevens story. The quotation declares Stevens as a friend of Libya which implies that most of the Libyans are in favour of the policies of America followed for Libya and the image of America in the eyes of Libyans is soft and pleasant. Obama exploits the quotation to establish the ideology that the Libyans and people from other countries are supporters of American policies and there are some negative forces which are working on a cause to damage the image of America and to threaten the existence of Israel. Moreover, Obama has merged the identities of Us and Them to marginalize the ideologies of Them and establish American ideologies as dominant as well as acceptable and followed by the subordinate group too (Fairclough, 1989; Van Dijk, 2001a, 2001b). His remarks on Stevens are actually remarks on America and his tribute to Stevens in reality is a tribute to the ideal of America that is implied through the quote that seems to be the voice of the Libyan people but in their voice, Obama’s own voice and voice of America are clearly heard and felt.

4.1.1.1b Free indirect speech

President Obama started his speech with an account of Chris Stevens, American ambassador to Libya, who was killed in an attack at US post in Benghazi. While telling his story, Obama mixes Stevens’ voice with his own (see Appendix A). This type of mixing of different voices through discourse representation is named as free indirect speech (Fairclough, 1992a).

*And he came ……with a broad smile.* (paragraph 1, Appendix A)
Apparently, Obama told the audience about Chris Stevens but actually, his purpose for narrating this story is to mouth his own ideologies through the life history of the diplomat. The quotation shows that discourse representation (story of Stevens) selected by Obama in his political speech is actually embedded in another discourse that is the discourse of Obama and the US as a superpower with rest of the world, specifically Muslim world and more specifically Muslim countries, the other party. Muslims are the other party here for many reasons; the basic issue at the time of speech was the protests of Muslims against the blasphemous video all around the world and reaction against the American government’s silence on the act of blasphemy. This is the reason he starts with the story of Stevens who was ambassador appointed in a Muslim country and was killed by terrorists, considered to be protesters against the video.

The initial part of the speech, therefore, depicts the positive character of the ambassador that actually represents the positive character of America or “Us” (van Dijk, 1995, van Dijk 2006, p.126). He showed Stevens sympathetic, loving, caring, down to earth and a socializing person. He draws his image and develops his identity as a part of America and specifically a representative of the American politics and policies for the rest of the world. The details about Stevens are discussed on purpose, that is, to build an image of a flawless and model ambassador who was more interested in mixing up and loving people than any other activity. This image has established his identity in a certain way and once his positive image is established Obama associates him to the group Stevens belongs to. The group is America and Obama is also a member of it. Thus, Obama through already established positive image of Stevens, establishes the positive image of America and himself. Similar idea is given by Fairclough (1989) that is, in the structure of power identities of individuals are representatives of the identities of the group they represent. After painting the picture of Stevens as a humanitarian, Obama indicated mildly towards his actions and feeling as an ambassador (van Dijk, 2006, p. 144). He utilized the already established image of the ambassador and remained successful in establishing him as a munificent diplomat too which is exposed in the words used by Obama form him i.e. “helped”, “cared for”, “respected”. These words may occur in the diplomatic discourse but would hardly give the sense they are giving here because the context for these words is already established
in such an intensive way that no one can ignore Stevens’ pictures in the mind; with broad smile, singing and eating in the streets when he/she reads/hears his helping people, caring for the people and above all working to gain respect for people who do not have any relation with him. Apparently, it looks like a simple story but actually it has its ideological importance that is attached to the event of the life of Stevens told by Obama who is very much present in the story as a first person, not a third person. That means Obama’s voice is present parallel to the voice of the ambassador.

He came to love and respect the people. (paragraph 1, Appendix A)

This statement is equal to fallacy because ambassadors never live in a country out of their own will; rather they are sent by their governments to the other countries to promote the cause of their nation and to build a soft image of their country. They are trained in the language of the country where they are appointed and are instructed to build a friendly relationship with the people while following their social and cultural norms. Obama here exploits this common practice of diplomacy to make his voice heard along with the voice of Stevens. He attempts to present America as a peace-loving, democracy-loving, caring and sympathetic country that is more interested in the peace and prosperity of the people than any other thing and is committed to helping people to live with peace and prosperity. Stevens “love” and “respect” for the people of Libya is represented beyond his identity as an ambassador and mixes the ambassador’s voice with the voice of his group. This mixing of voices helps Obama to establish a positive image of his group. In the binary of power relations, the dominant group suppresses the ideologies of the subordinate group by representing their own ideologies as positive and tries to establish them as common sense (Fairclough, 1989, p. 77). Obama is doing the same and to represent the positive image of himself and his group. He gets helps from free indirect discourse: mixing the voices of Stevens, himself and his group after establishing the positive image of Stevens and winning the sympathies of the audience for him.

The next statement of Obama “he would carry that commitment throughout his life” once again indicates that Stevens’ voice is actually America’s voice and it is America that is committed to helping people of Libya, particularly, and other countries of the Middle East in general. This hidden fact is exposed by Obama in the next line
(paragraph 4, Appendix A) where he declares that Stevens embodied the best of America.

President Obama mixes the voice of Stevens and America and then the voice of America is mixed with the voice of the United Nations. He does it to justify the actions of America against other countries, especially Muslim countries, where violent protests were made. The intertextual reference here is the discourse that is incorporated in the discourse of Obama (paragraph 4). President Obama goes a little further and models Stevens as a true representative of the United Nations. Like his fellow ...that the United Nations represents (paragraph 4, Appendix A). In these words, echoes can be heard of three voices merged together. The most visible voice is the diplomat and then hidden voice of America is connected with the voice of the United Nations that is actually the representative of the whole world (only three countries of the world are not members of the United Nations: Kosovo, Taiwan and Vatican City. They are not influential politically so; United Nations can be considered the representative of the whole world). He states the agenda of the United Nations that is accepted, respected and followed by all member nations. Implicitly, he has taken America and the United Nations as one so agenda seems to be the agenda of America that is also promoted by connecting it to Stevens’ voice and then mixing it with the voice of America. This can be represented mathematically as

Stevens = America
America=United Nations
United Nations=Almost the whole world
So,
Stevens=United Nations
Stevens= the whole world (leaving Taiwan, Kosovo and Vatican City)
America=United Nations
America=the whole world

The same equation is true for his next attempt of merging the voices of America and the United Nations (paragraph 7, Appendix A) (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.199). However, Stevens’s voice is missing here as it is already equalized with the voice of America. He declares that the attacks that were made on the American people and
places all around the world in the reaction to the release of blasphemous video are not actually the attacks on America but they are the attacks on the United Nations and the ideology on which the United Nations was formed. Once again, he merges the identity of United Nations with the identity of America and translates the interests of United Nations as the interests of America. The interests of United Nations are the interests of the whole world. In other words, Obama’s words can be translated as whatever America wants United Nations want the same. It is the representation of the whole world and so the world wants whatever Obama and America wants. This is a true example of hegemony that shows the struggle of the dominant (Obama, America) around the issue (blasphemy) which is a big reason of instability between the dominant and subordinate (Muslim world) groups and the struggle is aimed to sustain the power relations (Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b, 2003, p.101).

In the next instance (paragraph 9, line 3, Appendix A) Obama combined all the voices present in his speech leaving the extremists and violent protesters who are addressed here. Obama has shifted his identity from American president to the member of the United Nations (paragraph 7, 9, Appendix A). He avoids being at the other end of the table instead he merges his identity with the identity of the member nations (van Dijk, 1997) which is explicit in the linguistic signs he uses, i.e. “we” “our”. The message he gives while merging his identity with the other group has the purpose of backlashing the intolerance and violence that has emerged after the release of the video in September 2012 in the Muslim world.

4.1.1.2 Presuppositions

The intertextual nature of presupposition lies in the assumptions that are attached to them. These assumptions refer the reader to another text or discourse which is brought in by the writer/speaker through presuppositions. Fairclough (1992a) has declared presuppositions as propositions (judgments) that can be manipulative and ideological.

“...he came to. ..... throughout his life.” (paragraph 1 Appendix A)

Obama’s statement shows that Stevens had special feelings for Muslims and particularly the Muslims of the countries he served (The Middle East and North
America). He is manipulating the fact that Stevens was a diplomat and he was appointed by the American government in those countries. Instead the assumptions declare that Stevens came on his own will because he was in love with the countries and the people. Obama further adds that Stevens had intentions to love and respect the people of the country where he is working as a diplomat throughout his life. The fact is Stevens could have stayed in any country until the government allowed him to stay and the way he behaved with the people has an accordance with the foreign policy of the US. We know that diplomats are instructed to behave and keep a good relationship with the country and its common people that are based not only on the foreign policy of the country but also the interests that shape the relationship between the two countries. Therefore, as an ambassador Stevens’ actions were also controlled by his country. The manipulative nature of the presupposition makes it ideological and helps Obama to declare Stevens friend of Muslims and through the image of Stevens, he declares America friends of Muslims (Fairclough, 2003). He also lets down the reaction of the Muslims on the release of the video by declaring Stevens and America their friends and well-wishers. This effect is achieved by merging the voice of Stevens with the voice of America (see discussion on Free indirect speech above). In this example, he implies America’s ideology through the identity of the American ambassador. However, in the next lines, he identifies Stevens directly as a representative of America and discusses his achievements as an American.

The assumptions taken out from the above presupposition of Obama expose the manipulation like Steven came to love and respect the people. However, it is known that diplomats go to other countries for political and diplomatic reasons and not for their emotional attachment with the people. The word “came” is ambiguous and Obama utters it while standing in New York, not in a country of the Middle East or North Africa. This makes the word to be understood in different senses like he went to the Middle East and North Africa to love people of these countries, he was born to love the people of the Middle East and North Africa, he joined US embassy to love the people of the Middle East and North Africa and he went to the high officials of American diplomacy and volunteered himself for appointment in Libya because he loved the people of the Middle East and North Africa. All these possibilities are in contrast with the reality that he was appointed by the government of America as an ambassador of
Libya and other countries of the Middle East or North Africa on the same or the other posts and this does not have any connection with the personal feelings, emotions or love of Stevens. The manipulating presupposition here tries to establish the ideology that Stevens/America is working highly in favour of the people of Libya and other Muslim countries (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.120).

As America’s representative, .... would be respected. (paragraph 2, Appendix A)

Stevens positive and sympathetic image was established in the previous part of the speech. Here Obama associates the positive-image of Stevens to America by declaring him representative of America. He associates his actions to actions of America directly like “helping people”, “crafting vision for future” of Libyan and “protecting their rights”. These are actions of Stevens, but he did it all as an American so, his actions are actions of America. The outward picture of America painted in these lines is positive but the assumptions behind the presupposition tell some other story especially the idea of “crafting a vision for the future” of the Libyans by America reveals the dominance of America on the people of Libya. Obama assumes that there is a need of deciding or suggesting a vision to the Libyans. The rights of Libyans are not as international citizens but as citizens of Libya that is to be decided by the government or the leadership of Libya but here America in involved in protecting the rights. This is an example of interference that exposes the influence of America on the Libyan leadership and a hold on the decisions to be made internally by the local leadership. The interference unveils the marginalization of the subordinate and suppression of their ideologies (Fairclough 1989, 2003; van Dijk, 1996, 2001).

He acted with humility, ...... liberty, dignity, justice and opportunity. (paragraph 4 Appendix A)

Obama explains the character of Stevens as a diplomat. The statement shows explicit contrast between the clauses which are separated with a conjunction but. The presupposition establishes a positive character of the ambassador who was supposed to be very humble but when there came the question of the interests of people he stood up and defended the rights and freedom of people of all the countries he served. The statement adds a positive note to the image of America as helper and protector of the
oppressed and humbled people of the Middle East and North America. Obama emphasized the positive face of the ambassador and America by using the words like “humility”, “liberty”, “dignity”, “justice” and “opportunity” with reference to the people of other nations. The phrase “stood up for a set of principles” is in contrast with these words here because it represents his resistance on certain ideologies present in the countries he served. This can be negative aspect of Stevens personality but the way it is used makes it positive because it represents the positive resistance and aggression as Obama finds this aggression in the favour of people of these countries. However, “people” is not clear here as it can be taken in many ways: all the people of the countries he served, people in favour of American ideologies or people against their current governments. Each one of the three understandings of people expose the manipulation of Obama (see van Dijk, 2008 ch.2 p. 34) because in case of the favour of all people Stevens need not to be aggressive, in case of only the supporters of America in these countries then it is negative for an ambassador and in case of the people against their governments, it is intrusion in the internal matters of the countries and very negative for the image of an ambassador.

I tell you this story because Chris Stevens embodied the best of America. (paragraph 4 Appendix A)

Obama attempts to construct a soft, positive, friendly and sympathetic image of America by generalizing the qualities attributed to Chris Stevens as qualities of all the Americans. Obama is getting manipulative as he himself set the image of Stevens in front of the audience. The world only knows him as a diplomat like all the other diplomats, but Obama characterizes him in a way that the audience are influenced to not only like him as a diplomat but also as a common person and their sympathies go with him and against his killers. Before getting information about the event of his death they start hating his killers and loving him. After setting this image of Stevens, Obama brings America in the discourse to win the same feelings and sympathies of the audience that are for Stevens. Obama tries to intensify this image of America by using the word “best” and influences the ideologies of audience. The presupposition used here is an example of, manipulation and positive representation of self to intensify the negativity of the opposition (van Dijk, 2001c; Fairclough, 1992a).
Obama portrays Sevens as a role model for the whole world (highly positive representation) and assumes that the world has one out of two choices to be followed for future and they are Chris Stevens and his killers. Stevens is associated with a peaceful and prosperous future contrasted with “violence” associated with the killers of Stevens. He avoids specifying the killers and commenting on the event of the death of Stevens. The contrast of Chris Stevens with the killer and the picture of future presented in front of the eyes of the audience is an attempt to win their consent and establish Stevens as one of the best persons in the world. He, many times in his speech, has taken Stevens as a metaphor for America here as well, he tries to level the grounds for constructing a positive image of America in contrast with its opponents and they are “killers”. Determining the future is a complex term here and relative as well. In his speech, Obama supported the future where people through revolutions and protests (peaceful) change the governments established by the dictators. Secondly, a future determined by Chris Stevens is also not clear and it seems that Obama has exaggerated his character and metaphorically used him as a symbol of America. This argument concludes that Obama is getting dominant and wants to impose his views of democracy to the nations of the world. In the last part of his speech (paragraph 48 Appendix A), he affirms that he would help people against the dictatorship of their current leaders. Obama aspires to include the voices of all the member nations with his voice that can be an attempt to impose his ideology or at least win their consent about the issue by moulding their opinion in favour of America (see Fairclough, 1989 ch.1).

The presupposition holds that the world has to make a choice between two things, i.e. “forces” and “hopes” and keeps both of them unspecified. The article “the” before the words marks them specific linguistically as well as discursively that is explicit from the way they are used by Obama. The word “force” is not negative in itself but the context and the contrast make it negative. Obama has not marked it with any negative marker; he has rather put it in an environment where its sense has become negative. The contrast of force with “hope” has done it for him. The word “hope” can hardly be taken as negative and here it represents the positive picture of the future of
the world. The discourse behind this statement takes the reader towards the extremists and peace lovers. Extremists are represented with the word “force” that suggests their negative force which is used by them to create violence and to disrupt the peace of the world. Peace lovers according to Obama are people who are in favour of people’s government, freedom of expression (of his definition that does not condemn blasphemy; see the last sentence of paragraph 21, Appendix A) and stand against extremism. Obama’s definition of freedom of expression and extremism could be challenged by some especially the Muslims who cannot afford the idea of freedom of expression that allows individuals to disrespect their religious personalities and beliefs. Another important aspect of the presupposition is that Obama has assumed his aspirations and ideals for the future as the ideals of the world “we hold in common”. In this way, he has identified the ideologies of the people worldwide in terms of his ideologies and this is the point where the presupposition is manipulative (see Fairclough, 1992a, ch.4). It shows the emphasis of dominant discourse on the ideologies they promote over the ideologies and discourses of the subordinate.

*The world has ... of change. (paragraph 9 Appendix A)*

Obama uses the word “transformation” for the revolution in the Arab world that has started from Tunisia and spread in other Muslim countries like Libya and Egypt. The forces of change are the events which took place particularly in these countries against the leaders or governments which were considered corrupt by the people who protested. Obama confirms that his support is with the protesters in Arab countries but in an indirect way. He is supposed to be in favour of the forces of change without referring to or giving an explanation about those forces. Similarly, he has not talked about the Arab revolution directly but called it “the transformation” without giving comments on the nature of this transformation or discussing its relationship with anyone. In the above statement, the word “captivated” has established an ideology and associated that ideology with the whole world. It depicts the revolution in the Arab world (Arab Spring) positive and fascinating that has affected the whole world pleasantly (*the world has been captivated by the transformation that’s taken place*). However, this is the ideology of Obama himself and not of the whole world. His generalization has included the countries in this captivation which were at that time suffering from this crisis and were resisting it i.e. Syria (Fairclough, 2003). The fact
makes the presupposition manipulative and ideological as well as hegemonic. Apart
from the inclusion Obama has directly referred to the United States as the supporter of
the forces of change. This statement makes Obama stand alone to defend the change in
the Arab world and this has made the statement discourse of power. Obama by
including and excluding the rest of the world while discussing the support of the change,
has established the power relations with the rest of the world.

*...we had the ability ... than a tyrant.* (paragraph 11, Appendix A)

Obama refers to the actions of America in Libya against the government of
Gadhafi. He uses the presuppositions to take a power position that he can justify all his
actions. The assumption that Gadhafi was committing “slaughter” of the innocent
people in Libya is very harsh and helps Obama to depict the identity of Gadhafi as the
most detestable person on earth who should be given as severe punishment as possible.
The detestable identity of Gadhafi justifies the intervention of Obama in his country to
bring him to justice i.e. to deprive him from the government of his country. The next
presupposition belongs to the people who were being killed and destroyed by Gadhafi
and for whom everyone present in the meeting has sympathy after adopting the
ideologies set by Obama. So, if the people of Libya have “aspirations” everyone is
ready to support them due to the sympathies they win. Obama uses these sympathies
and takes a position along with the people to “topple the tyrant” and save them miseries.
This is how the presuppositions present in the text help him to justify his actions even
those which are above the international law (i.e. intervening in the internal matter of a
country) and he achieves dominance and ability to control the opposition (Foucault,

*As President .... disagree with.* (paragraph 22, Appendix A)

The statement is given in the context of the discussion of the controversial video
where Obama was trying to defend the right of the people to express whatever they feel.
He condemns the action of creation and publication of the video openly but in contrast
to this condemnation he declares it an instance of the freedom of expression of the
people who created the video. In addition to the contradiction of his statement, he
included himself the discourse to clarify his point which weakens his position the most.
The discussion was started from the slander of the Prophet of Islam (SAWW) and moulded by him towards the freedom of expression. He argues that he himself is disrespected by the people openly, but he accepts this insult as freedom and their right to have an opinion. There is no comparison between him and the Prophet of the Muslims (SAWW). The false and inappropriate comparison has made him lose power in discourse (see Fairclough, 1989, p.43-46). Later, he brings in the American nation to discussion for defending his argument that America is in favour of freedom of expression of the people around the globe, even if the opinion of people is against America. This statement cannot be called as a true statement and it expresses the attempts of president Obama to protect his ideology of freedom of expression and use it as a weapon against the discourse that was generated around the world against American reaction on the release of the video.

We empower the worst of us if that’s how we respond. (paragraph 26, Appendix A)

The statement refers to the reaction of the Muslim world on the release of the controversial video. Here, “worst of us” is used for the protesters or future protesters on any of such incident while “that’s how” indicates towards the events in the Muslim World in the reaction to the video in which many people were killed and buildings were damaged. Obama in the background of these events tries to establish his opinion that the reaction was wrong and unjustified. He uses “us” that shows he is struggling to achieve power by defending his ideology. It is also an attempt to win the consent of the Muslim world using the strategy of inclusion. The word “empower” is crucial here and it has multi-faceted meanings. Obama might have used it to speak about the past events like protests and violence or the future events of the same kind. The ambiguity here is he wants to warn the world (the Muslim world) to be prepared for the things like this to happen (release of video) or he is trying to prove that whatever happened in the reaction of the video was not acceptable for America. This is an example of dominance and oppression (see Foucault, 1976; Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, van Dijk, 2001a). The word empowerment is used for the people who reacted and this time Obama used “us” for them. This notion goes against his severe reaction on the protest against the video in the other statements of the speech (see sentence 2 of paragraph 9, paragraph 25 Appendix A). Now if not directly, he indirectly declares that the protesters are the participants of the same group to which Obama belongs. By doing it he is not only
hybridizing his own identity with the protesters but also changing their identity from “them” to “us” (see van Dijk, 2008).

More broadly, ...is moving towards democracy. (paragraph 26, Appendix A)

Obama here associates the protests with the tension between the Arab World and the West instead of declaring it a reaction against an event. This statement discloses that he believes whatever happened in the name of protests in the Arab world was actually a demonstration of the conflict between the two worlds. He, in this way, translates the things according to his own will and interests and ignoring the facts which he already accepted in the speech i.e. The reaction was against the video. He marginalizes the identity and ideologies of the Muslims (see Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, p.206-207). The intertextual reference of the statement here not only links to the anti-Islamic video protest but other conflicts, unrest and fights as well, which were going on in the Arab world during 2012. Some Arab countries at that time were facing the crisis and violent protests which were a consequence of the conflict between different groups within those countries while others were suffering from the consequences of war. These were the causes of the conflicts among different groups within the Arab countries in addition to the conflict between them and America and the West after the release of the video.

Obama expresses his interest in addressing the tensions and declares this process as a step towards democracy. Here an indirect hint leads towards the Arab Spring that is a symbol of the protests of the people in Arab countries against their governments. The hint helps Obama to establish his ideology that the governments in the Arab countries are based on dictatorship and they should be toppled. The American government is in favour of the anti-government protests in the Arab World and it aides the people who are involved in such protests (like strikes in Libya in favor of civil war 2011) by naming it a democratic move in the world that would make the world a better place to live. He assumes that the tension has taken a positive move because it is going towards democracy. He manipulates the facts here to establish his ideology by giving his own meaning to different aspects involved in the crisis of the Arab world (Fairclough, 1992a).
I do believe that ... violence and extremism. (paragraph 28 Appendix A)

The statement of Obama here is very forceful that makes the assumption present in the statement forceful as well. He assumes that it is the duty of the world leaders around the globe to speak against the violence and extremism. The assumption seems true if taken as a general statement but when considered in the context of the issue of blasphemy, it is false. First of all, the concept of violence and extremism is relevant, and every leader of the world thinks about that in a different way. However, some of the leaders can have the same opinion but not all. As the discussion in the speech is mostly related to the division of the Arab world and the West so the explanation of these terms from their point of view will clarify the matter in a proper manner. American invasion and intrusion in the Arab countries (paragraph 9-12, Appendix A) are termed as an aid to the people who are in favour of democracy as defined by Obama but for these countries, it is violence and terrorism. On the other hand, anti-American protests or actions by the other parties are seen as extremism and violence by America but for the other groups, it is just a reaction against American intrusion. Secondly, the leaders sitting in the assembly are divided in these two opinions, therefore, all the leaders are not in a position to accept whatever is said. Obama intentionally ignores the situation and directly addresses all the leaders for a cause that is the cause of America that’s why it is the cause for everyone present in the assembly. Obama here is getting manipulative and it helps him to sustain his position in the power structure of the world politics where he is attempting to impose his ideological beliefs on the rest of the world by speaking about it as the common ideology of the world (see Fairclough, 1995a, p.12).

Let us remember ... by a suicide bomber in Kabul. (paragraph 32, Appendix A)

American president here addresses the non-Muslim leaders directly and Muslims indirectly. The extremism discussed in the speech is mostly related to the Muslim world and some of the Muslim groups are considered to be responsible for violence mainly against America (i.e. Stevens) or other Muslims (protesters against government in the Muslim countries). However, here he talks from the other perspective that can be taken as pro-Muslim perspective. Obama’s statement comprises the sympathies for Muslims who suffered. However, these sympathies might be used
to clarify his position in the war against extremism. He quotes one example of the victimization of the American diplomat (Chris Stevens and his colleagues) and three instances from the Muslim countries where people were killed in violent attacks. The purpose of this is to convince the Muslim countries of the world on his point (not just Arab or North African Muslim countries) and to make his argument strong that can be more convincing for the Muslims to fight against extremism. However, the history of the events mentioned for making his point does not match with his statement as it has different roots and reasons.

The attack on Benghazi was an instance of revenge from America by the people who were attacked by the American army in Libya (2011 military invasion). The killing of a Turkish police officer was the result of the clash between the Turkish government and the leftist rebels who have been in conflict with Turkey for more than two decades. The car bomb in Sana’a was attacked on the defence minister of Yemen by Al-Qaeda as a result of the death of their leader in the east of Yemen a day before. Lastly, the attack on the children in Kabul was probably going to be an attack on the compound of the allied forces but children unknowingly stopped the suicide bomber, and, in a panic, he blew himself. Obama tried to associate the attack in Benghazi with the anti-video protests in his speech. Here the attack on American compound is associated with attacks in different Muslim countries on the same day but in fact, every event has a different history and the ideology behind the killing is also different. Obama manipulates the history to establish positive self-image both intragroup and intergroup (see van Dijk, 2001b, p.25,27,31). Manipulation of history is carried out to split the other group for damaging the authenticity of their ideologies.

The impulse towards ...tribes and clans. (paragraph 33, Appendix A)

Obama assumes as well as warns the (Muslim) world leaders about the impulses of some people who want to cause harm to the Western world. The impulses here referred to the ideologies of anti-American Muslim groups around the world who are fighting against or resisting the Americans in one or the other way. Most of them are from Muslim countries like Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya and Syria. They have ideological and political differences with America and every group has its own reason. Obama makes his point that these are the forces which want to create violence to get their
political benefits and most of the time they do not want anything but violence and intolerance. In the Muslim world, the most critical issue is the clash between the Muslims of different sects and tribes.

According to Obama the people who make others fight on the difference of sect or tribe are the same who are spreading hatred against America. He warns the Muslim world to take serious actions against the anti-American forces because this action can stop the other inter-Muslim conflicts in the Muslim world. In this manner, he identifies the opponents of America with the opponents of the Muslim solidarity. He makes his point to convince the Muslim world to be on the side of America to overcome the instances of violence that prevail all around the Muslim world and he does it by manipulation of the fact about the opponents of America and other extremist factors dominant in many parts of the Muslim world. He establishes a strong background context and associates the intolerance and other negative aspects with the Muslims to avoid the blame for being responsible for restricting the religious freedom of the Muslims (Fairclough, 1989, 1992a p.86-87).

It is time to leave …of division behind. (paragraph 34, Appendix A)

The statement links back to the thought of Obama about the violence and calls for violence (paragraph 17 Appendix A), that is, violent and extremist forces are spreading hatred against America to achieve their political goals. The politics of division refers to the statement he gave in the speech about the politicians of some (Muslim) countries who project the hatred of America against the masses to divert their attention from the other issues like the economy, unemployment, health and education. It is politics of division because it divides the people of the world into two groups i.e. East and West. The phrases “the call of violence” and “the politics of violence” help Obama to manipulate the presupposition that there are some forces in the world which create violence, so America has the right to stop them, likewise the politics of division. Obama implies that some people (Muslims) are involved in this type of politics so they (audience) need to stop favouring or strengthening such forces. Moreover, the word “behind” is hinting toward something hopeful that can lead a person (a negative person may be) towards a positive move where nothing related to (negative) past is there. Obama also gives the message through his words to the opponents to finish the conflicts
and to move forward as one instead of going on as divided groups. The power of Obama on the violent forces makes him talk like this and take a position as a “right” person and a member of a “right and “just” group that is America/the West (see Foucault, 1984, van Dijk, 1996, Fairclough, 1989, 1995a p.122-123).

4.1.1.3 Negation

Obama in his speech has used negation many times. He has used “no”, “not” and sometimes semantically negative sentences in his speech. Negation is a negative presupposition that can be manipulative and ideological (Fairclough, 1992a). The negations discussed below have intertextual references and are used to achieve different goals in the structure of power and hegemony by exposing the hidden ideologies and manipulation by the dominant group (Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b).

*There should be no ...killers and bringing them to justice.* (paragraph 5 Appendix A)

Obama refers to the killers of Stevens with confirmation of taking severe action against them while rejecting the assumption that the killers would be treated kind heartedly. The text keeps another text in it which shows an expectation that the killers might not be sentenced severely. The negation here is revealing dominance and coercive power of Obama over the opposition that is exposed through negative presupposition (Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, 2003; van Dijk, 2008, ch.3). The co-text of negation is very powerful and the agent who is showing this power is addressed as “we” that refers to Obama including his group and alliance i.e. the United Nations and other nations assisting him in military operations in Libya.

*But understand... assault on America.* (paragraph 7 Appendix A)

He talks about the attacks on American post at Benghazi by rejecting the assumption that the attackers targeted American citizen because they are enemies of America. Instead he presupposes that attackers are against the ideology of the United Nations. He has used the negation to win the consent of the audience on the point that the enemies of America are actually the enemies of humanity. So, they are enemies of the whole world including his audience. Therefore, those who harm America actually harm humanity and all the innocent people of the world. This shows his attempt to
reconstruct the ideologies of the political actors present as audience in the meeting. Obama tries to do so by moulding their ideologies in favour of America and against the enemies of America. Ironically, he is referring to the people who are against the notion of freedom of expression and they demand freedom of religious ideologies (van Dijk, 2001b).

...it will not ...hold in common. (paragraph 8, Appendix A)

Obama rejects the actions taken by the governments especially the Muslim country governments after the death of Stevens. These were increasing the security of the American embassies to protect Americans in their countries. Obama criticizes their actions and contests the assumption that increasing security of the embassies of America is enough to save them from attacks. Moreover, he urges the other group to “speak honestly about the deeper cause of the crisis”. The demand made by Obama to the other group is an attempt to prove them dishonest and unwilling to solve the dispute and responsible for the whole crisis. He manipulates the negative presupposition to create a divide between him and the other group and represent himself sympathetic to humanity and protector of the “hopes” of all the people while the other group as a divider of the nations to create conflicts (see Fairclough, 1992a p. 91-92).

Today, we must reaffirm that our future will be determined by people like Chris Stevens – and not by his killers. (paragraph 9, Appendix A)

Obama’s negation here presupposes that the killers of Stevens are negative minded people and enemies of humanity. Therefore, they should be out of the future picture of the world. Obama depicts Stevens’ character in opposition to the killers. The contrast enhances Stevens’ character as a philanthropist and sympathetic individual. He negates the idea that people who killed him should be owned or defended by any group. His discourse is directed to the Muslim world because American embassies were attacked there. He is criticizing the Muslims for not defending America both ideologically and physically. Actually, for Obama the reason of attacks is ideological because they are the consequence of the clash between the ideologies of the West and the Muslim world. He finds his ideologies in favour of the humanity and the ideologies of the other group negative (see van Dijk, 1995a, p.151). Thus, he is oppressing the
ideologies of the Muslim world by preferring his ideologies on theirs. Obama also demands the protection of his ideologies that would be the negation of the ideologies of the other group. This is, therefore, the example of an ideological oppression of the Muslims by Obama.

...we must declare that this violence and intolerance has no place among our United Nations. (paragraph 9, Appendix A)

The use of negation in the above statements establishes the identities and ideologies of America as dominant and accurate and the opposite identities and ideologies associated with the unspecified killers of Chris Stevens are proved to be negative, false and dangerous for the human survival in the world. It is also an indirect warning to the member nations of the United Nations against the supporting of the groups who are against America because they are violent and enemies of humanity. There is a difference in the use of “we” and “our” as “we” is used to include all the member nations in one group that are a pro-America group and “our” is showing the ownership of United States that is in the hands of America. The negation is threatening for the other group and its supporters. They are declared violent and extremist that is another example of negative representation of the opponent group. Obama is exposing this position as dominant and powerful and his power seems to be coercive at time which is echoed in the hard tone of the negation (see Fairclough, 1989, p.12-13).

There is no speech ...destruction in Pakistan. (paragraph 25, Appendix A)

The excerpt comprises of multiple negations with one reference that is the reaction in the Muslim countries against the video. The series of negative statements contest the assumptions which hold that the protests are justified. Obama mitigates the importance of the religious ideologies by criticizing their protests against the act of Blasphemy creating an analogy between the religious ideology and the consequences of the protests in favour of it. He represents religious ideologies by using the words “speech”, “words”, “video” and “slander” while consequences of the protest by the expressions “mindless violence”, “killing of innocents”, “attack on embassy” and “burn, destroy, death and destruction”. All the words and phrases representing religious ideologies are followed by the negative “no” that shows the unacceptance of the
religion of the Muslim by Obama. Every intertext that represents the religious ideology is contested by more intensive intertext from the discourse that discusses its consequences as for example speech is contested by mindless violence, words by the killing of innocents, video by the attack on the embassy and slander by burn, destroy, death and destruction. This is done to intensify the negative consequences of protecting certain religious ideologies and also to debase the groups that support these ideologies. The word “slander” is directly related to the blasphemy of Islamic beliefs, so it is contested more intensively by bringing in multiple discourses to enhance its destructive consequences (see van Dijk, 2008, Fairclough, 1989).

...the majority of Americans ... most sacred beliefs. (paragraph 21, Appendix A)

Obama tries to justify the video by comparing the attitudes and ideologies of the East and the West/Muslims and Christians towards their religion. He intentionally ignores and manipulates the basic tenet of Islam that sees blasphemy as a severe sin and compares it with a something that is less severe in effect (see van Leeuwen, 2008, p.142). The negation also reveals his intentions of not supporting the ideologies of Muslims about blasphemy. He is dominating the Muslim world as he is not in favour of protecting an ideology that is not followed by his group which they call blasphemy. The statement negates the presupposition that blasphemy should be banned, and it is weakening the position of the Muslim world on this issue while strengthening the position of Obama as it establishes tolerance against the religious differences (he does not ban blasphemy of Christian beliefs and tolerates it). He brings in Christianity in the discussion of blasphemy against the Islamic values to marginalize the effect of the reaction against the video by the Muslim world (Fairclough, 2003, p.79).

And yet the turmoil ...casting of a ballot. (paragraph 15, Appendix A)

Obama expects something more from democratic countries than casting of vote by people and choosing representatives of their choice. In fact, he is accusing the democracies that are involved in the protests against the video. He holds that the democracies in the Muslim world are not following the true spirit as they are unable to stop the protests against the video that caused deaths and destruction. The negation here has questioned the credibility of the governments in the Muslim world and spoil their
image and the image of democratic rule over there. Obama indirectly challenges their knowledge/concept of democracy that is faulty in his eyes. The negation exposes the power of Obama as he has taken a position from where he is directing them and pointing out the faults in their political set up and also criticizing them.

_I know there ... such a video._ (paragraph 21, Appendix A)

Obama here reveals that he is aware of the feelings of Muslims without a direct reference to them. The negation is powerful because it gives a sense of confirmation that Obama will not ban the video. This shows suppression of Muslim ideologies by Obama who does not take into account their emotional attachment to their religion. Furthermore, it also shows the power and dominance of Obama who has the ability to ban the video but he is not willing to do so. The word “such” here, is de-emphasizing the importance of the video or the critical nature of the message it conveys. The act of de-emphasizing the crucial nature of video and its message lead to establish that the protest against it is exaggerated and unreasonable. In this way, the religious ideologies of the Muslim world are suppressed by Obama to sustain the power position in the international politics (Fairclough, 1989, 1992a).

_We do not ... may be threatened._ (paragraph 23, Appendix A)

The excerpt explains the reason Obama’s government did not ban the video that is the freedom of expression. The final part of the sentence negates the assumption semantically that people of America might not be able to practice their religion or raise their voice against something they want to express about. Obama understands that people might think he is supporting the makers of videos so he negates this allegation. The way he criticizes the protests against the video and emphasizes negative effects of the protests against it but never criticizes its makers so he can be a supporter of the video makers. He manipulates the idea of freedom of expression and glorifies it in contrast with the issue of blasphemy (see Fairclough, 1989, 1995a; van Dijk, 2001a, 2001b). The idea of providing each individual to express their views is actually in clash with Obama’s stance on the blasphemy which he has hidden in semantic negation.
Obama has undermined the issue of blasphemy by comparing it with hateful speech. His suggestion for more speech in the response to hate speech is getting controversial in the context as he has not explained what he wants to suggest to those whose religious feelings are hurt. The idea of more speech can be taken from different perspectives like blasphemy in response to blasphemy or some other speech that can hurt the makers of the video. However, he rejects these negative reactions and suggests the speech of tolerance that is again ambiguous. Obama suggests to the groups whose feelings are hurt instead of the one who hurt. This shows Obama’s authority and domination on the other group. He through false analogy between hateful speech and blasphemy manipulates the reality and oppresses the Muslim ideologies behind the issue of blasphemy (see Fairclough, 1992a, 2003, 2011).

Now, let me be clear... those of Americans. (paragraph 27, Appendix A)

This excerpt has contested many assumptions and interestingly they are established by Obama himself in this speech. He contested the assumption that America can solve problems of the people of the world on the basis of which he justified his intrusion in Arab Muslim countries. He also contested the idea that America dictates democratic principles to the world and America wants the world to agree with it in every matter. Interestingly, he has said something opposite to it while attempting to win the consent of the other nations about taking severe actions against his enemies (killers of Stevens). His comments about the African Arab countries, their democracies and support for the change in the governments and favour for the protests against the dictators indicate the attempt and ability of Obama to solve the problems. He found their democracies faulty and the governments ran by dictators and suggested the type of governments for them that is by the people and for the people. This is a sort of dictation by Obama and finally at many places he invited the world to join him to make the world a better place (see paragraph 9 to 17, Appendix A). Obama here gets help from negations to take a distance from the discourse of blasphemy and he does it after establishing his ideologies and making many attempts to win the consent of the audience about this matter by bringing in prominence the negative qualities of the
blasphemy issue and the reaction and by deemphasizing the root cause of the issue (see van Dijk, 2001c, 2006; Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b, 2003, 2008).

*Burning an American...a single job.* (paragraph 29, Appendix A)

The negation here creates a negative impression towards the issue of blasphemy as the harms done by protesters in the reaction of the video are emphasized. The association of the blasphemy issue with the basic human needs enhances the gravity and intensity of the protesters’ actions in negative sense. It helps Obama to provoke the sympathies of the audience to those who suffer due to negative political strategies of their leaders. Additionally, he depicts protests against the issue of blasphemy as one of the political strategies of the Muslim politicians to divert the attention of their people from corruption in the politics. The negation supports Obama to prove his point on the issue of blasphemy in a stable and convincing manner and to reduce the severity of the issue in the eyes of the world. He marginalizes the true spirit of the blasphemy by diverting his discussion towards the common human needs. He tries to convince the audience that the protests against the video are useless as they cannot fulfil the basic human needs. Once again, he makes odd comparison this time between the protests after the release of the video and basic rights of the citizens. This comparison is actually an attack on the Muslim politician who, in the words of Obama, highlighted the issue and fanned the flame of violence because they are corrupt and this is the only way for them to win the favour of their people because they do not do anything for the welfare of their countries effectively and Obama’s dominance on the other group is sustained (see Fairclough 1992a p.91-96).

*The impulse ... and prosperity but to chaos.* (paragraph 33, Appendix A)

The excerpt is a warning under the grab of negation. Obama assumes that the extremism against the West is not taken seriously by the Muslim countries. He warns the Muslim countries that if they will not stop the extremist forces present in their countries who work against the West, they would be in great trouble in future. He believes that the extremism in the Muslim countries against the West will soon take the shape of sectarian violence inside the Muslim countries and will create hurdles in the way of prosperity. Obama’s words are hiding behind themselves warning as well as
criticizing the Muslim world and their ideology about the blasphemy. There is also a threat in the negation for the Muslims and that is spoiling their image to a great extent. Obama’s warning stamps them as extremists and violent towards the West without any solid reason. He omits the basic issue from the context of the conflict between the Muslims and the West to intensify their negative character. The second negation in the same paragraph is also portraying the negative image of the Muslims as it is contesting the presupposition that Muslims are in favour of violence and intolerance because they think this will make them strong and prosper (see van Dijk, 1995a, p. 142).

...they have nothing ...they only destroy (paragraph 34, Appendix A)

The negation is used to attack the assumed ideologies of the protesters. The absence of the issue on which the protests were based further intensifies the negativity in their character. Obama describes the extremists out of the context and generalizes them while avoiding the specification of the reference. However, the issue under discussion and the context of his speech make it clear that he is referring towards the people who protested against the video. This helps Obama to achieve his goals in the struggle of power relations and hegemony on the opposite group. The attempts of establishing the negative image of the other group and winning the consent of the audience expose Obama’s struggle to sustain the dominant position in the political world as a hegemon (van Dijk, 1995a, 2008; Gramsci, 1971; Fairclough, 1992, p.91-96).

The future must not ... Holocaust that is denied. (paragraph 36 Appendix A)

The assumptions in the above excerpt are explained and associated with some groups who target Christians, bully women, resist the female education and steal resources at country level. He adds blasphemy to the Muslim Prophet (SAAW) as well but quickly puts a condition on the protesters of the video that they should also condemn the desecration of Christian values along with the Jewish values; holocaust. The negation reveals the identity of Obama as dominating and oppressing political leader who has the power to control the other groups in the world political order. He has the power to criticize his opponents, manipulate ideologies, marginalize them and deemphasize their positive or rather strong points. This is how the dominant oppress
the subordinate and achieve the ultimate power position (see Foucault, 1979, Fairclough, 1989, van Dijk, 2001a).

...the notion that ... obsolete. (paragraph 24, Appendix A)

The statement is an example of semantic negation where the word “obsolete” creates the negative meaning. Obama shows helplessness of America and the West in banning the video with an argument that in the advanced technological world like ours, it is difficult to stop people from spreading offensive material on the internet. The statement exposes the acceptance of blasphemy by Obama but a rejection of taking it too serious to address. Missing of the negative word and use of “obsolete” for creating negativity is an attempt to conceal his ideological stance that is hidden under the helplessness he shows on the ban of offensive information. The analogy of the issue of blasphemy and the modern information technology demeans the issue as not fit an idea to be practiced in the 21st century. This is how he oppresses the religious ideologies of the Muslim world (see Fairclough, 1992a, 2001).

Together, we must... defined by them. (paragraph 37, Appendix A)

Obama has established that the nations of the world should work together that is to work according to his interest and without contesting any idea of the West the Muslim world should behave like one with the West. He is dominating the Muslim world and while accepting the differences between the West and the Muslim world he wants to win their consent and make them realize that they would be strengthened only when they will become one with the West. This again is an example of coercive power that is the oppression of the ideologies of the other group (see van Dijk 2008, Fairclough 1989).

4.1.1.4 Metadiscourse

And I also ... and called for calm. (paragraph 6, Appendix A)

The appreciation in this statement is indirect and reflects the distance of the speaker from the discourse. Obama again includes and excludes the other group in his discourse to maintain his dominant position. The words “other” and “our” expose the binaries which are formed in ideological patterns. In the end, the appreciation turns out
to be an appreciation of “ours” rather than “those” because “we” appreciate if “they” do something good that also holds that they do not do it frequently. The nomination of the countries is also marginalization not only of those referred to but those not referred to (see Fairclough & Wodak, 1997).

_They are also an assault ... for our citizens._ (paragraph 7, Appendix A)

The strategy of the dominant group to include other (neutral) parties in their group is another attempt to gain power. Obama keeps the United Nations on his side here to intensify the wrongs done by the other groups. The attack on the United Nations is an already established crime which reflects the excess of negativity. He in the association of this ‘common sense ideology’ (see Fairclough, 1989), mixes his (America’s and West’s) ideology to win the consent of the common people and nations. He equals himself with the United Nations to share the dignity and importance it has in the eyes of the world. After setting this position, he associates harms done to America with harms done to the United Nations to emphasize the negative aspect of the protests against the video that brought damage to America. He explains and paraphrases whatever he wants to say, and this helps him to keep himself at a distance from his own discourse to achieve his goals in the structure of power. This distance is vital for achieving his goals in the binary of political power because the direct account of having a strong influence on the United Nations would be offensive for the other groups and they might react against the direct oppression by Obama (see Wodak 2001a).

_If we are serious ... we hold in common._ (paragraph 8, Appendix A)

The attempt of the dominant is visible in the statement to consider the opponents a part of his own group. This is to make his interests the concerns of the other group. The attempt of pointing out the differences between him and the other group and suggesting some solutions to finish these differences show that he is very much concerned to win the consent of the other group. After establishing the positive self-image, the dominant puts two choices in front of the other group “forces that drive apart”, “hope that we hold in common” and they are depicted in a way that the interests of the dominant are going towards the positive side of the picture (see van Dijk, 2001a, Fairclough, 1992a). The acceptance of the choice of “hopes” by the other group will
strengthen the dominant group because the subordinate group will work of the interests of the dominant group. If the subordinate group goes against the ideologies of the dominant group and chooses “forces” will be proved negative and enemy of humanity because it will be in opposition of the dominant group. In both the situations the dominant group will sustain the power. In the first case the dominant will have the consent of the subordinate while in the second case the subordinate will take the opponent position.

_We were ... the side of the people._ (paragraph 10, Appendix A)

The binary here is created by the power relations between America and the dictator (Tunisian president Ben Ali). In the theory of power, the opponents of the “other” group are the friends of the “our” group (see Fairclough, 1989), this makes America friend of the rebellious groups in Tunisia. The friends are always defined in the positive and inspirational way and their actions are always right. Similarly, in Egypt, America favoured the people who stood against the president Hosni Mubarak, they were considered right because they were fighting for “democracy”, a weapon of the hegemon group to defend its interests. The discourse shows the indirect involvement of the dominant in the internal matters of the subordinate group. The dominant prefers the indirect way to avoid the revelation of its intentions of sustaining the power position without provoking the subordinate group (see Foucault, 1984; van Dijk, 1997, 2001c).

_We intervened in ... powerful than a tyrant._ (paragraph 11, Appendix A)

In the power discourse, the “other” is considered slayer and the “our” is the protector. Here Gadhafi is the slayer and America is the defender. The justification to intrude in the internal matters of the other country is the mandate of the United Nation, a representative of the world nations. The association of the United Nation interests with the interests of America is a way to universalize the ideologies of America because they are proved to be the ideologies of all the member nations. The capacity and power of fighting against the tyranny are achieved because the whole world wants to finish the tyrants and bring democracy and peace in the world. The manipulation of the ideologies and marginalization is visible in the statement (see van Dijk, 1995a).

_These are not ... universal values._ (paragraph 13, Appendix A)
Obama is universalizing the interests of America and the West to gain the favour of the other group. He finishes discrimination and declares the world one group which shares the similar interests and the interests mentioned are in actual the interests of Americans and the West only. He separates America and the West but the way he is doing it is not convincing. This shows he is saying it just for the sake of saying otherwise he does not believe in it. In fact, he is separating to persuade the other group that out of three (America, the West and Muslims), the two share the same ideologies (America and the West). So, the third group should also share it. In the explanatory part of the statement (after the dash), he himself brings the third group in. He is dragging the Muslims to share his ideologies because he wants to prove his ideologies as the correct ideologies while the Muslim ideologies should be shifted to the universal ideologies. This part exposes the excessive power of Obama as he is imposing his ideologies on the Muslim world by calling them “universal” that shows the whole world is following whatever his group wants them to follow and Muslims should also follow them (Fairclough, 1989, 1992a; van Dijk, 1996, p.84-105).

*In other words, true democracy -- real freedom -- is hard work.* (paragraph 17, Appendix A)

The definition of democracy is made complicated that has created a gap between America and the other world. Obama explains democracy as real freedom without describing the sense in which he is talking. The equalization of democracy with hard work can be understood in many senses. He inserted the phrase “real freedom” in his statement to prove democracy equal to freedom. The adjectives “true” and “real” have made the statement complex as they talk about a particular type of democracy that is equal to a particular type of freedom. This makes the statement subjective and the subjectivity is leading Obama to a powerful position where only he knows what the true democracy and real freedom are (see van Leeuwen, 2008). Although he tells the audience it is hard work but without explaining the meaning of hard work and its relation to democracy and freedom, that is where the audience depends on his knowledge and understanding. Moreover, the definition and explanation are done from a distance and without appointing himself the direct producer of the statement. The strategy of defining things while keeping a distance from discourse helps the dominant groups to construct and maintain power relations.
Moreover, there will ... flames of hate and division. (paragraph 18, Appendix A)

It is a quality of power discourse to define things in the favour or according to the ideology of the dominant group (see Fairclough, 1989, 1992a). Obama talks about “those” and blames them of damaging the humanity and then gives a detailed explanation of their actions to prove the blame. Dictators and extremists are the relevant terms and the definitions given here are totally in the interests of the speaker. Democratic leaders also “cling to power”, have interests and many depend on “the status quo”. Extremists are extremists for the other group but in their group, they are no extremists rather they are heroes and protectors of certain ideals of their group. Similarly, “the flames of hate and division” can be a reaction of similar flames from the other group or are just an act of protection of certain ideologies but this aspect is marginalized. The definition given in the statement is an attempt of the dominant and to elevate the positive self-image and destructive other-image in front of the world. The avoidance of the direct statement has boosted the effect and the dominance of the powerful group is sustained.

…and I believe ... worship across our country. (paragraph 20, Appendix A)

In Obama’s discourse the condemnation of the video is not direct as compared to the criticism on the protests against it which is mostly in direct manner (see paragraph 25). He accepts that the video is responsible for insulting the Muslims but at once associates America with the Muslims to detach himself and America from the video. It weakens the dominant character of the president. He, to recover his power position, gives reasons for his association with Muslims and holds that America has same ideals for the respect of their religion as Muslims. In this way the blame shifts on the Muslims again for being unreasonable in their response to the video that is equally offensive for America. This also comes under the definition of generalization of the issue to disestablish it and debase the ideology of the other group. The distant discourse about the American ideals of a liberal and tolerant country helps Obama to sustain his position. The dominant supports the other group to enhance his positive character in the eyes of others. This strategy helps to keep the power relation without resistance from the other group as well as helps to win their consent (see Fairclough, 1989, 1992a; van Dijk, 1993, 1995b).
I know there are... ban such a video. (paragraph 21, Appendix A)

The unspecified group “some” is assumed to be the opponent and the idea that western people may also be against the video is manipulated with the use of “some”. The unspecified agent helps Obama to include everyone from any part of the world who is against the video while excluding all except the opponent or the other group (Muslim countries which protested against it) and sustain the dominant position in the power structure. It also helps him to stay outside of his own discourse. The plural “we” also generalizes the agent of the statement as it is not directly associated with Obama and it takes into account all the countries where the video is not banned. However, “we” also shows authority and power of Obama which allows him to ban the video, but he does not ban it. “We” hides the authority of Obama by not specifying the agent instead of it generalizing it with the help of plural pronoun of the agent. In this manner, the authority is shifted to “we” that does not exclude Obama but includes some other group also as responsible for not banning the blasphemous video (see Schaffner, 1997).

We do so because ... understanding and mutual respect. (paragraph 23, Appendix A)

The self-benefiting explanation against the voices who want America to ban the video is another strategy to avoid the blame. The ambiguous use of more speech and connecting it with blasphemy is confusing and above the understanding of the Muslims who believe blasphemy is the biggest sin. Obama does not explain how “more speech” can unhurt the feeling of Muslims and what more speech can be? How can that be “tolerant” if it is in the reaction of blasphemy? The ambiguity here in Obama’s statement exposes his attempt to dominate and marginalize Muslim ideologies. He is trying to compete with the strength in the religious emotions of the Muslims with the help of modern concepts of democracy but he fails to make them much forceful to compete with the force of issue of blasphemy. However, his analogy and false comparison expose that he is in a position where he can dominate and suppress the powerful ideologies of the other group (see Fairclough, 1989 p. 32-33).

It is time to marginalize ... principle of politics. (paragraph 28, Appendix A)

Direct reference to “those” (the subordinate group) and their misconduct (hatred against America, Israel and West) reveal the absolute dominant position of America,
the West and Israel and establishes them as one group. The negative image of other and the positive self-image strategy is used to manipulate the reality and marginalize the other group. The goal is achieved through an explanation of “who” with an attempt to stay outside of the discourse. Obama tells us who should be marginalized but never specifies who should marginalize? We know only the dominant group can do it but who is dominant we are not told by Obama. Here hiding of the subject suggests that he is trying to win the consent of the audience and wants them to be one with him in following his enemies. He already established his enemies as enemies of the whole world. Throughout this process, he is not directly involved in the discourse he is producing (see van Dijk, p.142).

That brand of ... promise of freedom. (paragraph 29, Appendix A)

The political ideologies of the other group are criticized and humiliated by associating them with the negative actions. Their system of government, their dealing with masses and understanding of democracy or freedom are criticized by an explanation of the ideas against them or paraphrasing the statements. The explanation and paraphrasing of the discourse indicates the intention of Obama to avoid the direct involvement in the matter. He shares his ideologies in an indirect manner and from a distance (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.122-123). However, the distance never stops him to establish positive self-image and negative image of the other group. The word “brand” indicates towards the negativity in the political system of the Muslim world that according to him is based on the strategy of dividing groups differently by creating feelings of hatred among them. The criticism on the political system of the Muslim world also helps him to justify his support for the anti-government groups in Arab-Muslim countries.

A politics based ... to these forces. (paragraph 31, Appendix A)

The ideologies of the dominant group are exposed through metadiscourse. Obama has tried to keep a distance from his own discourse while criticizing the political ideologies of the “other” group. He depicts the views of other group in a negative and vague manner i.e. without directly associating things to a person or group. Obama attempts to influence the views of the neutral groups and the supporters of the “other”
group. To achieve this purpose, he reveals the dark picture of the future of “other”. He tries to win the favour of the neutral group to strengthen his position in the binary of power relations and to construct and sustain the power position (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.91-95).

The road is hard, ... prosperous Palestine. (paragraph 38, Appendix A)

The “our” groups are always considered free and democratic while the “other” are depicted as struggling for freedom, democracy and prosperity. The only problem with “our” group is the threat to the security from “other”. This also depicts the “other” as extremist, violent and terrorist. The destination of “us” is the most positive thing because it goes more in favour of people of the world than “us” but here the explanation of the destination proves that the intentions of the dominant forces are always to strengthen themselves and their allies which are hidden in their discourse and can only be revealed by analysing it. The “our” group (Israel) is not “secure” and the “other” group (Palestine) is not “independent” and “prosperous” but the responsibility of all goes to the other group that threatens “our” security and independence and prosperity of their own people. The “Jewish” state is parallel to the Muslim state of Palestine, but their religious identity is deemphasized. The emphasis on the Jewish state is threatening somehow as it holds a warning for those (the Muslims) who are against Israel and in favour of independent and peaceful Palestine. The analogy between secure and independent, Jewish and prosperous is meaningful as it reveals the condition of Palestine’s independence and prosperity that is security (end of resistance from Palestine against Israel) and Jewish identity of Israel. This in the way Obama by explaining things while detaching them from the main statement reveals his ideologies from a distance (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.122-123).

Together, we must stand ... America stands for. (paragraph 40, Appendix A)

The positively depicted aspirations and intentions of “us” (Obama) and favour of the opponents of the “other” (Syrian government) who (rebels in Syria) believe in “different vision” from the rest of the Syria are exposing the ideologies of Obama. He has pictured a very positive future of Syria and assumed it to be possible only if American intentions for Syria are fulfilled that is the democratic selection of the leaders.
As a power holder, he defends his intrusion in Syria by declaring it in favour of the people of Syria. He emphasizes his justification by referring to the religious, sectarian and regional differences among the Syrian and argues that he wanted to finish it all and establish a democracy that is the defeat of the opponent (Bashar al-Assad) and only that can promise a bright future in Syria. The explanation is apparently about the positive future picture of Syria but actually, it is depicting a negative picture of it that says the present Syria is not “united and inclusive”, “children are scared of the government”, Syria is led by “a dictator”. The dark side is exposed by emphasizing the absent brightness from the picture of Syria. The account of children in the explanation heightens the dislike and hatred of the world for Bashar al-Assad, the current ruler of Syria. Obama succeeds in intensifying the negativity of the other group while he himself is detached from the statement through explanation (see van Dijk, 2006).

_And I promise you ... a friend to all Libyans._ (paragraph 48, Appendix A)

The strategy of the dominant to manipulate the facts and describe them in a way which leads to their interest and glory is a feature of the power discourse (see Van Dijk, 1996). Obama heightens the personality of Stevens and glorifies his death while putting himself at a distance from the story. The glorification of his death is processed in the background of the elevated picture of his life. The exaggerated picture of his death gives a feeling of a legendary hero who fought against the unjust and gave his life for humanity. He seems more a biblical figure than a modern man of a twenty-first century and instead of a diplomat he is assumed to be a knight who fought against the evil and sin. In the power structure, the powerful celebrates his deeds and marginalizes the deeds of the other group. This is explicit in the above statements by Obama. Stevens’ walking in the streets, the action of humility, standing up for the support of individuals elevates his character and then declaration as an American is a method to enhance the character of America in the eyes of the world. The celebration of his death like the death of a biblical figure and the account of the common people in favour of him is all ideological attempt to establish the positive image of America as well as the American strategies for the world that are criticized. In the light of the above statement throughout the ideological process of constructing the power relations, Obama is at a distance from the story instead of dealing with it directly. This is a strategy used in the hegemonic
structure to make the other group feel that the hegemon is not their opponent and whatever he is doing is the action taken in their interest instead of his own interest.

4.1.1.5 Irony

*If we are serious … that we hold in common.* (paragraph 8, Appendix A)

Power in the discourse of Obama is exposed through the ironic statement he made against the Muslim countries that raised the security of American embassies to protect them from those who were protesting against the video and condemned the damage done to Americans in the Muslim countries. Obama manipulates them by demanding the causes of the crisis. The cause of the crisis is clear; release of the blasphemous video in America. The truth is exploited and made complex to dominate the Muslim world. He dominates the discourse as he is giving choices to the other group in the form of binaries of hopes and forces. The forces that divide are the hard choices because an implicit threat is present in this choice while in the case of the second choice of common hope the other group would become a part of the dominant group and had to work, behave and speak in the interest of the dominant group (see Gramsci, 1971; Fairclough, 1992a, p.67).

*Those in power … work of reform.* (paragraph 17, Appendix A)

The statement holds the irony because whatever Obama is saying about the “other” group to distort their image exactly applies to himself as well. It is a form of situational irony. Obama himself holds the position of superpower and he admitted in his speech that he has supported the revolution against the political leader of different countries because he assumed them to be dictators and tyrants. They are the perceived enemies of America and the West and instead of making the relationship better with them the Western powers raised the people of these countries against their government. He criticizes the Muslim politicians for rallying the people against their enemies while he himself supported the rebel groups in various Muslim countries to finish their government. The irony of situation established the position of Obama as a powerful and hegemon (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.124).
In every country, ... freedom for others. (paragraph 19, Appendix A)

The irony lies in the context of freedom of expression and blasphemy as it goes against the views of Obama about the blasphemy. The freedom of the other group (Muslims) is manipulated and the discourse relevant to their freedom of religion is used against them. The accusation on the opponent group on the matter that is related to “us” is used to exercise power and establish hegemony. The allegations of Obama on the other group are ironically referring to himself (line 1-3, Appendix A). The dominant here accuses the protesters to violate the right of the people to express freely to emphasize the negative image of the other group and to establish its negative identity in the eyes of the audience. However, he himself intruded in different Arab countries and demolished their peace and stability (Libya, Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan) that is implied in his discourse and creates the irony. The critical discourse analysis sees the suppression and marginalization of the subordinate (Fairclough, 1989; van Dijk, 1995a) group through irony present in the discourse of the dominant group.

We not only respect ... what they believe. (paragraph 21, Appendix A)

Obama claims the protection of the freedom of religion in his country in the context of the issue that has harmed the feelings of the Muslims of the world. The ironic situation here is manipulative as well as oppressive as it helped Obama to dominate and suppress the Muslim world through his discourse. He through this statement mitigated the effect of the Muslim voices on the issue of blasphemy and establish the views similar to theirs against their views and in favour of the freedom of speech. The irony reveals the dominant position of Obama in the power structure of global politics where through his discourse he is sustaining these relations by dominating, suppressing and marginalizing the views and feeling of the other group while establishing his ideology and identity as the superpower of the world (Fairclough, 1992a, p.91-93).

More broadly, the ... moving towards democracy. (paragraph 26, Appendix A)

The events which are referred to are the protests against the video and Obama shows his concerns about the situation and wants to finish tension between both the worlds. The irony is that Obama shows his concern on the tension between the Muslims and suggests the world to “address” this “tension” seriously while the reason of the
current tension is the release of the video in his country. He could have stopped the tension by banning the controversial video, but he defends the release of the video as freedom of expression and is not interested in banning it even after the critical situation created by its release. The power and dominant position of Obama make him exploit the facts and marginalize the freedom of others by oppressing and suppressing their views and rights (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.207).

4.1.2 Interdiscursivity

The instances of the mixing of genres, discourses and styles present in the speech of Obama and the way he utilizes them in constructing and sustaining the power relations with the other nations of the world is the concern of this section.

Obama starts with an informal and intimate tenor e.g. “fellow delegates” “ladies and gentlemen” without using formal expressions or details. It exposes his identity as a member of the dominant group and power. It is also explicit from his narrative rhetorical mode right in the beginning and without any foreword. He mixes political discourse with the discourse of diplomacy and also brings in the intertext from some other discourses like discourse of music, law, education and daily life “musician”, “lawyer”, “taught English” and “walking”, “tasting the local food”, “speaking”, “listening with a broad smile” (paragraph 1, Appendix A).

These snatches are associated with Stevens and all focus the peaceful face of the world. They help Obama to draw a positive image of the diplomat. Obama deemphasizes Stevens identity as an ambassador who has a direct relation with the political leadership of the country rather is portrayed as a common cheerful, friendly and down to earth person who loves people around him whether they are his own people or the people from the other group. He also brings in discourse of global cooperation with reference to the Middle East and North Africa, the regions with a Muslim majority (the other group in this context of discourse). Obama keeps a conversational mode that is vernacular in nature. The genre of political speech is mixed with storytelling and public dealing. Mode and genre shift suggest the power and control of president Obama over the other leaders present at the meeting. He tells a story in a vernacular mode and mixing it while taking shifts from one to the other discourse other than the political
order. All this show his dominance and power with the interdiscursive references, he exposes his power in the global political order (see Fairclough, 1992b). He is emphasizing the commonplace information through intertexts and is regardless of the opinion and ideologies of the other political leaders in the response to his discursive practices. The beginning of the speech might not be traditional for the genre of political speech because it has power, therefore, it is totally in his control to structure and restructure the set norm in the prevalent discourses, genres and styles. He is highlighting the contribution of Stevens as a diplomat in the process of stabilization of the Muslim countries. The individualization of the Muslim countries does emphasize the positive identity of Stevens especially as a friend of Muslims (the subordinate group), who speaks Arabic, smiles broadly while meeting them, eats and walks with them just like their own family or friend and through Stevens’ positive image of America.

Obama mixes the narrative and expository rhetorical modes (paragraph 2, Appendix A). The genre of storytelling is mixed with the genre of reporting. The intimate mode gets a turn towards serious mode that focuses the attention of the audience by taking them to Libya following the discourses of revolution/conflict and democracy. The intertextual references present in the text like “cargo ship”, “cared”, “crafted”, “respected” and “supported” are attributed to Stevens (America) and “violent conflict”, “wounded” and “dictatorship” are directed to the Libyans (Muslims). The attributions identify Stevens as humane, sympathetic, respectful and supportive person and construct the powerful and positive image of him/ America while wretched, helpless, miserable image of the Libyans/Muslims who received help, support and aid from America to get rid of the dictatorship/conflicts by establishing democracy as well as new infrastructure especially in Libya. This reveals the binary of political power relations between subordinate and dominant group where America is powerful and dominant while Muslims are powerless, suppressed and dependent on American support for the growth and development of their countries (see Fairclough, 1989). Obama skillfully detaches Stevens from the bureaucracy and politics of America and gives prominence to the human and personal side of him. He declares Stevens an American representative but while discussing his achievements for the Libyans he is totally individualized as a common person. The interdiscursive snatches in the text expose his identity as American rather a diplomat but it is only implied without explicit
declaration by Obama. This is for a special purpose that is going to be exposed in the next paragraphs of the speech.

Obama takes a shift from vernacular to descriptive rhetorical mode which is used to highlight the contributions of Stevens in Libya (paragraph 3, Appendix A). The discourse shifts to political discourse which manipulates the role of Stevens in Libya. The intertexts used to discuss Stevens “love to work”, “country he served”, “dignity in the people”, “establish a new cultural centre and modernize a hospital” and “helped to save” paint him as a leader of Libya. It shows that he had liberty to perform all the activities that are usually performed by the leadership of a country. Apparently, he is a diplomat, but this shows Libya is totally under his control, in other words, in the control of America. The genre of storytelling is still mixed with the genre of political discourse which is a sign of dominance of Obama’s discourse. Obama is not very formal in his style and he selects and rejects the expressions with ease and comfort. The selection and rejection of the style, genre and discourse depend on the power position of the discourse producer. Obama’s discourse and his selection of certain interdiscursive references (for Stevens: love, pride, dignity) and rejecting others (the ones which could have been replaced by the selected ones but were not selected) identifies him as a dominant political actor. For example, he rejects to name the agency who attacked the American compound by passivizing the structure while selected to mention the three colleagues of Stevens who died with him as well as the age of Stevens (see van Dijk, 1995a, 2008).

Obama follows the explanatory rhetorical mode to justify the narrative rhetorical mode. Explanatory rhetorical mode helps to enhance the positive image of his group by associating Stevens with his group (paragraph 4, Appendix A). Obama intentionally detaches Stevens from his group and develops his highly humane and positive image to achieve the effect he has achieved here in this paragraph. Stevens is declared as “best of America” and just this phrase elevates the image of America to a great extent because the image of Stevens is already established as excellent by Obama in the previous paragraphs. Additionally, Obama generalizes the image of Stevens and includes all the foreign service officers as good as Stevens. This further adds to the image of America and Americans. The discourse of international relations and cooperation is brought in to stress the positive role of Americans and America in the
context of international cooperation in all the fields. Obama brings in the international relations discourse while discussing the ideology of Stevens but in reality, it is not just the ideology of Stevens rather; it is the ideology of America that is negotiated through interdiscursivity.

Obama in declarative style discloses that the identities of Stevens and himself are not different but both are one. He manipulates “civilians” and detaches Stevens from the forces as well as politics of America and by doing it he is also distancing himself from American army and other forces. He shifts to the assertive and forceful style which has an indirect threat to the enemies of Stevens and of course enemies of America and himself as he is taking these three as one. The intertextual references like “relentless”, “tracking down”, “bringing them to justice” expose the power position of America in the international political order because the context he is talking in is not about internal politics of America but international politics (paragraph 5, Appendix A). In the context of Benghazi attack, Muslims are on the subordinate side in the binary of power relations and are addressees of Obama. Another aspect of the matter is that the Libyan people and Libyan government are excluded by Obama from the other group by addressing them in an intimate style. He is manipulating their identity without including them in his group; he is just attempting to expose his positive image and friendly relationship with Libya (see Fairclough, 1993, Wodak, 2001a).

Obama in intimate style appreciates the Muslim world. The reason for appreciation is the help and assistance they offered to America for achieving goals in the political order. This is not only exposing his power position but also the subordinate position of Muslims in the binary of power relations (paragraph 6, Appendix A). As the subordinate group is helping the dominant power to maintain the powerful position in the global politics. His discourse has snatches of the discourse of revolution in the African Arab countries which is exposed by him through the individualization of these countries. In the time of 2010 to 2012 these countries suffered from unrest and protests against their government. The West named it as “Arab Spring”. America fully supported the protests and detainment of the then leaders of these countries because it was in America’s interest. New governments in the countries influenced by Arab Spring, are supporters of America and they developed good diplomatic relations with America. He includes the religious support from all around the world which means
Islam because the context he is speaking in is the Muslim world. He emphasizes the support of the Muslim leadership for his ideals. He mentions the Muslim religious institutions in Arabs countries also as supporters of ideals. Additionally, these groups favour his position as a member of a powerful group as well as his control over all the institutions of the other groups e.g. political and religious which are actually the fundamental pillars of any nation.

United Nations is considered the international community itself by the subordinate groups in the world political order but Obama sees it as representative of the all the member countries. The argumentative rhetorical mode is brought in by Obama to convince the other group (Muslim world) that the interests of America are actually the interests of the whole world. There is a direct threat in the style he follows to produce this discourse that is “the assault will be considered as an assault on the world”. In other words, the assaulters would be punished and crushed by the superpower. They will not get favour from any other group because America is the superpower and the ideals of the United Nations will not be followed in that case. The assaulters will not be at peace: war will be posed against them; they will be subjugated; and their security would be at stake (paragraph 7, Appendix A). Obama is proved to be the most powerful here as he has control and dominance over the other groups (see van Dijk, 1993, 2001a,) not only in the political matter but for the development of all the major institutions they need American help.

Obama gets sarcastic while talking about the actions taken by the other group for the safety of his group. The intertexts from the discourse of international relations “guards in front of an embassy”, “statements of regret”, “wait for the outrage to pass” are brought in by him to show his dissatisfaction on the measures taken by the Muslim world for the safety of American embassies in their countries (paragraph 8, Appendix A). In the times of crisis usually security of the embassies is increased and it is the international standard in the genre of diplomatic safety but Obama wants more than that which shows he is in a position where he can demand more than others. In other words, Obama is interfering in the internal matters of the Muslim countries and wants them to follow the political and administrative strategies that are recommended by him. He is acting as a super power and other groups are his subordinates; therefore, he is oppressing them by criticizing their way of doing things in their counties (see van Dijk,
The other intertexts are expressing the sarcasm of Obama for the other group on their reactions when some attack or damage happens to American embassies. He is universalizing “we” here to emphasize the negative picture of the other group as whatever is said using “we” is attributed to them and not to Obama. He is assertive in his style as he is sure and is not worried about whatever he is saying about the other group. The mix of genre also indicates that he is not happy with the actions of the other group with reference to the relationship he has with them. He is speaking from a powerful position where he can judge, criticize and suggest reform to the members of the other group.

Obama shifts the focus of his discourse from the United Nations and brings in the discourse of Arab/Tunisian revolution. In an assertive style he is intensifying (use of must) his point that the other group’s future will be determined by America (Chris Stevens) and not by their own group ideologies and perspectives (the killers, taken as Muslims or a group in Muslims who is anti-America). He mixes narrative rhetorical mode to expose the negative aspects of the Muslim world. The intertextual references from the Arab revolution like “fire”, “protest” and “oppressive corruption” reveal the negativity of the political order of the other group/Muslims (paragraph 9, Appendix A).

Obama condones the conflicts and violence due to clashes between the masses and the governments in Arab countries and admits it openly. He universalizes his ideology about the ideal Arab states and declares his ideology as the ideology of “the world” that is “captivated” by the fall of the governments in the Arab countries (see Fairclough, 1989). It reveals that he has an influence and control over the political matters of the Arabs and it helps him to maintain the dominant position in the world political order where the Arab Muslims are dominated. He achieves his power goals through interdiscursive references (mixing discourse, style and genres while discussing this issue) he uses in his speech.

He brings in the internal political discourse of Tunisia and takes a position of a supporter of the anti-government movement of Tunisia by supporting the protesters while generalizing them as “men and women”. He takes a shift to the internal political discourse of Egypt and supports the revolution but in an ambiguous manner (paragraph 10, Appendix A). He chooses the descriptive rhetorical mode which is an attempt to
detach himself from the internal politics of Tunisia and Egypt. The presence of internal political discourse here is hinting at the argument that Obama is not only interested in the internal matters of these countries but tries to intrude and influence as much as possible for him. This is how he constructs and maintains the power relations and politically oppresses the less powerful nations. Obama mixes the internal political discourses of Yemen and Libya to emphasize the negative aspects of the politics due to its “corrupt status quo”, its “slaughter of innocents” and rule by “tyrant”. The intertexts highly intensify the negativity of the political system of Arab countries (paragraph 11, Appendix A). This is done to justify the American support to demolish this political system and bring “transition” that the intrusion in the internal political matters of these countries (see Schaffner, 1997).

The intrusion of America was supported by other countries and UN Security Council, that is a sound justification as an evidence of the power America exercises in the global political order. The power position of America is absolute, and it has the consent of the big nations and international organizations because it has an influence on them. The power of America permits him to intrude in the internal matters of the countries to move their political leadership to the point that is acceptable to it or that is according to the ideologies of America. This also exposed the oppression of the subordinate or weak countries. Obama follows the explanatory style to justify his actions against the subordinate group that explains his intrusions and intervening in the matter of other groups as the most righteous actions that could be taken to save innocent people and demolish the cruel tyranny in those countries.

The shift from the internal political discourse to the international political discourse is an attempt to establish the political values set for the individual groups to set them internationally. The presence of “American values, Western values” exposes the unity of both the groups and establishes the reality that they both are actually a single group. The phrase “universal values” show the attempt of Obama to clarify to the other group that they have to follow whatever America, or the West suggests for them. While defining democracy “government by the people” he is impersonalizing the political leadership of the Muslim countries where the present governments were demolished with his support. In this way again, a shift occurs to the internal political discourse (paragraph 13, Appendix A). The meaning of “season of progress” for him is
the establishment of the governments of his choice where “season” is a chunk from the discourse which depicts positivity. He utilizes references from parliamentary election discourse to confirm the credibility and fair nature of the present or post-dictatorship leadership that is the result of “credible”, “competitive” and “fair” election. In this way, he is attempting to construct his image as credible and fair in the eyes of the other group (who were opposing the actions of America against the previous leaders of these countries) to maintain the power relations. His assertive and argumentative style helps him to sustain his dominant position in the binary relations of power with the Muslim world (see van Dijk, 1992a).

Obama is generalizing his ideals of democracy that he established in the previous paragraphs by shifting to the global/international political order of discourse. Whatever he said in the previous part of the speech is said to establish a strong ideology to win the consent of his audience to discuss the issue he is going to discuss (see Gramsci, 1971). However, he avoids mentioning the issue directly by articulating “the turmoil” that is the issue of blasphemy vs freedom of expression (paragraph 15, Appendix A). He shifts to the discourse of democratic process “casting of ballot” and negates it as equal to democracy. The negation here exposes his power position that is rejection of the set concepts of democracy because they are not fulfilling his power goals i.e. the presence of “the turmoil” in the countries where his concept of democracy is followed. The mix of style and discourse from Obama is creating confusion here (see Fairclough, 1992b). He intentionally deemphasizes the clear reference to the matter because he does not want to lose his position in the binary of political power relations. He is in the pursuit of some other arguments to take a powerful position in the context of freedom of expression vs blasphemy. This also exposes that Obama is struggling to maintain his dominance, specifically in this matter.

Obama is still struggling to come to the point of the topic directly that he wants to discuss. He brings in snatches from the discourse of democracy to establish a certain shape of democracy by rejecting the other type and becomes descriptive in style about the “true democracy”. While bringing in the concept of true democracy he brings into light the negative aspects of the democracy of the other group. he hides the agency by using the passivizing technique (see Fairclough, 1992b). This exposes the struggle of Obama for sustaining his position in the world politics which he attempts in the next
part and it is explicit in the intertexts “freedom of citizens” “without fear” and “rule of law”. He gives three options for democratic rule in response of the democracy of “jail” and “bribe” of the other group but still Obama fails to take a powerful position here (paragraph 16, Appendix A).

Obama attacks the political strategies of the other group (Muslims) with the help of the references from the internal political discourse of them. He exposes the negative internal political strategies of the other group who has “temptation” to “crackdown on dissidents” and “rally the people” against “perceived enemy” (America) instead of “painstaking” and “hard work”. He establishes the point that the other group promotes its people to protest violently against America i.e. the protest against the release of the video (paragraph 17, Appendix A). He is trying to marginalize the religious emotions of people by blaming the governments for showing matches to the petrol. He is un-intensifying the matter by politicizing it in argumentative rather suggestive style (see Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b).

Furthermore, he attempts to exclude religion and religious emotions from the issue to make it less important and to prove the protest against the video unjustified, unreasonable and negative in terms of violence and protests people made in the reaction to the release of the video. The process of exclusion of certain ideas and emphasis on the other ideas is a strategy to enhance his image in the eyes of the political world by diminishing the force and the effect of the ideals of the other group. This shows dominance and helps to construct, maintain and sustain the power positions dominant with the other group that is dominated or powerless in front of the powerful group.

He adds in the references from dictatorship and extremism as root causes of the issues like the divide between the freedom of expression and the religious freedom. He invalidates the grounds of the issue by comparing the discourse generated by it to already established discourses “dictator(ism)” and “extremism” which are proved to be responsible for “fan(ing) the flames of hate and division”. These strong allegations are attempts from him to deemphasize the drastic nature of the issue under discussion (see van Dijk, 1993). He further adds to his point by bringing in the references for the whole world by individualizing the countries where the conflict (like the one in the issue under discussion) brought transitions in the set up. He further brings the divide between the
modern world and faith and tradition that implies his intentions to separate religion and modernity to establish the priority of modernity over the faith. He also categorizes faith and tradition as one to reduce the importance of faith in the modern world. He mixes discourses to make his points forceful and valid in the context of the issue. The expository rhetoric style is exposing the weakness behind the ideologies of the issue of blasphemy as it helps him to bring in details from other discourses and compare them with the current issue. Furthermore, the mix of argumentative style adds some effect by validating and establishing the ideologies of Obama (paragraph 18, Appendix A). This helps him to sustain dominance of the points made by him and weakens the ideological stance of the other group.

He is generalizing the uploading and creation of the video to diminish its effect that is very drastic on the other group. America is blamed by the protesters against the video for not taking action against the makers of the movie and the video. He responds to them by taking this matter out of the internal discourse of America to the international discourse. This is explicit from the intertextual references like “in every country” and “that is what we saw”. In these examples, his focus in not the video as he finds it a common and general issue (In every. …threatening;) instead he specifies the reaction and shifts from every country to every culture, gives more space to discuss and criticize the reaction against it (…those who…. for others) (paragraph 19, Appendix A). The reference to the issue of blasphemy is portrayed by focusing on the negative actions of the other group and criticizing them while de-emphasizing the cause of the reaction that is the negative action from his own group. Moreover, he detaches himself from the negative actions of his group by further dividing his group e.g. from “America” to “United States government” so the discourses that criticize or protest against the video should not attack the government, is the message but whom should they address is not specified by Obama. The argumentative rhetorical mode is exposing his dominant stance and his powerful position.

Obama brings the other group into his own group to invalidate the protests against the video. He is de-emphasizing the difference of the ideology of Muslims as one nation and generalizing it to the common concept of nation. In his manner, he damages the identity of Muslims as one nation (Ummah) and splitting them on the regional and biographical grounds. Obama mixes the discourse of Muslims as a group
and the internal discourse of America to marginalize the identity of Muslims a whole group. They are depicted by Obama as a small part of America itself. In this way Obama tries to establish that the protests against the video and the stance of the Muslim world on making and publishing the video is commonplace as well as unjustified because the Muslim world does not have a separate free identity as a nation but they are just a part of a big nation that is America. His argumentative and assertive style helps him to dominate the other discourse, though his discourse has more power than the other discourses present in the context due to the powerful position he enjoys (Foucault, 1979, van Dijk, 1996, 2001a). The force and power behind the discourse of Obama help him to dominate and marginalize the other group. It also confirms a highly powerful position of Obama whose dominance has not been restricted to a country or some countries but he is dominating the whole world (paragraph 20, Appendix A).

Obama uses the strategy of inclusion to maintain his power position in the world political order (see Schaffner, 1997). He brings in the issue under discussion to the internal discourse of America from international and internal discourse of the Muslim world. He attempts to indigenize the issue of blasphemy and gets his full control on this idea. It makes him able to handle in more comfortable manner and according to his ideologies and his interests in the world political order. In this way he is giving a message to the Muslims that he can handle their religious matters and internal conflicts better than themselves. This also exposes the incompetence, inability and powerlessness of the Muslim world to deal with the issues related to their nation/religion. He discusses religion and race (first sentence) together as an endeavour to mollify the intensity of the issue under discussion. Additionally, discussing this issue with reference to internal American discourse helps him to compare and contrast the religious ideologies of Muslims with the religious ideologies of other nations settled in America and mitigates the intensity of the matter. For this purpose, he brings in Christianity, the major religion in America and discusses that blasphemy against Christianity happens in America but never reacted in the manner the Muslims reacted to the video (paragraph 21, Appendix A).

This is also an attempt to convince the Muslim world to accept the video as freedom of expression and their reaction against it is hyperbolic and larger-than-life. He is marginalizing the emotional attachment of the Muslims with their faith and the
Prophet (SAWW) that is far more than the Christians especially the Christians of America who are more liberal than religious. Obama also marginalizes the basic ideology of the Muslims that does not take religious as a personal matter but for that religion is penetrated in their whole lives (see Fairclough, 2003). On the basis of the given reasons which are in clash with the religious ideology of Muslims, Obama justifies his action of not banning the video. The discourse of Obama in this paragraph is highly manipulative that is endeavouring to mould the true ideology of the Muslim world about their religion (see van Dijk, 1995a). He is in a position to do so because the Muslim world is under his control and dominance.

Obama uses the discourse strategy of inclusion to de-intensify the issue of blasphemy as he includes himself in the discourse of blasphemy to politicize it and detach it from the religion. This is done to challenge the protests against this issue. His attempt at bringing himself in and establishing an analogy between himself and the basic ideals of Islam is manipulative and an attempt to marginalize the religious ideology of the Muslim world. He glorifies his identity as the leader and “commander in chief of military” to enhance his images as well as the dominant position of his group. The mix of the religious discourse and American political discourse reveals highly oppressive attitude of Obama towards the Muslim world with special reference to the issue of blasphemy (Paragraph 22). He is not just rejecting the right of the Muslims to protest against the blasphemous action against their religion but also disproving the highly emotional attachment of the Muslims with their religion. He highlights the actions of some “Americans” (forces and ambassadors) to mollify the effect of the actions of other Americans (video makers) (see sentence 2). The positive actions of the Americans are not directed to the Muslims only but it is to “all people” that means America is not concerned about the interests of the Muslims only but whatever it does is done for everyone but Obama brought this argument in the context that gives an effect to the world that America is interested in working for the better future of Muslims. The manipulative and dominant nature of his discourse help Obama to maintain the power position (see Fairclough, 2011; Wodak, 2001a).

The paragraph shows the struggle of Obama to maintain the power relations with the Muslim world after the release of the video. He starts with an explanatory rhetorical style which exposes his concern about his position and the clarifications he
makes to contest the opposition from the Muslim world for misunderstanding and marginalizing their religious ideologies (paragraph 23). His style loses force while giving explanations that also expose his struggle to sustain his position. Moreover, his explanations are not up to the mark with reference to the issue of blasphemy but just endeavour to satisfy the Muslim world and justify his ideologies on the issue. He comes out of the political discourse in the social context and discusses the issue from a soft perspective that is focused on the reform of the tolerant society where people from different faiths and races can live together in peace and security. Obama here is striving to convince the Muslim world to rethink on their religious ideologies and attitudes with the help of bringing in the references from the other discourses and mixing the styles of argumentation and explanation. His discourse has the shadows of the genre of debate and discussion on the value of religion in the modern diverse society. He brings in different genres to establish that the religious beliefs in the modern world should not dominate the other matters like international relations, international cooperation and tolerance for diversity. In other words, he tries to establish his point and convince his audience that the issue of blasphemy was not as serious as the Muslim world made or portrayed it by violently protesting against it.

This paragraph shows the reconciliation in the style of Obama who brings in the discourse from information technology to make his point convincing and reveal the negative effects of protesting against the religious beliefs. Obama first separates the countries of the world into two halves on the basis of the divide between the free speech and blasphemy and then brings all of them together as one group that shares similar interests. The process of division and the union is symbolic to show that it is a cause of splitting the world into two halves as well as an attempt to invalidate the issue of blasphemy once again. The presence of modern informational technology in the context of the issue helps Obama to make his point valid and change the ideologies of the other group and make them one with his own ideology. He continues his struggle to prove the other group wrong in reacting against the blasphemy by bringing in the discourses of destruction and violence from the internal discourse of the Muslim countries (paragraph 25) to make his argument forceful and his ideological beliefs stronger than their religious ideologies.
The snatches of the texts from the discourse of blasphemy are brought in and contrasted with the references from the discourse of destruction and violence in the Muslim countries like the (blasphemous) speech is contrasted with mindless violence, words (blasphemous) with killing of innocents, video with attack to an embassy, slander with burning a restaurant, destroying a school, as well as death and destruction in the Muslim world where the protests against the video took place. His account of restricting himself to the internal discourse of the Muslim countries is intentional and it is done to make the point that if Muslims will react to such actions, they will harm themselves not the international community, America or the West. This shows dominance and oppression in the discourse of Obama which is further enhanced by the exposure of his ideology that international safety, security and peace are more important than the religion. The safety of masses, schools, embassies (American) and restaurants is more important than the protection of the religious ideologies and beliefs (paragraph 24, 25, Appendix, A). Eventually, Obama is successful in marginalizing and suppressing the ideological beliefs and interests of the Muslim world and sustain the power position he struggles for in the previous paragraphs (see Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, 2003).

Obama brings in the discourse of modernity and technology and mingles it with the religious discourse of blasphemy. He is advocating the idea that the religion in the modern technological world should take a shift or change its shape from the previous one. He is deemphasizing the nature of the video by euphemizing it as “hateful speech”. His discourse is majorly focused on the reaction against the “hateful speech” and he hardly talks about the video or the people who made it. This is an endeavour to de-intensify the negative actions of his own group by indulging most of the time in discussing the reaction of the other group and proving it more negative, serious and harmful for the safety of the whole world. He never stops diverting the issue from its actual shape and intensity and yet again he does it to blend the discourse from the Arab world, in his words “Arab Spring”. He invites his audience to turn away from the basic issue and focus on the tension between the West and the Arab world. He goes further in demeaning the act of protests against the video and terms them triggers for “chaos” and “worst of us” (paragraph 26, Appendix A). As a final diversion he attaches the protests to the unrest in the Arab world of that time (2012). The paragraph exposes him as a free person who speaks whatever he feels is right and judges the ideologies,
aspirations and issues of the other group with reference to his interest and ideology. In this manner, he is suppressing as well as repressing the ideologies as well as the discourse of the other group and that is only because he has the power to do it all (see Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b).

After establishing his ideologies, Obama steps back from the internal discourse of the Muslim world and speaks in the context of global political discourse (paragraph 27, Appendix A). He attempts to distance himself from the internal issues of individual Arab countries as well as the whole Muslim world. He declares that he will not “dictate” them but actually he is doing it and has already done it in the previous part of his speech. This denial exposes his power position in two ways, that is, he knows more than these countries about the positive points of democracy because he practices it while these countries do not know because they never experienced it. This adds to his power that is not only because he is from a dominant political group but he is better in knowledge too as compared to the other group (see Fairclough, 1992a, 2001).

He keeps the distance more from the internal political discourse to establish that whatever happens in the Arab countries has been their own choice and America has not played a role in it. He also detaches himself from the issue of blasphemy by dismissing the makers of the video from his group and to succeed in this attempt he also divides the Muslim world into two groups: One who protested against the video and the rest of the Muslim world. The analogical discursive strategy of Obama helps him to save himself from the blame of blasphemy while, on the other hand, he makes it sure that the whole Muslim world is not concerned with the issue and it is only a small violent group with evil intentions who is doing it. It also brings the rest of the Muslim world under his control and is his ally and to achieve this effect his descriptive rhetorical mode throughout the paragraph helps him.

Obama now brings the issue into the global discourse as he tries to establish the issue as a harm to the security and peace of the whole world (paragraph 28, Appendix A). He invites the leaders all around the world to condemn the protests. He includes all the countries in one group that is his group and his group is meant to work for his interests and his ideologies. This is the discourse of suppression as it is attempting to merge the identities of the subordinate group in the dominant group and forcing the
subordinate group to change their ideologies in the interests and favour of the dominant group. Furthermore, the dominant group is forcing the suppressed group not only to reject their own ideologies but to speak out against them as they are not right and are “violence and extremism”. Obama goes a step forward to make demands from the Muslim countries in asking them to react and take actions against the violence and extremism that are directed towards America and demands actions against those also who hate America, the West or Israel. This reveals that for Obama America, the West and Israel are one or the same group, i.e. “us” and Muslim world the other group that is “them”. While making this statement he excludes the Muslim world from his group (see van Dijk, 1989, Fairclough, 1992a, 2003).

He politicizes the issue of blasphemy by attaching it to political strategies and interest of the leader from the Muslim countries (paragraph 29, Appendix A). This paragraph has snatches from the discourses of religion, internal as well as international politics and extremism. All these discourses are brought in to suppress and marginalize the discourse of blasphemy. Obama draws a clear line between his group and the other group by nominating it as “east, south and Muslims” and nominates his group as “west, north, Christians, Hindus and Jews” to confirm the geographical and religious differences between the two. Obama side-lines the Muslims and marginalizes their ideologies by grouping himself with major religions of the world leaving aside the Muslims (see Fairclough, 2003. p.79). He groups the Muslims separate from the other religions to prove them different in negative sense and by grouping the other religions together, he tries to make the point that the whole world shares his religious ideological beliefs and only Muslims are odd and different. This comes under the discursive strategy of excluding certain discourses or groups to weaken their position in the power structure and prove them and their ideologies wrong or threatening. Obama parallelizes the discourse of blasphemy and protests against America to mitigate the importance of the discourse of blasphemy and also politicizes it to dismiss the possibility that religious emotions of the Muslims are attached with it in real.

Obama brings in the imperative style that is threatening and assertive and expresses the determination of Obama to be consistent with his ideologies. The determination of being present in the internal discourse of the world countries without “retreat” reveals the suppression of the other group by Obama and his established
dominance on them that allows him to intrude in their internal matters and decide their future himself (paragraph 30, Appendix A). He separates the addressee group from his group, friends and allies. This shows the message from Obama to the other group to be either his friend or ally; otherwise he will consider them enemies and will “bring justice to” them. There is a feel of suppression and coercive power used by Obama on the other group as he is not interested in winning the consent of them; rather he warns them to be with him as his friends or allies otherwise they will be crushed by him, his friends and allies. After establishing the dominance over the other group and suppressing them, he invites them to become his partner and to give a positive and soft picture of himself he comes out from the political discourse and brings in science, technology, energy and development which are the needs and wants of the other group and are in the power of Obama (Fairclough et.al, 2011). He further influences the other group by bringing in the economic growth and shifts again to the political order to give a message to the other group that they can get whatever they want but only after being one with America and working for the interests of it.

Obama shifts to the non-political internal discourse of the other group where his group is present in the form of NGOs and shifts to the international discourse (paragraph 31, Appendix A). He highlights the negative role of the other group as in hindering the efforts of his group to work for the reform of the people of the other group. He shifts the threatening and aggressive to reconciling and expository to establish his positive image and convince the other group that he is a friend and well-wisher (see van Dijk, 1995a). He attempts to convince the other group by bringing in their internal political discourse and capturing a negative picture of it by talking about politics of “anger” that is “dividing” the world in opposite group rather than uniting the world. He pictures the positive image of his group by creating a divide within the other group: between the political order and the civil society. He portrays his group as a friend of the civil society because it expresses the positivity. His blaming the political leadership of the other group and stressing his intentions to work for the betterment of the people of the other group help him to take a position from where he can get into the non-political structure of the other group and influence it while moulding it according to his ideologies and interests.
Obama takes a shift from international to the internal political discourse of the Muslim world to emphasize the harm they suffered due to the protests against the issue of blasphemy (paragraph 32, Appendix A). He deemphasizes the harms suffered by America with the help of passivizing and intensifies the events by individualizing them (Turkish, Yemenis, Afghan), using active constructions and giving full details rather more details than the necessary information to establish that the protests were more dangerous and harmful for the Muslim world itself than America or the West. The intensification of the damages in the Muslim world “police officer murdered......days before his wedding”, “10 Yemenis killed in car bomb”, “Afghan children were mourned by their parents......killed by suicide bomber” and de-intensification of American “civilians were killed in Benghazi” (even identity of the civilians is not disclosed as Americans) exposes the ideology of Obama that is to prove the reaction of the Muslim world wrong and destructive for themselves. (see van Dijk, 2006, Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b, 2003)

Obama challenges the very ideology behind the issue of blasphemy and the protests in its consequence around the world by Muslims. He brings in the internal religious and social discourse of the Muslim world and reveals the divide present there on the basis of sectarian differences and socio-cultural variations (paragraph 33, Appendix A). He reveals these internal divides to weaken the position of the Muslim world on the issue of blasphemy and dominates and suppresses their ideologies and conventions. He is exposing the weaknesses of the other group to strengthen his position in the binary of power where the other group is powerless. He manipulates the division inside the Muslim world to establish his views and ideologies superior and righteous (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.59). The blend of the internal discourse of Muslims with the international political discourse by Obama is an indication that he has the access to the religious, socio-cultural and political institutions of the Muslim world and this access is a step towards the control and dominance. He endeavours to expose the negative effects of the inner divide of the Muslim world and apply it on the divide between the blasphemy and freedom of expression to de-intensify the value and importance of the issue of blasphemy. This manipulative discursive strategy helps Obama to enhance the value of his ideologies and marginalize the ideologies behind the reaction against the video.
To validate and prove his ideologies as righteous Obama gets in the discourse of the Arab Spring (paragraph 34, Appendix A). He manipulates the truth by articulating the protest during the Arab spring peaceful because according to the reports tens of thousands of people were killed and many more lost their houses and migrated to the other countries (2013 http://www.worldbulletin.net/Arab-spring/125344/180000-killed-6-million-displaced-in-Arab-spring). He generalizes the Arab Spring matter to defocus the attention of the audience as “change to Muslim-majority countries” but the audience knows what he is referring to. He attacks an unspecified group for being “extremists”, have no “offer to improve the lives of people”, for “violence” and for intentions to “destroy” without direct reference but the context and the co-text of the text confirms that he is referring to the group who protested violently against the video because they found it blasphemous. This is the stance of the whole Muslim world against the video, so his reference goes towards the Muslims all around the globe. In this way, the attributions to some non-specified groups are directed to the Muslim world that is proved to be the dominated group in the binary of political power relations (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.67).

He creates a binary at the level of international political discourse between future and the past by glorifying the future and debasing the past (paragraph 35, Appendix A). The connotation suggests future is attributed to the West because it is portrayed in a positive manner and the past to the other group (Muslim world) because it is portrayed in a negative manner. In a power structure, the dominant achieves the power when he gets successful in establishing his assumptions (see Fairclough, 1989) and they can get it done in the best way while focusing on the future. Obama is doing the same to influence the ideals of the other group. Another thing he is doing is the magnification of the darkness of the past by comparing it to “prisons”. The intensifying of the dark picture of past is an attempt to make the other group realize that the denial from the offered “better” future can make their future darker than their dark past. This is a discourse of suppression, but suppression is implicit and concealed under the discourse of friendship and alliance. Obama shows readiness of America to work with others for a future without exposing what he means by the better future. The context of discourse tells us that “better future” means working with and for America to achieve its goals in the world political order.
He continues with the metaphor of future and mixes discourses from different parts of the Muslim world. The future that is in the favour of America and the West is for those who work with and for the dominant group (at Tahrir Square where Muslims were together with Christians) not for those who are against them (target Coptic Christians). Obama intentionally brings in the inter-religious discourse to debase the religious ideologies of the other group by attaching them to the negative actions that is to “bully women” and “steal(ing) a country’s resources” (politician) (paragraph 36, Appendix A). These allegations create a horrible picture of the opposite group and the parallel discourse that is detached from them by Obama further strengthens it, e.g. women education, equality between male and female child, belief in the broader prosperity for all people. The ideologies detached from the opposite group are attached by Obama to the group he is with (see Fairclough, 1989). In other words, he wants Muslims to change their ideologies because only then he will stand for them and the West will support them. To win the favour of America and the West they should modernize themselves according to the needs of the modern world (freedom of expression) instead of following the traditional religious norms (issue of blasphemy) which hinder their progress and create problems for them to live with the other communities of the world in a global village.

Obama brings in the reference from the discourse of blasphemy and condemning the acts of slander against the Prophet (SAWW) of Islam which changes his position from the suppressor to the friend and ally of the Muslim world, but he takes another shift to Christianity to mitigate the effect of his discourse and to reverse his position as a group other than the Muslims. The use of contrast as a discursive strategy makes him comfortable to shift his position without any problem. The contrast he brought in is between the blasphemy of Islam and blasphemy of Christianity. He blames the protesters against the video for not protesting against the slander of the Christian beliefs. That exposes Obama’s ambition for the other group that is they should be active equally for the interests of his group as they are for their own group. In this way he suppresses their right to speak against the violation of their religious rights. This is not only suppression but denial of the rights too which is exposed in the last sentence of the paragraph where Obama demands that their voices should be raised to save the religious ideologies of his group (see Fairclough, 1989, p.4-5).
Obama once again throws the light on the negative aspects of the internal religious discourse of the Muslims and highlight the differences in the Muslim world on the basis of different sects (paragraph 37, Appendix A). This is an attempt to debase their religious ideologies and mitigate the intensity of the issue of blasphemy. He is attempting to establish that the ideologies shared by the Muslims who protested are not the ideologies of the whole Muslim group because the Muslims are inwardly separated into sects based on the differences in their religious views. This is an endeavour to weaken the stance of the Muslim world on the issue of blasphemy which they think cannot be discussed along with the debate of freedom of expression. After that he gets back to the discourse of globalization and establishes the difference between his group and the Muslim world but aspires that all should be together to work for the interests of the whole world (America and the west). The direct discourse representation here is also opposing the religious ideology of the Muslims. Obama himself is attempting to convince Muslims to be one with his group to share his ideologies which belong to the dominant group and shift their ideologies which make them subordinate and suppressed in the world political order (see Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b).

Obama brings in the internal political discourse of Syria to establish the negativity of ruling class there. In an expository rhetoric mode of style, he exposes the brutality of the ruler who “massacres”, “tortures”, “shoots rockets” on his people (paragraph 39, Appendix A). This is the cruellest and the ugliest picture of the Muslim world portrayed so far by Obama (see van Dijk, p.27-28, 1995b). He associates the mentioned negativities with the differences on the basis of religion within the Muslim groups. In the background of the ugly picture of the Muslim rulers due to sectarian violence, he rallies the world against them to defeat them and save the innocent people from the cruelty and sectional violence. This is the discourse he is using that establishes the villain picture of the Muslim world and reality of their religious ideologies that turns to violence and brutality. He achieves his goals in the power structure that are controlling ideologies of the opposition, suppress them and establish them as inferior or harmful to the peace and security of the world political order. Obama gets consent of the other groups to take actions against the violence and brutality of the opposition to save the innocent men and women by establishing a peaceful democratic rule that is in favour of humanity.
The issue of Syria is brought out of the Muslim world to the global political discourse after establishing certain ideologies about the people and the ruler of Syria (paragraph 40, Appendix A). Now Obama is in a position to win the consent of the international community to take actions against the Syrian government. To enhance the importance of his ideologies about Syria he splits it into two groups; pro-government and anti-government. The anti-government group stands with the ideologies of America as it has a “different vision” that is the positive side of Syria “united and inclusive” and without fear and oppression while the pro-government group is involved in the crime of strengthening and supporting a dictator, i.e. Bashar al-Assad. The intertextual references to the ideal Syria are assisting Obama to intensify the negative picture of the present Syria even more and he reaches the point where he is in a position to suggest as well as decide the future of Syria and the international community as his ally in this mission. The mission is to change the present ugly Syria to the new Syria where people from different religions and sects will have their place in the government. The mission of Obama reveals his intentions to change the present Syria as an Arab Muslim country to a secular and democratic Syria where Islam is not the only religion and rulers are not necessarily Muslims. This can be taken by the Muslim world as an attempt by Obama to weaken their majority in the world political order to strengthen his position there (see Foucault, 1976, Fairclough, 1989, 1992, van Dijk, 2001a).

Obama clarifies to the international community his intentions and aspirations for the future of Syria. His discourse reveals his power and dominance over the world where he suppresses the groups who go against his ideologies with “sanctions” i.e. economic suppression and “consequences” (paragraph 41, Appendix A). Here, he seems to be involved in the exercise of the coercive power through military operations against the groups who oppose to his ideals and “persecute”, i.e. they have different religious ideologies and they practice it. There is another group in Syria that works for “common good” or works against the rulers and religion-political order which is prevailing in Syria. The anti-government groups in Syria receive “assistance” from America for being separate from the group that is in opposition to America and aspired by America to be the next rulers of Syria. This paragraph reveals the power, dominance and oppression of the opposition by the dominant group which is revealed from the shifts in the styles and discourse by Obama (see Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b). He mixes
internal and international political discourse with reference to Syria that established that the internal chaos of Syria had become too serious to be handled by the Syrian government and authorities. In this situation, the international solution of the issue is required that is taking actions against the rulers of Syria by America in the form of military operation by American and allied forces. Expository rhetoric mode helps him to clarify his vision and win the consent of the member nations to initiate military action against the Syrian government.

President Obama discusses the clashes with the Iranian government, a country from the Muslim world by bringing in its internal political discourse and emphasizing the negative face with the help of intertextual references like “unaccountable ideology” “restricts the rights of its own people”, “prop up a dictator”, “supports terrorist groups abroad”, “nuclear program” that is not peaceful (paragraph 42, Appendix A). The negative picture of Iran helps Obama to take a position in the world political order against Iran but it fails to exercise its power and dominance on Iran. In contrast with Syria, Egypt, Yemen and Libya, Iran is led by a strong leadership that is free from the suppression of America and the West and discourse of Obama reveals this fact in the last part of the paragraph where for the first time in his speech he is talking about solving the issues through democracy rather than force or suppression. Obama is not assertive while criticizing the nuclear program of Iran and the dictatorship there; rather he is indirect in his discourse and tries to keep a distance. He has also separated the dictatorship from the government of Iran unlike the Syrian, Libyan, Yemenis and Egyptian government which were articulated as negative and brutal dictatorships but here it has only one weakness i.e. “prop (ing) up a dictator” by supporting the Syrian government. Through his discourse Obama reveals the political ideology of Iran that in opposition with that is in America. Iran is supporting the opponents of America by providing aid but America is unable to do anything to stop this process. Obama struggles to take a dominant position and suppress the ideologies of Iran as the political set up and government of Iran are strong and are not influenced by the foreign pressure.

Obama here restricts himself to the nuclear program of Iran and finds it dangerous and harmful for the peace of the world. In this manner he picks the weak aspect of the Iranian government and creates a negative image in the world political order (paragraph 43, Appendix A). Obama includes the United Nations in his group to
get power and “harness” nuclear program of Iran. He fails to prove it harmful and is not accessed for a peaceful purpose which is revealed in the references like “it would threaten”, “it risks”. These references reveal the possibility and probability and do not assure the harmfulness of the nuclear program of Iran. The co-text of the references “eliminations of Israel”, “security of Gulf nations” and “stability of global economy” reveal that threats are mostly directed to the interests of the United States, that are, Israel and global economy. Israel stands in the group of America and the global economy is in control of America. This unveils that the Iranian nuclear program is not a threat to the world as a whole but it threatens the power position and dominance of America in the global politics. Therefore, America does its best to “prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapon”. Obama is struggling to construct and maintain the power relations with Iran and dominate and control specifically its nuclear program to avoid a stable and strong position of Iran in the world politics (see Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, 1992b, 2003, p.9-10).

Obama brings in different discourses from the present and the past world to establish that people of the world should respect the law set by the international community (paragraph 44, Appendix A). He mixes expository and argumentative rhetorical modes to establish the credibility of his ideologies. He attempts to convince the member nations by emphasizing the beneficial and positive picture of the international law with the help of the discourses that prove his point like “liberty and triumph over tyranny”, “peace and progress”, “united, free and at peace”, “lifted out of poverty”. This reveals his attempt to convince the other group to join the international community to get all the benefits and to avoid “conflict”, “deadliest battlefield”, “poverty” that are the consequences of not following the international law.

He turns from the general to the specific in his style. After establishing his ideologies as superior and beneficial for the security of the humanity, he leaves “we” that represents an individual from a group who speaks on behalf of his group and comes to “I” because the identity of his group is established as powerful and dominant due to its superior ideologies. He is in a position to exercise his individual power as leader of the dominant group. The contrast of discourses is exposing the bleak and bright aspects of accepting and rejecting the international rule of law. The interplay of discourses and shifts of styles in tenor and mode are the discursive strategies used by Obama to validate
his ideologies and enhance the importance of his group in the world political order. The validation and establishment of his ideologies in the world political order help him to maintain his position in the world political order as dominant (see Fairclough, 1989 p.11).

This paragraph reveals the endeavours of Obama to portray a positive and convincing picture of his group by highlighting their achievements in the world politics and the success of their ideological stance (paragraph 45, Appendix A). The snatches from different discourses like Iraq, Afghanistan, Al Qaeda are brought in by Obama to enhance the positivity of the ideals of his group that actually is manipulative as American forces are out of Iraq but it is still suffering the horrors of war, America’s withdrawal forces from Afghanistan is manipulated as establishing peace there. The weakening of al Qaeda and death of Osama bin Laden is also attributed to the success against the violence which is also manipulating.

The act of manipulation is suppressive and exposes the dominance. Obama attempts to conceal the information because it affects its positive image and highlights the information that glorifies the actions and ideologies of his group. All this is aimed at winning the consent of the other group to follow the ideologies of America because it is beneficial and promise the peace, stability and security for them. In this way, the discourse of Obama reveals his struggle to construct the power relations with the help of mixing different discourses and styles and through them establishing his ideologies in the context of international politics (see Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, 2003; van Dijk, 2001a, 2001b, 2006).

Obama in this paragraph, brings in the discourses from various institutions and from different parts of the world like the military, education and politics and brings these internal discourses together on the platform of global political discourse. This is an attempt to associate himself with the positive picture of the world and also show that the peaceful and progressive groups of the world are at his side (or he is at their side) (paragraph 47, Appendix A). He includes military to show the positive picture of America as it risks the lives of its forces to save the people who are “strangers”. Obama here denies the interests he has, behind the military actions, in the other countries and the drastic problems created by the American military actions for the people of those
countries. The destruction, deaths and instability followed the breaking of the governments in Arab countries (see Brennan, 2016). Obama mixes discourses of education, politics and religion to construct positive ideologies for his group. He makes the people of the world to get captivated by his vision and eventually adopt his ideological beliefs as their own. On the other hand, the shift of ideologies is a great help for Obama to win their consent and work for his ideologies to structure, restructure and maintain the power position in the politics of the globe. The shift in the rhetorical mode from descriptive to narrative and argumentative makes it possible for Obama to persuade his audience to accept his ideologies as their own and in this way submit to his power and dominance by taking it as assistance and help and accept it with gratitude (see Gramsci, 1971; Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b).

President Obama confirms as he mixes the internal political discourse of America and the international political discourse that he is not just the leader of America but is leading the people of the whole world (paragraph 48, Appendix A). He reconfirms his position as the ultimate dominant power in the world politics by bringing in the references from Chris Stevens story and the political history and foundation of America. The discourse brought in to exposes the manipulation of the reality by Obama that is America was founded with an aim to dominate the other countries of the world. It has been dominating the whole world throughout its political history and Chris Stevens was also working for the same cause. His rhetorical mode takes a shift to the narrative by the end of his speech that is used to glorify the image of Chris Stevens. He attracts his audience with this style as an attempt to win their sympathies for Chris Stevens and establishes him as a friend of humanity. He actually uses Stevens as a metaphor for America so the positive opinion for Stevens is diverted towards the ideologies of Obama and this is how he wins the positive opinions of the world and achieve power position where he can dominate others after winning their consent (see Gramsci, 1971; Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, 2003, 2011).
4.2 Intertextual Analysis of the Political Discourse from the United Nations

Context

This section provides the intertextual analysis of the speech of the United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki Moon. With this identity his position in the binary of the international political power relation is neutral. In most parts of the World it is considered an organization that supports the Western ideologies and agenda. However, it cannot be taken as the West because it has members from all around the world which makes it an organization that represents the whole world. Identity of Ban Ki Moon here is equal to a neutral person in the binary of the Muslim World and the West.

4.2.1 Manifest Intertextuality

Ban Ki Moon used all the five elements of manifest intertextuality in his speech. i.e. discourse representations, presuppositions, negation, irony and metadiscourse.

4.2.1.1 Discourse Representations

Ban Ki Moon used discourse representations in the form of one quotation and free indirect discourse.

4.2.1.1a Direct quotations.

“You do not speak for us” (paragraph 11, Appendix B).

Ban Ki Moon uses direct discourse representation in order to voice the “moderate majority” that is in favour of tolerance and freedom of expression. He through direct discourse representation tries to challenge the protesters’ majority and representation as Muslims or followers of the idea of religious freedom. He yearns to marginalize and isolate them from the whole Muslim community of the world to expose them as violent, negative and corrupt (Fairclough, 1992a, p. 206-207, Fairclough, 2003, p.79,). The discourse representation here is not a real quote rather it is constructed by him. He strives to isolate the group of people who protested against the release of the video from the people of the same group who stayed at home. They are considered not
only silent but also in favour of the West and against the protesters. Discursive strategy of the UN Secretary General exposes his favours for the dominant group or the West. It also exposes the position of the UN in the binary of global political relations. He marginalizes the voice of the other group that criticizes the suppressing of the religious freedom.

4.2.1.1 b Free indirect discourse

*The winds of change in the Arab world and elsewhere will continue to blow* (paragraph 10, Appendix B).

United Nations Secretary General bring in free indirect discourse in the context of Arab Spring that started from Yemen and moved to the other Arab countries. He mixes the voices of the United Nations and the West who are in favour of change. He also mixes the voices from different Arab countries which were affected by the Arab Spring and then direct his comment to the Palestine. The statement is ambiguous and implicit. It is not clear whom he refers to when he says “elsewhere”. It seems he uses this word to generalize his comment in order to show objectivity. He individualizes the Arab world by nominating and predicting change for it but at the same time he adds “elsewhere” to include some supposed countries other than the Arab world. They are never specified so they cannot be compared in analogy with the Arab world. The unspecified world exposes the hidden ideologies of Ban Ki Moon who as a representative of the world organization avoids the direct comment about countries, but his discursive strategies are exposing the ideologies behind discourse.

The words “winds” and “blow” are complicating the idea more because they can be taken positive and negative at the same time. It is not clear from this example whether he favours or disfavours the change. The complication exposes his intention to be objective and neutral in the world political context. He strived to keep his neutral status intact, but his discourse exposes his inclination towards the West. He appreciates as well as supports the Western stance on the emergence of the Arab Spring which toppled the Muslim rules in the countries under the influence of the Arab Spring. He gives his consent to the dominant ideologies which help them to become common sense in the socio-political order (for detailed discussion see Fairclough, 1995a, p.15-20).
Too many people are ready to take small flames of difference and turn them into a bonfire (paragraph 11, Appendix B)

Ban Ki Moon criticizes the actions of the protesters by mixing his voice with their voices. He keeps his voice opposite to the voices of them. The statement echoes the divide created after the release of the video which was protested by the people all around the world. He emphasizes the majority of the people who belong to the other group are fond of creating difference and violence. The “small flame of difference” indicates the release of the video and “bonfire” the protests against its release. The statement goes against the group who opposed the release of the video. He avoided to specify too many people here again. He disapproves the protests but avoids favouring the other group as he belongs to the United Nations; neutral organization. It is explicit from the context that “too many people” mean politicians. He states in the previous sentence that people use others for political gain. Form this background we can understand that people referred here belong to the Muslim countries. Obama also blames politicians to enrage people against the West for political gains. Here Ban Ki Moon refers to “too many people” i.e. politicians are busy in destructing the peace of the world to win their political positions and power goals. He not only deemphasizes and suppresses the Muslim’s point of view but also blames them, specially the politicians for being corrupt and destructive. The word “flame” is significant because it exposes the presence of differences between the two groups which are accepted by the leader. His supresses the ideologies of them and supports the ideological stance of the dominant group by de-intensifying their actions (van Dijk, 2005, p.16-18).

4.2.1.2 Presuppositions

The moderate majority should not be a silent majority (paragraph 11, Appendix B)

Ban Ki Moon has contextualized this statement in the internal political discourse of the Muslim world. The statement has a presupposition that there is a moderate majority that is comprised of the Muslims who are against the protests. He manipulates the fact through presupposition that the majority of the Muslim world did not find the video threatening. It is just a group within the Muslim world which has created the situation in the name of religion to gain their political goals. The
presupposition exposes his attempt to marginalize the issue of blasphemy and its intensity and emotional value in the Muslim world. After assuming “the moderate majority” as against the ideologies of the protesters he declares that it is silent on whatever has happened in the name of religion. The presupposition is an attempt to isolate the protesters from the rest of the Muslim world. He uses the strategy of inclusion and exclusion to marginalize the stance of the protesters. He blames the Muslim world for silence against the protesters, but he never said anything against the other group i.e. makers of the video. He tries to isolate the protesters from the other world to marginalize their religious ideologies (Fairclough 2003, p.112, see for further details)

*Over the past two weeks a disgraceful act of great insensitivity has led to justifiable offense and unjustifiable violence* (paragraph 5, Appendix B)

It is presupposed that some act of “insensitivity” happened which was “great” in nature. However, the act is not detailed in an explicit manner which makes the situation obscure. The video was released in the month of July 2012 and protests were made in September and two weeks before the speech of the Secretary General. However, the word “disgraceful” shows that he is talking about the video too and the act of insensitivity is the release of the video which led to “justifiable offence” that is the reaction of the Muslim world to condemn the video. The word “offence” is important here as it shows he is aware that the video was offensive. It also exposes that the reaction against the video by the Muslim world is justified. However, the violence in the protest against the US and the West is considered unjustifiable. It shows his position as a neutral in the binary of power relations.

**4.2.1.3 Negation**

*The moderate majority should not be a silent majority* (paragraph 11, Appendix B)

This statement from United Nations Secretary General negates the presupposition that the majority of the Muslim world that follows moderate attitude should not participate in the discourse and actions going on in the background of the divide between the freedom of expression and religious freedom. The negative presupposition here is only concerned with the role of the presupposed silent majority.
He already established the fact that this majority is present and is moderate and tolerant. The negation is used to strengthen the already established presupposition that majority of the Muslims are not interested in the reaction against the release of the video. In fact, he wants to move the Muslims to talk about the violent protests and accept them as act of violence which cannot be justified. The effect of the negation on the audience is of high impact. It shows that for Moon Muslims should not be protesting the way they did on the release of the blasphemous video. He exercises powers on the Muslims which is more coercive and leads to the dominance (see van Dijk, 2008; Fairclough, 1989, p. 33-34).

The next negative statement in the context of the divide in actually voice of the major majority “you do not speak for us”. The voice that is assumed by Ban Ki Moon. He tries to depict a tolerant image of the Muslim world by isolating the major majority from the protesters. However, the statement can also be taken as a message for the Muslim world to understand the negativity of the matter, which is the violent protests, in the reaction of the video. He implicitly directs the Muslims to condemn the protests or disclaim them as Muslims to isolate the protesters who are already established as people who are after their interests and gains (see Fairclough, 1989).

4.2.1.4 Metadiscourse

Too many people are tolerant to intolerance (paragraph 11, Appendix B)

The statement shows Ban Ki Moon’s careful choice of words. The context of the statement is the divide between freedom of expression and religious freedom and the protests which occurred after the ideological clash between the two groups. It is obvious from the context that the statement refers to the Muslim protesters in reaction of the video but it is not declared openly by the speaker. The expression “too many” is used to create the distance from what is said because it shows the generalization of the idea of intolerance. The context free nature of the words in this statement makes it fit in any context for the speaker. The general nature of the statement has the quality of meta-discourse. He as head of the United Nations avoids the direct reference to the Muslims. The word “tolerant” is meaningful in this context and as it can have multiple meanings. It is not used here in the positive connotation rather its sense is negativized
by the next word “intolerance”. The distance of the speaker for the statement helps him to generalize it instead of nomination of the protesters. However, the co-text and the context of the statement takes out the element of generalization and makes the Muslim protesters target of this statement. Speakers stay at a distance from their discourse because they want to create and effect. Ban Ki Moon attempts to condemn the actions of the protesters but he avoids relating the protests to the background issue and also avoids blaming the people directly (see Fairclough, 1992a).

*It is the duty of our generation to put an end to impunity for international crimes* (paragraph 9, Appendix B)

Fairclough (1992a, 1992b) states the political actor say certain things while trying to keep themselves on a distance (metadiscourse) from the things they say. The distance is linguistically traceable because it is communicated through linguistic items. One of the linguistic strategies for metadiscourse is the use of “it” structure. Ban Ki Moon uses it here in a skilful manner. Next part of the statement is a blame for “impunity of international crimes”. As head of the world organization he is responsible to keep a check on crimes and find ways to stop them. However, he includes the whole world as subject of the statement. Use of “generation” further generalizes what he says as he comes out from the context of politics or international relations by addressing the whole generation. This exposes two aspects of the matter; one he does not want to take the blame on himself and his organization so includes the other people as his group or stake holders in the impunity of crime. Secondly, he attempts to criticize the world, specially the political leaders of the world, for allowing freedom for crime in their societies. In both the situations he does not attack the people directly rather he uses the strategy of inclusion (see Fairclough, 1989, p. 92). The meta-discursive element in this instance is used in the context of Syria, however again it is generalized by the expression “elsewhere”.

4.2.1.5 Irony

*They want ideas, your leadership and concrete hope for the future. Our duty is to respond to these frustrations and yearnings* (paragraph 2, Appendix B).
The statement creates irony in the context of the divide between the freedom of expression and the religious freedom. He talks about the people of the world who expect that their leaders will protect their ideologies and provide them hope for a better future and keeping in mind these expectations it is the duty of the leaders and the United Nations to fulfil their needs and expectations. He includes the United Nations with the governments responsible for making the life better for the people. Here, he finds himself responsible for responding to the frustrations and yearning of the people but while commenting on the issue of blasphemy his stance is different. Instead of responding to the anger and frustration of the people who were protesting after getting emotionally hurt, he criticizes their protests. It shows that “they” represent a specific group or people with specific ideologies and identities which are accepted by Ban Ki Moon as positive.

Apparently, he talks about the people of the whole world, but the statement has an element of situational irony where he isolates the protesting Muslims while commenting about the protests. In the second sentence he mentions the duty for the United Nations as well as the governments to “respond to” “frustrations” of the people of the world. The statement means positive response that can take the people out from the situation of depravity and disturbances. However, while stating about the protesters against the video his stance was different. Instead of responding to their frustrations, he declares them “minority” that is insane and pushed by the political powers to achieve their political gains. This exposes the position of Ban Ki Moon as supporter of the Western ideology (see van Dijk, 1995a).

4.2.2 Interdiscursivity

Mr. Ban Ki Moon mostly starts with a global discourse where every member of the organization is a part like family. He misses different discourses to indicate towards the global issues of humanity. His major focus is political discourse as well as discourse from law and justice, but he shifts his focus to other discourses too. He mixes environmental discourse, socio-economic discourse, global as well as individual to specific countries as a global leader. He mixes different genres in certain discourse to emphasize his points. He keeps the formal tenor throughout but the rhetorical mode shifts. For example, it gets authoritative “Your people want to see results in real time, now, not the distant future” and sarcastic “Too many people are ready to take small
"flames of difference and turn them into a bonfire." The shift of style indicated the shift of ideologies with the change of the topic and ideologies. While addressing the developing nations his style is more authoritative (paragraph 2, Appendix B). His rhetorical mode gets imperative shift specifically while talking about the political matters i.e. *Now, you must make good on this promise* (paragraph 6, Appendix B)

Another important aspect of the interdiscursivity in Ban Ki Moon’s discourse is the use of singular pronoun I and plural We. Use of “I” makes his statements assertive and forceful and depict direct nature of the style which exposes his position as powerful i.e. I am here to sound the……, I see Governments wasting….., (paragraph 1, Appendix B), I have set out (paragraph 3, Appendix D) I am profoundly concerned about continued (paragraph 7) *I urge you……* (paragraph 8, Appendix B). In all these instances he sounds authoritative and sometimes also a bit aggressive. These statements are addressed to Muslims either directly or indirectly. In the direct instances the addressee i.e., Muslim countries are nominated while in indirect instances link can be found from the divide between the Muslims and the West. However, even in the use of “I” he generalizes the statements where Western countries are also addressed in negative context. *I also reject both….one state against another* (paragraph 10, Appendix D). Sometime his direct style exposes his helplessness to handle the situation which usually is created after the clash of the people due to differences, *I need space to manage….* (paragraph 12, Appendix B). While mixing different aspects of tenor mode and rhetorical mode he also mixed certain discourses ranging from internal (Muslim World) to international, adding political, non-political, civic, environmental and judicial. His style also reflects the genre shift within the discourses he used.

He discusses the divide between the freedom of expression and religious freedom in an indirect style. He sets a background before commenting of the divide itself to contextualize the issue (paragraph 11, Appendix B). The context is set in the background of the human rights including women and children rights. He maintains formal as well as indirect style to establish the context. He mixes various discourses from areas of law, peace, local and international politics, and international cooperation. He starts his commentary on the issue from narrative rhetorical mode and mixes it with descriptive, expository and assertive modes. The shift from one rhetorical mode to the next exposes the shift of the ideologies of the discourse user. Narrative mode is adopted
to express understanding about the issue. Description further enhances this idea. Expository mode is used to establish his ideologies on the matter as correct while assertive rhetorical mode is adopted to bring force in the argument and support his ideologies by criticizing the ideologies and actions of the others (Muslims/protesters). The tenor shift is also visible here from formal to conversational and argumentative as well as assertive. Genre of political speech is mixed with that of political debate. This shift is also very meaningful in this context because it unveils the hidden ideologies of the General Secretary.

4.3 Intertextual Analysis of the Political Discourse from the Muslims World

4.3.1 Intertextual Analysis of the Speech of the President Zardari

Context

The context of the speech is important to be discussed because it is highly influencing the discourse of president Zardari. He is talking to international audience among them. He is facing the countries that support his country at different levels through economic aid and other agreements. His country is in the control of the West because it depends on their grant and help. This influences his country’s political structure as well that is to an extent under the control of the West and America. Another important fact about his country is that it belongs to the Muslim world that is the “other” group in the context under study. Both the identities of Pakistan are making Zardari interpret discourse in a certain manner and avoid the other. Additionally, he is trying to establish a positive image of himself as a president of Pakistan to win the sympathies and support of the Western world because he has been facing a lot of criticism from his country and has not been a popular leader.

4.3.1.1 Manifest Intertextuality

Zardari used all the five elements of manifest intertextuality in his speech i.e. discourse representations, presuppositions, negation, irony and metadiscourse.
4.3.1.1 Discourse Representations

Zardari used discourse representations in the form of direct quotation and free indirect discourse.

4.3.1.1a Direct quotations.

“I dream of a third millennium in which the gap ...and all of yours.” (paragraph 23 Appendix C)

Zardari has taken the excerpt from the speech of Benazir Bhutto as a direct quotation. She said these words while addressing the UN General Assembly on 3rd October 1996. Zardari used the quotation in two contexts at a time. One is the context of global relations and collaboration and the other is the context of his government and democratic rule in Pakistan. He discusses the achievements and attempts of himself as President of Pakistan for the democratic rule. The direct quotation is used to add value to his attempt and make his statements more valid and persuasive. The quotation helps him to convince his audience and appreciate the ideology and mission of Benazir Bhutto as depicted in this quotation. He mentions his relationship in an emotional way before quoting that shows his intention to be considered one with his wife and her ideologies and mission. This direct discourse representation throws light upon all the major problems of the world.

The quotation helped Zardari to justify his point in favour of democracy in his country. The selection of quotation exposes the political ideologies. He is trying to establish a strong position in the power structure by talking about the positive aspects of the politics he believes in (van Dijk, 1995). Being a Pakistani, his image is raised but being a member of an international organization in the power structure actually his image is getting lowered. The problems he talked about are actually the problems present in his country and by solving them or having a positive thinking about solving them is his duty as a president. Secondly, this quotation is unable to help him in discussion of his achievement in the democratic rule of his. The quotation weakens his position by exposing the negative things about his country more explicitly.
Additionally, the dreams of “third millennium” makes the situation worse for him because it suggests his planning for a future that is far away instead of the actions he is ready to take now and in near future. The statement describes aspirations to fight against “gap between rich and poor” “hunger”, “illiteracy” and “diseases”. In the international scenario, he belongs to the poor country and seeks aid from the rich countries. This already weakened his position and made him a member of the “other” group. In this position, he is unable to address these issues internationally; instead he can aspire for the solution of these issues within his country alone and with the help of the rich. The distinction between a boy and a girl in its extremely negative shape is specific to some parts of the world including Pakistan, however, in India it is a big and controversial issue now. In the context of the present study, this reference goes towards the negative points of the Muslims, the “other” or suppressed group and Zardari belongs to the same group.

The words like “planned, wanted, nurtured and supported” refer to the problem of increasing population that is problem of the third world countries, like Pakistan. Other references like “tolerance” and “pluralism” also go against the positive self-image of the president because his group is accused of intolerance and divisions on religious, regional, ethnic and social grounds. The references used by Zardari to establish the soft and positive image of himself are actually going reverse and his discourse here is exposing the weakness of his position in the world political scenario (Fairclough, 1988, 1992a). They are also exposing his identity as a member of the suppressed and dominated group. The quotation also exposes the subjectivity as it is a statement of a political leader from his own country as well as family.

Secondly, Benazir is not an internationally established figure and has no contribution to the structure of the international politics. She may have been important in her own country but not internationally unlike Gandhi and Mandela who were quoted by Obama in his speech. The context of quotation within the speech is totally subjective and direct. He tries to establish himself as a good politician of his country and assumes his wife to be the best one in Pakistan. This makes him associate his politics with her politics. In the international context, his description and explanation of his way of ruling his country expose his oppressed position and identify him as a member of the suppressed group whose country is not free from the influence of the international
community (America/America and West) and they have control over the internal issues of Pakistan (Fairclough, 2003, p.123).

4.3.1.1b Free indirect discourse

There are a lot... these days (Paragraph 10, Appendix C).

Zardari utters the statement rather abruptly that is without mentioning the agent. He mixes the voices of different groups who are concerned or are affected by the role of Pakistan in the war against terrorism. The word “questions” suggests the negative image of Pakistan or criticism on the policy of Pakistan on the war on terrorism. Zardari is unable to state this fact directly and clearly which is a sign of his subordinate position in the global politics. He has many things to say including complaints against the attitude of the West/America about the war on terror in Pakistan, but he is compelled to choose the indirect way of discussing this matter. In the next statements he talks about answers of the said questions without mentioning the questions.

Zardari attempts to strengthen his position in the power structure by showing a sort of reaction on the unappreciative approach of the world on the suffering of Pakistan in the journey of terrorism and extremism free world. He is unsuccessful in establishing his ideology because he is unable to clarify the responsible agency as well as the actual problem he is referring to in the statement. He tries to achieve his goal of attaining a position in the power structure by mixing voices of the agencies, but the statement instead exposes his weakness and position as a subordinate political actor in the world of politics. He diverts the focus of the statement from himself to the people of Pakistan, politicians of Pakistan and army of Pakistan (paragraph 10, line 2-3). This action has excluded him from the binary of power relations and he loses his position even as a member of the subordinate group (Richardson, 2007). The reason for that is he is neither associated with armed forces nor with political structure (he is not an elected member of the people of Pakistan rather he is there on his position because he is associated with the ruling political party). He also mentions people of Pakistan but from the context and co-text it is not proved that he includes himself in the people of Pakistan. This instance implies that Zardari by failing to establish his position as even a part of the subordinate
group fractures the power relations and his attempt instead of himself benefited the dominant group in the power structure inside his own group.

*One of them is the tendency to respond to failure through blame* (paragraph 20, Appendix C).

This statement is also ambiguous and is without a reporting verb or any other clue that can indicate the speaker of it. A deep analysis of the statement exposes the mixing of the voices from opposite groups. The word “failure” can be associated with America who is fighting against terrorism in Pakistan and it can also be associated with Pakistan because it fails to overcome terrorism. The context of the statement suggests that he aspires to achieve a positive self-image and tries to identify himself as a responsible, honest and committed member of the group who is fighting against terrorism and is very much concerned about building strong ties with other nations. Instead of recognizing his positive role the others blame him or his group for not fulfilling his/their responsibilities as allies in the war against terrorism. His statement has a tenor of complaint on this situation.

The discourse representation here again exposes his position as struggling to affiliate himself with the dominant group even at the stake of the loss of his own people and country (Foucault, 1982). However, he fails to achieve his goals and it is explicit from his discourse specifically this discourse representation. His taking out the agency or the speaker of the statement and keeping it indirect as well as ambiguous is the indication that he wants to win sympathies of the dominant group and wants them to consider him a member of their own group (van Dijk, 2001b). The very next statement (paragraph 20, Appendix C) he is involved in is a sort of taunt that his country is also facing challenges and it is the fruit of affiliation with the West and America but still they do not blame their partners/masters in the war against terrorism in Pakistan. This clarification further weakens his position and uncover his identity as a member of a suppressed group (Dellinger, 1995).

4.3.1.2 Presuppositions

*I want to express ... Mohammad (Peace be upon him).* (paragraph 1, Appendix C)
The presuppositions used in the speech of president Zardari reflect his position in the global political order. The first assumption present in the presupposition above, suggests the responsible body is not mentioned who committed the condemnable act of incitement against the group Zardari belongs to. We are aware that Zardari knows about the person who made the movie *Innocence of Muslims* and posted the video on YouTube, but he intentionally avoids the information about him because he is from America; the dominant group.

The presupposition is communicated in the phrase “the act of incitement of hate against Muslims” the phrase has a feeling of the distance of the speaker from his discourse that is exposed in the use of the word “incitement”. He could have used a word or phrase which could express his feelings in a direct manner, but he avoids it of purpose. On the other side the intertextual nature of the presupposition (that attaches the statement with the discourse generated post uploading of the video including making and posting the video) or the history of the text/statement demands direct condemnation from Zardari because the group he belongs to is emotionally hurt by the video and while being in the position of leader and representative of the group and its ideologies, he is expected to record strong protest against the video and later events.

However, by starting his speech with the same issue he made his group feel that he has fulfilled his duty as a representative of the group, but the critical analysis of his statement proves otherwise. He never mentions the video in his speech, he never directly discusses the situation created by it; rather he takes it for granted and talks about it by hiding it in the cover of presupposition. He tries to distance himself from the act of condemnation of the video and event related to it by beginning his statement with “I want to” that works as a hedge and shows his attempt to detach himself from people of Pakistan and the Muslim world, the group that actually is in favour of disproving and taking action against this act. By detaching himself from the group he is a member of, he attempts to attach himself to the group opposite to his own. In the present context, that group is America and the West. Zardari in the next half of the statement directs himself to the Muslims and the Prophet (SAWW) to put some weight in his condemnation but the initial distance and ambiguity overcomes the statement and he loses his identity as a member of the group who condemns the “incitement of hate
against the Muslims”. This shows resistance from the subordinate for the dominance and suppression in the context of the issue of blasphemy (see Fairclough, 1992a, ch.2).

4.3.1.3 Negations

Although we can never ... misusing freedom of expression. (paragraph 1, Appendix C)

Zardari assumes that the present political leaders have knowledge about the role of the international community on the problem of blasphemy and criticizes it. He rejects the idea of freedom of expression suggested by Obama and the West (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.115). He holds a strong position in this context to highlight the negative image/action of the “other” group that is the main strategy to exert power through language but his attempt to criticize the “other” group fails to establish his dominant identity and his discourse shows that he is unable to exercise power. This is revealed from the initial part of the statement where he is indicating towards the actions that are related to his group and are considered negative. His exposition of the self-weaknesses reveals that he wants to be a part of the dominant group to avoid suppression.

He starts with “although” which is creating ambiguity because the meanings of the clause following although have become unclear because the subject position in the next clause is changed. It seems as if he left something unsaid and whatever he was going to say was about the actions of his own group. If “although” is taken away from the clause, meanings are crystal clear that Zardari is against the violence that took place in reaction to the video or he could justify it as an action associated with his own group but he avoids both the opts and chooses the third one that is to avoid association with either of the groups in the binary of power relation. He opted for this because he is not in a position to accept it because he belongs to the subordinate group and he is unable to reject it too because he cannot exclude himself from the group he belongs to. The middle way he opts for indicates the pressure he is facing in the context he is present to speak on this matter, the pressure of the political power America and the West.

I am sure the international community ... all in Pakistan. (paragraph 16, Appendix C)

The praise of the “other” group that is dominant and attempt to identify self with the dominant group are the strategies to react to the suppression. However, the word
“sure” indicates towards the ambiguity and exposes the distance Zardari intentionally maintains through his discourse. The confidence of the international community is another attempt to connect himself with the international community as a friend and supporter. Zardari assumes that Pakistan is special to the international community therefore, the international community will never think negative for Pakistan. Both the sentences are in favour of the dominant group and an attempt is made by Zardari to be a part of that group.

There is no “us” and “them” distinction here rather solidarity is expressed with the other group. The style of praise is going a little far and touches the boundaries of flattery which is exposed in “least of all”. Zardari is aspiring to make the point that Pakistan is the most important country for the international community. This also suggests a reminder that he wants to give to the international community that Pakistan always helped them in any type of situation, even at the stake of its own solidarity and integrity. The message is powerful but the tone of flattery reveals his identity as a member of a group who can do anything for his master and at any cost because he is impressed by the power and reach of his master. In other words, he shows his dependence and thirst for a favour and good opinion of the international community because he is not self-sufficient and strong enough to deal with even his domestic matters without the help of the other group (see Gramsci, 1971).

4.3.1.1.4 Metadiscourse

Although we can never condone ... freedom of expression. (paragraph 1, Appendix C)

Zardari distances himself from the statement “we never condone violence” by using “although”. The content he is distancing from, makes his identity doubtful and his position crucial. He is talking about the violence in the Muslim world in the reaction to the blasphemous video and as a member of the protesting group he could have taken a clear stance on this matter; instead he made it ambiguous. Furthermore “can” also exposes ambiguity. His people were most actively involved in the violent protests against the video which makes him shaky while protesting against it. Additionally, his group believes the protest against the video is right and their religious duty. In this context, Zardari is unable to reject or disapprove the violence but he is compelled to do
it due to his position and the context of his speech. He solves this problem by saying and taking a distance from what he said. His indirect approach and keeping a distance from his own discourse to discuss the negative actions of the dominant group (the international… expression.) strengthen the position of the international community as a dominant group in the world political structure (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.122-123).

In Pakistan, the lesson we … and indeed the world. (paragraph 20, Appendix C)

Metadiscourse lies in the explanation of Zardari of the future and the distance he keeps from the words he is uttering. The statement is generalized because it does not have an attachment with the issues discussed in the speech. He tries to depict the picture of a bright future for the whole world along with Pakistan and to make the point that the cooperation among the nations of the world should be there for such future. He tries to equalize Pakistan with the other nations in general and with international community specifically.

He intermediates the regional cooperation with reference to the cooperation among the whole world. He attempts to establish his position being a leader of Pakistan as a cooperative and positive person who aspires for the “brighter”, “prosperous” and “secure” future for the people of the world. The phrase “not only” exposes the reality that Pakistan is in need of the “elements” of the future and establishes that Pakistan is not prosperous and secure at the moment. This holds that the discourse of Zardari highlights negative qualities of his own group which also gives birth to the assumption that international community and the countries that share the same region as Pakistan should know the problems of Pakistan and help Pakistanis in solving them. The assumption exposes the established dominance of the international community on Pakistan (see Fairclough, 1989, 1992a).

I want to express the… Mohammed (Peace Be Upon Him). (paragraph 1, Appendix C)

The statement reveals that the dominant group has oppressed the religious freedom of the subordinate group. Zardari, being a member of the subordinate group reveals the suppression through his discourse. The expression “I want to express” has helped him to maintain a distance from the discourse that helps him to establish as a friend of the dominant group. He avoids being direct in referring to the acts he mentions
which also expresses his attempts to avoid the exposure of the negative actions of the dominant group (see van Dijk, 2006). He generalizes his statement by using “our” to save the international community from the blame of hurting the Muslims. He condemns without specifying the agency whose actions are condemnable and also keeps himself away from the direct involvement in the act of condemnation which is revealed by the phrase “I want to express.” He hides his intention behind “want to” that is whether he is actually condemning the release of the video or otherwise. This also shows the pressure of the international community and his own group. The dominance of the international community prevents him to directly criticize the video and his identity as a leader of a Muslim country stops him to avoid mentioning this issue (see van Dijk, 1995a, 2001a, 2008). So, to save himself he utilizes the strategy of metadiscourse.

*Being a democratic country... should be accommodated peacefully.* (paragraph 9, Appendix C)

The statement is utilized as a context to discuss the Palestinian issue. The explanation before the statement “being a democratic country” reveals the subordinate position of Zardari in the power structure. His attempt to keep a distance from the discourse by using “we believe” shows avoidance of affiliation with the group he is supporting by using “any people” instead of people of a specific area to generalize it. The attempt of generalization indicates the suppressed identity of president Zardari and the group he belongs to and the use of “should” and “believe” further prove this. He has enclosed his statement in the boundaries of democracy that establish him as a member of the subordinated group (see Fairclough, 1989, 1992a). In addition, the problem of Palestine is the problem of his group (The Muslim World) but the domination of the other group does not allow him to discuss it directly and openly that is the reason he opts for metadiscourse.

*We believe in fact, that the ... all nations to work together.* (paragraph 16, Appendix C)

The International community is the dominant group and Zardari belongs to the subordinate group. However, he reveals his interests in being a part of the international community and confirms his assistance to the international community in the action it takes and the ideologies it holds. This sort of affiliation establishes the dominance of
the international community and also his consent to the dominance (see Fairclough, 1992a p. 86-91). However, he is aspiring for this affiliation, but the power of the other group makes him unsure. The expression “we believe” exposes his attempt to keep a distance and detach himself from the discourse. The next sentence further exposes his subordinate identity where he explains and clarifies the belief he has about the international community (that it is a partner). He is not in a position to affiliate himself with the other group because it is dominant and is out of his reach that is the reason he further explains that he shares the common interest. In other words, the interests of the international community are his interest, but we know from the context of the statement that his interests are not interests of the international community (see the section of Negation for further explanation). He is totally exposed here as a member of the oppressed group and due to this his failed attempt to be one with the dominant group is also revealed.

*I remember the red carpet ... support those dictatorships.* (paragraph 14, Appendix C)

Zardari here keeps himself aside from the other groups of Pakistan and tries to identify himself as separate from them to gain the favour of the international community. He tries to make the international community feel that the other groups from Pakistan supported by it were not worth supporting because they have not fulfilled the promises made to the international community. Here Zardari comes out from the binary of the international politics to go to the national political setting of Pakistan to establish his dominant position there that can help him to win the favour of the international community (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.91-96).

He contests with the army-based politics in the country (Martial Laws) which was supported by the international community, but they did not manage to help the international community to achieve its goals for Pakistan. The attack on the army-based politics here is an attempt to establish his politics as superior and his promises to the international community as true. This reveals Zardari’s attempt to establish himself as a friend of the international community who should be trusted fully and rewarded on this base. Zardari is referring to the intervention of the West in the internal matters of Pakistan specially the political matters. The phrase “billions provided” exposes the interest of Zardari in getting material support from the international community and
offers himself in the place of the army based government. Throughout the statement, the blame of the wrong action is directed to the dictators rather than the international community of damaging political structure of Pakistan. Zardari saves the international community behind the destructive picture of the dictators who make wrong promises and diverts later while the international community is depicted as a victim of their lies and dishonesty. This is how he tries to prove himself as the true friend and ally of the international community in contrast with the other people/groups of Pakistan.

4.3.1.5 Irony

Zardari in his speech contradicts his own comments which leads to situational irony. In the start of paragraph 3, Appendix C, he associates the qualities of bravery and courage with the people of Pakistan but later in his speech these qualities are challenged by his own discourse like in paragraph 13, the way he portrays people of Pakistan, they neither prove to be brave nor courageous. There he requests the international community to avoid insulting and demonizing them. They are insulted and demonized by the international community because they are not brave. His people also rely on the aid from the West (paragraph 21, Appendix C) and they are killed and destroyed in the war that is posed by the international community to fight against terrorism (paragraph 15, Appendix).

The irony proves that the assumptions and aspirations of Zardari about the people of his country “brave and courageous” (paragraph 3, Appendix A) are false as exposed by himself in front of the audience. In this presupposition, he unveils his intention to construct a positive self-image and affiliates himself with the powerful group e.g. “brave” and “courageous” show power and self-reliance which are the qualities of the dominant group rather than the oppressed. In contrast to them “say”, “insult” and “demonize” are also attributed to the Pakistani people which cause a clash in the comments of Zardari in a single speech. Zardari is unable to be consistent in his comments as they are highly influenced by the context and audience of his discourse as well as the co-text in which he utters these statements.

Another instance of situational irony is his comments about UN. In paragraph 5 and 6 he depicts a positive image of the organization and he proudly details the
contributions of his country as a member of the UN. Contrary to that in paragraph 7 he expresses his reservations about the UN system and suggests reforms for it and wants it to be “more democratic” and “more accountable”. The irony lies in the contradiction of his statements about the UN. He expresses that being a part of UN system and performing duties is a pride for his people. Additionally, his army is working for the UN projects and campaigns all around the world but then he says he finds UN system not democratic and accountable. The question is if that is so then why he is a part of it and participating in its projects? The irony exposes his subordinate position because he does not have the power to reject an undemocratic and unaccountable organization as he feels it is because the organization belongs to the group that dominates his group and he is in hegemonic relation with it. The irony here also reveals the consent of the subordinate group to follow it even after knowing its weaknesses that exposes the hegemonic power of the dominant group.

*Pakistan does not blame others for the challenges it faces.* (paragraph 20, Appendix C)

The irony in the statement lies in the fact that the challenges faced by Pakistan are rooted in the interests of the international community. The blame automatically goes to America for the attacks in Pakistan against the terrorists but common masses are getting targeted in these attacks. The irony here shows the subordinate position of the President because he is using indirect language to discuss the drastic issue. He does get ironic himself, unlike Obama whose irony is situational. The difference shows the positions of both the leaders in the structure of the political power where they are connected to each other in binary relations that are dominant and subordinate. Additionally, Pakistan is not in a position to blame that’s why it does not blame and the reason again is its position in the binary or political power relations. He never names international community instead he uses “others” which is an indirect expression and is evident of the weak and suppressed identity of the text producer in the present context, President Zardari (see van Dijk, 2008).

*We believe we should look for win-win solutions.* (paragraph 20, Appendix C)

The irony lies in the history (intertextuality) of the statement and the position of the producer. Zardari many times in his speech associates himself with the international
community and his use of plural subject pronouns (we and us) explicitly shows it. In this statement, he takes international community as a partner instead of relating himself directly with them. He demands the international community to consider his group as partner and take care of benefits of his group too. In this situation he loses his identity as a subordinate and no other position is suitable for him to relate himself with the international community. This situation makes the statement ironic. The statement attacks the international community for dominating the other world especially the Muslim countries and in the context of terrorism.

The international community is interested in their win; instead they should take into consideration the overall win of the humanity against the threats faced by it. The statement also indicates towards the indulgence of the international community in following their own interest and crushing the other group for doing so. The dominance of the other group (international community) is accepted and complained indirectly; without any challenge a suggestion is given for consideration. The statement does not emphasize the negative image or actions of the international community rather accepts the dominance. The acceptance of the dominance helps the international community to sustain and maintain the power relations (Fairclough, 1992a p.91).

4.3.1.2 Interdiscursivity

Zardari starts with mixing religious and political discourses which is exposed in his choice of words “faith”, “Muslims”, “Prophet” for religion particularly Islam and “peace”, “security”, “International community”, “freedom of expression”, for global politics. Actually, both are integrated here and merged by him. The attribution like “incitement of hate, condone and violence is associated by him with the religious discourse. All of them are negative but only one is attributed to the other group. He is protesting against the publication of the video that hurt every Muslim but, in this attempt, only “incitement of hate” (rather an indirect expression) is from the other group while more forceful words like “violence, condone and condemnation are attributed to his own group. The most initial part of Zardari’s speech is “Bismilla hirrahmaan irrahim – Assalam-o- Alaikum — Peace be upon you”. This is an Islamic style of starting something. The addition of this identifies president Zardari as a representative of the Muslim community. He further shifts from the discourse of global politics and
cooperation by adding metaphors “bridge and “Widening rift” and leaves both the political and the religious discourse (paragraph 1, Appendix C).

He himself separates this initial paragraph from his speech by saying “before I take up my speech”. It means he has not entered yet in the genre of political speech rather it is a pre-speech declaration that is mixed with the genre of political speech. This paragraph contains important information because here he complains against the issue of blasphemy to the international community and protests against the uploading of the video. This part is very important for his ideological and identical position in the world politics, but he separates it from the main speech and declares it a separate and detached thing. This attempt of exclusion mitigates the effect of the protest he has just made. His style is direct in the beginning which shifted to indirect and “I” is replaced by “we” while addressing the international community. In the final sentence “we” is taken up by “Pakistan” which is going towards neutral tone. The interdiscursivity in the paragraph is exposing the power relations between Pakistan and the international community where Pakistan is at dominated position.

In paragraph 2 he entirely shifted the discourse from where he left in paragraph. This looks like the actual beginning of his speech. He congratulates the UN staff and appreciates their contributions. The rhetorical style is intimate and very pleasant, the tenor is still formal but more pleasant that proves the mixing of style too. Zardari disconnects the previous part of his speech in a rather abrupt way to enter a new genre, discourse and style. The sudden shift from a very important topic to a common or totally different topic suggests his avoidance from the discussion in the previous paragraph that was going against the dominant group. This shift also exposes his ideologies about the feelings of his group and the other group (paragraph 2, Appendix C).

It looks that this is the actual start of his speech and before that it was a preamble. Zardari has problems with cohesion as he jumps from one topic to the other (paragraph 3, Appendix C). Therefore, he is often indulged in the mixing of discourses, genres and styles. The cheerful tenor of the first sentence changes into grave tenor of the second sentence and forceful in the next part of the paragraph. The rhetorical mode also changes in second sentence to expository and argumentative. He brings in different discourses together from discourse of economics and environment to the discourse of
law and military. The intertexts of the mixed discourses are joined together to establish an ideological stance that could help him to take a strong position in the power structure (see Fairclough, 1992a). He intensifies his discourse with the help of modal verb “must” but the discourse he is involved in is focused on the problems of the world (including his country) and he, at his present position and identity, seems to be commenting on them for the sake of commenting. He does not have power or authority to solve these problems. His intensified discourse and mixing of styles are not effective. Therefore, he fails to influence the ideologies of the audience and winning their opinion to establish himself as a strong political actor or one from the dominating class (see van Dijk, 1989, 1995, 200a).

This paragraph also has a sudden and unexpected start. Zardari mixes private and public discourse here and he shifts from pluralization of personal pronouns “we” and “us” of the previous paragraph into singular form “I”, “my” and “me”. While mixing the private discourse with public/ global discourse he endeavours to be considered one with the global power (paragraph 4, Appendix C). He is in a struggle with constructing new power relations by restructuring his present identity. His discourse is ideological and through that he tries to influence the ideologies and assumptions of the political world that world keeps about him. He is involved in the production of discourse as a political actor in the global political order and not a member of certain political party or nation. This is also explicit in the single personal pronouns by Zardari that he endeavoured to detach himself from his group and he is taking himself and his family (children) as a group that has similar goals, aspirations and problems to be solved. This paragraph also reveals hybridization of genres by the president by bringing in private discourse. He mixes genre of family discussion and personal account in the genre of political speech. The style mode is oscillating between personal and intimate. These strategies are used as the best possible way to achieve his goals in global political power (see Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b).

He takes a shift from personal to global discourse. In these paragraphs, he concentrates on the discourse of war and peace as a part of the global political discourse. The phrase “wear blue helmets” belongs to a specific activity type (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.112) in the genre of military discourse. He starts with descriptive style but by the end of paragraph 6 he again gets personal by using words “brothers and sisters”.
His style, discourse and genre choices unveil his ideologies. He talks about international responsibilities, call for duty and contributions of Pakistani troops in peacekeeping campaigns by the United Nations. These things are mentioned to construct and maintain the power position. He mixes genres and styles to associate himself with the dominant group. However, the highly intimate rhetoric mode of style establishes the strong position of the international community. He fails to shift his identity by shifting from one to the other discourse, genre and style. Words like “proud”, “proudly” and “service”, “consistency” have ideological importance and are used in the context of serving the dominant group (the west). The height of intimacy with the other group is shown to construct a positive identity rather powerful one by preferring “brothers and sisters” over the people of the world (paragraph 5.6, Appendix C).

Within the broad umbrella of the political order of discourse, parliamentary discourse is a point of focus here (paragraph 7, Appendix C). It has many genres but only voting and selection are evident here. Pakistan’s “commitment to world peace” is driven by the mixing of the genre and brings in the history from the war on terror. Pakistan itself is suffering badly due to war on terror and it is more in the interest of America than Pakistan. Zardari’s commitment to the world peace is actually a commitment of fulfilling America’s interests at the stake of lives of Pakistani citizen and its instability. The tenor and mode are rather stable in this paragraph. His rhetoric style is descriptive but gets explanatory near the end of the paragraph. He can be identified as an ally of the powerful group but not at an equal level friend.

4.3.2 Intertextuality in the Speech of President Morsi

Context

Mohamed Morsi the president of Egypt represents Muslims; in the world politics a subordinate group. He became the president after the 2011 revolution that brought the end of thirty year-long rule of Hosni Mubarak. His country receives aid from the US to support Israel and the US. His government is totally supported by the US which is reflected in the speech of Obama (see Appendix A). His position as a US supported newly elected leader of an Arab Muslim country is crucial element to
influence his discourse in the context to international politics. Morsi in the present context is from the group that is supporter of the religious freedom.

4.3.2.1 Manifest intertextuality

Morsi used all the five elements of manifest intertextuality in his speech. i.e. discourse representations, presuppositions, negation, irony and metadiscourse.

4.3.2.1.1 Discourse representations

Morsi used free indirect speech only in the form of discourse representations.

4.3.2.1.1a Free indirect discourse

*This runs against the most basic principles of the organization of where we meet today* (paragraph 24, Appendix D)

Mohamed Morsi mixes the voice of the Muslims with the voice of the United Nations. Context of the statement is the issue of blasphemy and defending the Muslim stance of the issue. The mixing of voice here reveals the struggle of Morsi to recognize the Muslims as stake holders in the United Nations. He attempts to establish this issue as an issue instead of an insane reaction of some protesters (as seen by the West i.e. Obama and Ban Ki Moon). He strives to identify Muslims as part of the international community along with their religious ideologies. It is important to note that he justifies the protests against the video and finds them an attempt of the Muslims to protect their religious rights. The voices mixed in this instance are from almost opposite directions. However, he strives to bring them together, merge them and establish the Muslims’ voice (on the issue of blasphemy) as one with the voice of the United Nations and that is his own voice. He belongs to the subordinate group, but he avoids protecting the dominant ideologies rather he establishes his own ideologies as true ideologies. The instance of free indirect discourse here exposes resistance from the political leader (Foucault, 1976; Fairclough, 1992a, p. 91).
In this statement Morsi develops the same argument that is the divide between the freedom of expression and the issue of blasphemy with in a context he specifies and un-specifies at the same time. In this instance he mixes the voice of the people of Muslim countries with his own voice. He affirms that the people of the Muslim countries who obtained freedom will speak if something happens with them that violates their rights. The word “tolerate” indicates towards the aggressive attentions of the people while fighting for their rights. He warns and then specifies the direction of the warning that is towards the internal and international political forces of those countries. The expression “outside forces” implicitly indicates towards the Western forces. The influence of the US and the West in the area with reference to peace and stability of the countries is obvious. However, the reference here to the West by Morsi is indirect (van Dijk 1995).

He nominates inner forces as “their own leaders” but avoids direct reference to the outside forces. This unveils his subordinate position in the binary of power relations. He tries to assert that the people of Middle East and other areas (Muslims) should be given right to live with freedom within their countries by their political leaders. This also implies that the governments in these countries are not in favour of the freedom of the people. He mentions the leaders of these countries and outside forces together which reveals that there is similarity in the intentions and ideologies of outside forces and the leaders. The free indirect discourse establishes here that Morsi is in favour of the freedom of the people of the Muslim countries. His voice is one with the voice of the Muslims. Furthermore, this voice is in contrast with the voice of the leaders of these countries and that of the West. The statement also exposes the influence of the “outside forces” on the decisions and policies of “leaders” which makes people suffer in all the aspects. Hence, he intensifies the negative face of the Muslims leaders in internal political contexts and their supporters/influences in international political context. This is also linked with negative depiction of the other/dominant group to establish positive self-image (see van Dijk 2006 for details)
4.3.2.1.2 Presupposition

The General Assembly as well as the Security Council ... clearly affect international peace and security. (paragraph 25, Appendix D)

Morsi presupposes that the solution of the issue of blasphemy and other related issues, which are the result of the clash of opinions or ideologies and which end up in violence and extremism, are the responsibility of the United Nations at both General Assembly level and Security Council level. Additionally, he assumes that the complications and after effects of the issue of blasphemy and freedom of expression are affecting the peace and security at international level. He here, attempts to contextualize the issue of blasphemy from limited context of the Muslim countries to the broader aspect that is international level. He tries to highlight that the release of the video and protests in response cannot be labelled as political strategies of the Muslim political leaders who back their people to rise against the West. Rather, it is a matter that should be accepted as international issue and measures should be taken to find out the reason as well as going for a fruitful solution which can make the situation better for both the sides (Foucault, 1984, Fairclough 1989, van Dijk, 2008, p.137). His nomination of the General Assembly and the Security Council as responsible bodies in this matter is another attempt to change the Western ideologies about the issue of blasphemy and freedom of expression. He struggles to bring this issue at international forum and gives it the status of the international issue. This struggle also exposes the resistance for the Western ideologies about that matter (see van Dijk, 2008, p.137).

The obscenities that I have referred ... and require a promise of firm stance. (paragraph 26, Appendix D)

Morsi again attempts to establish that the video was obscene and then associates it to the broader campaign against Islam. In this instance of discourse, he goes beyond the discussion of the release of the video that moved Muslims to protest for their religious rights. He strives to bring a vivid picture of the matter in front of the whole world that he thinks is true picture behind the issue. Towards the end of the statement he firmly rejects not only the video but any other type of obscenity against the Muslim religious ideologies. The presupposition terms into a firm commitment, however, the
proposition about the video “the obscenities” has its affect on the whole statement. While commenting on the effects of the blasphemous video at the international level, he mentions some other aspects which along with the release of video are responsible for creating the divide between the Muslims and West. He blames the people for running a campaign against the Muslims to hurt their religious ideologies. The blame is connected to the release of the video which was made by a Hollywood director (US National). In this context, the allegations of campaign against the Muslims religious ideologies is also pointed towards the US and the West. This is another instance of the discourse of resistance by the subordinate political actor in the context of international politics (see Fairclough, 2003, p.199-129).

4.3.2.1.3 Negation

_Egypt stresses that the international system will not be fixed as long as we have double standards._ (Paragraph 23, Appendix D)

The statement has both positive and negative presupposition. The presupposition “the international system” affirms the presence of a system that works in collaboration with all the nations of the world while its problems are mentioned to deny its efficiency. The negation here highlights the issues in the international systems which need to be fixed. Morsi not only points out the problem but also points out the reason behind it. He claims that the international system follows double standards. The discourse has force which exposes the struggle of the discourse user to, if not dominate, at least resist the dominant ideologies which are responsible for the suppression of the subordinate (Muslim) ideologies (see Fairclough 1989, Foucault, 1979). The international system represents the West and its shortcomings also refer to the West. In the binary of domination and subordination here Morsi is responsible for attempting to fracture and resist the power relations. The assumptions behind the negative presupposition are responsible to depict negative picture of the dominant group which is reflected in “double standards”. Morsi is unable to dominate the West/US/UN, but he is successful in resisting the dominant ideologies.
they respect our cultural specificities... politicize certain issues (paragraph 23, Appendix D)

The negative statement here is challenging the Western stance on the issue of blasphemy and freedom of expression. He rejects the possibility of the political nature of the protests and promotes the reality that the protests do not have political grounds. The protesters were reacting on the incitement of their sacred personality and ideologies. There is nothing political in this matter, rather it is totally about religious emotions. He also specifies the difference between the Muslim culture and the Western culture and along with the distinction of culture Muslims share distinctive religious beliefs as well. So, it is the right of the Muslims to be accepted by the Western World along with these distinctions. He firmly defends the Muslim ideologies in the background of the divide between the freedom of expression and blasphemy. Morsi not only explains the distinctive nature of Muslims as a group he also contests the Western ideologies about the Muslims. He states Western concerns about the issue as intervention in the internal matters of the Muslims. He establishes the stance that Muslims are distinctive, and their specific ideologies should be accepted as well as respected by the West (see Fairclough, 1992a).

4.3.2.1.4 Metadiscourse

This is unacceptable behavior by some – some individuals. And the insults heard on the Prophet of Islam Muhammad is rejected (paragraph 24, Appendix D)

Morsi here criticizes the making of the blasphemous video that was made by Sam Bacile, a Hollywood director who belongs to the United States. The second part of the statement rejects the insult of the Sacredness of Islam which was done in the video. In both the parts he used passive construction that shows the direct nature of the comments. Passivation helps Morsi to keep himself away from the discourse he is involved in. He seems to be a commentator on the situation that was created after the release of the video instead of the stake holder who has personal concerns about the situation. In the first statement “some” is repeated in and out of hyphen. The word “some” outside the hyphen is vague as it does not suggest the agency. It is used for the people who created the video.
Morsi avoids specifying even the nature of the agency i.e. group, organization, country or nation. Then he repeats this word again and paraphrases his own comment “some individuals” which reveals that the agency was some individuals. Hence, here also he specifies the human nature of the agency but never exposes the identity of them which reflects his reluctance to be a part of the discourse. He avoids nominating the agency, thus escaping from revealing his position in the binary of power. He continues the passive structure in the next part and this time he avoids nominating the receivers of the discourse created by the blasphemous video. He never mentions who “heard” the insults and who “rejected them. However, from the contest of the discourse it can be assumed that it is the subordinate group /the Muslims. In both the statements a distance can be seen by the discourse user from his own discourse to hide his ideologies as well as to avoid direct reference to the other group. In this instance of discourse metadiscourse exposes the subordinate position of the discourse user. It is reflected by the hyphenated comment, double use of “some” and the word “individuals” which hides the identity of other or dominant group.

On the other hand, he also hides the identity of the people who suffered after the release of the video. In that context he even avoided the expressions like “some” and instead he does with the passive verbs “heard” and rejected”. This can also imply that he is more concerned for hiding his own identity than the identity of the dominant group. Secondly, not specifying the subjects goes in favour of the dominant group (see Fairclough, 1989) because nobody knows who was hurt by the release of the video and why? The word “heard” also exposes the subordinate position of the subject because hearing insult is an action that exposes their weakness. The next word “rejected” is a forceful word but in this context where it is used and the missing of the subject for this word made it less forceful.

Egypt respects freedom of expression – freedom of expression … tackle extremism and violence – not a freedom of expression that deepens ignorance and disregards others (paragraph 27, Appendix D)

The effect of metadiscourse here is created by the explanation, he adds to his comment. The things said in the hyphen show the intention of Morsi to keep a distance from the things he said out of hyphen. He starts with a very specific identity that is the
leader of a Muslim country, Egypt. He isolates himself from the Muslim group and individualizes his identity to comment on the freedom of expression (see Fairclough, 2003; van Dijk, 1989, 1995). After declaring the idea of freedom of expression in the same individualized identity, he maintains a distance from his own discourse by explaining further the idea of freedom of expression. In this explanation he paraphrases his version of freedom of expression. He gives a new meaning to the idea which excludes the religious incitement from the concept of freedom of expression. He makes clear for the world at the international forum of world politics that freedom of expression for him is different from the way it is taken in the West. He implicitly criticizes the Western idea of the expression.

Through paraphrasing, he challenges the Western views about the freedom of expression. His intentions behind the metadiscourse are to promote his ideologies, emphasize them, intensify them and establish them as true. Apart from establishing his ideologies he censures the Western ideologies. He blames the West for targeting Islam in the name of freedom of expression. Following his ideologies, he assumes to unveil the hidden ideologies of the West which are responsible for damaging the true picture of the Muslims and Islam.

The second instance of explanation is even harsher as it is a direct attack on the Western stance. He finds the West version of freedom of expression responsible for enhancing the ignorance. The ignorance from the context can be guessed as the ignorance about the Muslim ideologies. He blames the West to spread this ignorance among the people of the world specially the Western world. Along with the word “deepen” for “ignorance” he also brings “disregard for other” which indicates that in his view the West in not unbiased in his opinion about the matters at international level. They change their standards and approaches while commenting and making decision about the Muslims. They have a specific strategy for Muslims that is to negativize them at all levels. Whatever they do, ether politicize or propagate it as negative. All these things led to the phenomenon called Islamophobia which is mentioned directly by Morsi in the previous paragraph. He comments in a clear tone but instead of keeping the things he says, direct, he encloses them in hyphen to create an effect of distance form whatever he is saying about the West (see Fairclough, 1989). Within hyphen, he further explains a general expression he has declared earlier. He never nominated
anyone while censuring but from the context of the speech and his position in the binary of power relations and hegemony, it gets clear that he is addressing the other group that is the dominant group or the group that supports freedom of expression.

*As we speak today, the world is shaken by the depravity of fanatics who have committed acts of insult against the faith of over 1.5 billion Muslims* (paragraph 2, Appendix D).

The statement censors the making of the video and its effects on the world in the form of divide. Here, Karzai states that the reason of the violence and damage goes on to the “fanatics” who made the video and insulted the faith of Muslims. The statement is an example of resistance which can be felt in the expressions used to depict negative picture of the people who created and published the video and they belong to the West (see Foucault, 1982, p.777-795). The effect of the resistance for the dominant discourse is damaged by the metadiscursive reference. The effect of meta discourse is created by the initial part of the statement “as we speak today” which reveals his attempt to keep himself at a distance from his own discourse. He uses the inclusion to resist the dominant discourse which weakens his point as well as position.

Another sign of inclusion is the passive construction which implies that he is not fighting for the ideologies of his group rather he is more concerned about the peace and stability of the whole world, including the West and it may also include the people responsible for the act of incitement. The statement is about the negative actions of the dominant group, however, the binary of dominant and subordinate is not constructed. Muslims are individualized by Karzai and they were supported for being hurt by the video but at the same time responsible persons are also individualized as “fanatics” which isolates them and builds their separate ideology (see Fairclough, 1992b). In the process of constructing and reshaping identities he misses his own identity as Muslim which makes this statement too general and distant to resist or accept the dominant or the subordinate discourse.

**4.3.2.1.5 Irony**

*We expect from others as they expect from us* (paragraph 30, Appendix D).
Morsi gets ironic on the double standards of the other group. Context of the statement is the divide between the freedom of expression and the issue of blasphemy. The word “expect” shows his attempt to create a balance in the status of his group and the other group. In other words, he fractures the binary of the dominant and subordinate power relations and brings both the groups at equal level (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.91-92). Apparently, it is a simple statement but the co-text and context of it makes it ironic. Pronouns “we” and “they” expose the binary of us and them while the verb “expect” brings both the group at the same level. Furthermore “others” and “us” also help Morsi to fracture the binary of domination and subordination. Irony lies in the context where he comments on the freedom of expression. He criticizes the Western version of the idea and he makes it clear to the other group that they should treat them the way they are treated otherwise his group would also change its attitude towards them. Between the lines he censures the approach of the other group. The statement has an implicit message about the double standard policy of the West for the Muslims, especially in the context of the divide between them which was caused after the release of the blasphemous video by a Western individual. The statement reveals that Morsi is careful in criticizing the other group in a direct manner, so he avoids nominating the subjects of the statement as well as the object. Furthermore, to unspecify the subject and object he prefers plural pronouns.

4.3.2.2 Interdiscursivity

He starts his speech with an account of his own country while bringing in the internal political and mixing it with international political discourse (paragraph 1, Appendix D). Along with the internal and external political discourse, he mixes the religious discourse here to enhance the effect of the struggle of the Egyptian people and the fruit of that struggle. He attempts to glorify the efforts of the Egyptian people in establishing democracy in their country. It is a typical approach of the subordinate political discourse to highlight the positive image of the internal situation to raise the image in the eyes of the world, socially the dominant group (see van Dijk, 1995a). His style is formal and descriptive, rhetorical mode is prominent. However, he adds narrative mode to detail the actions of the Egyptian people and government. Political discourse is mixed with the discourse of internal peace and stability is another try to positivise and maximize the actions of his country. He chooses words from different
discourse to mix the discourses at broader level as well as genres in specific i.e. “truth”, “dignity”, “freedom”, “social justice”, “human rights” and “values”. These words are presented as main ingredients in the foundation of the new Egypt after Hosni Mubarak.

In paragraph 2 (Appendix D) he continues with the same stance adding and mixing further the discourses and genres. Here he contextualizes the internal political discourse as the discourse of revolution and change to enhance the importance of change he brings in metrological discourse in a metaphoric way. The focus on the change reveals that he wants to isolate his rule from the previous government systems prevalent in Egypt. This point can also work as a strong base for further discussion by Morsi. Once established as strong positive and fair government leaders, he would be able to comment on other issues, specifically issue of blasphemy in an effective way. Style followed in this paragraph is still formal, but the force is a bit less than the previous one. Rhetorical mode shifts from argumentative to assertive and also expository. He shifts from political to public discourse which helps him to make his argument forceful.

Morsi contributes to mix internal and international political discourse (paragraph 3, Appendix D) and also the religious discourse “God willing”. He also brings in the discourse of international relations and international peace and prosperity. Mixing of the discourses with the political discourse help him to establish himself and his country as an active member of the United Nations, having respect for UN agenda and an active part of the international community. This exposes his struggle to win the consent of the international community. After all these efforts of building a positive image in the context of international politics he discussed his stance on one of the most crucial issue of the Muslim world i.e. Palestine issue. The narrative rhetorical mode is adopted to stress that after passing of decades and death and damage of the people, especially Muslims, the issue is still to be resolved (paragraph 4, Appendix D). He continues commenting about the issue form different aspects (paragraph 4-7, Appendix D) mixing different genres, discourses and styles to establish his point. He brings snatches from law and justice “to restore their full rights”, “legitimate means” to mix in the political discourse to create an effect that in the issue of Palestine justice is not done by the international community.
Discourse of democracy is visible in the intertexts like “independent state”, “freedom”, western oppression is exposed through the words like “occupation of Arab lands, colonization, alteration, occupied”. Genres from different discourses are also mixed and style shift from modes, tenor and rhetorical mode is present in these paragraphs. He uses narrative to descriptive, argumentative to assertive and expository to establish his stance on the issue of Palestine. All this shows the resistance to the Western strategy as well as ideology on the issue of Palestine (see Foucault, 1982, 1976; Fairclough, 1989, 1992a; van Dijk, 1995b, 2001a).

He comments on other issues like Syria and Middle East. His focus is on the problems of the Muslim world which are created or caused by the Western intrusion, policies of interest in the Arab and non-Arab Muslim counties. In this discussion he brings in various interdiscursive elements to resist the dominant discourse about the Muslim world. After setting the strong background towards the end of his speech he discusses the situation created by the release of the video. On this issue as well, he resists the Western stance.

He starts his discussion on the situation by attacking the Western attitude and strategies for Islam (paragraph 23, Appendix D). He mixes international political discourse with the religious discourse which indicates that for him the clash between the issue of blasphemy and freedom of expression is politicized by the international community. He followed imperative, form and assertive style which creates a lot of force in his argument. The genre shift from speech to debate or controversy also adds to the force. He takes shifts from socio-cultural to political discourse and likewise. Socio-cultural discourse is used to mitigate the negativity about Islam among the international community.

Furthermore, the shift from cultural to religious makes Islamic religious discourse less threatening and more peace and harmony oriented. He depicts the discrimination of the international community for Muslims by snatching the discourse of violence and international cooperation. He strives to positivize the Muslims and Islam by exposing the other side of the picture which was not shown by the West to the international community. He stresses that the dominant group propagates and politicizes the Islamic values to intensity the negative image of Islam. His style is
assertive instead of descriptive which shows his control and resistance power on the issue of blasphemy. His tone gets hard while commenting on the Western actions and violence against the Muslims and Islam. In the binary, in the context of this study he belongs to the subordinate group. However, his discourse does not show the consent for the dominant specially in the background of the issue under discussion. He challenges, criticizes as well as exposes the negative image of the dominant group. Therefore, his discourse is an example of the discourse of resistance (see Fairclough, 1992b, 1992a, p 90,91,117).

The direct reference to the release of the video also shows resistance. He follows assertive rhetorical mode, following formal but aggressive and serious tone (paragraph 24). However, the mix of narrative and explanatory style can be seen i.e. hyphenated expression. He brings in the religious discourse and genre of the discourse of blasphemy into the forum of the United Nations. The mix of them helps him to establish this issue as an important international concern instead of just a controversy or an instance of violence. The individualization of the prophet of Islam and the term Islamophobia brings in the religious discourses and genre of religious extremism. He justifies the stance of the Muslim world in protecting the Islamic ideologies in the context of the divide between the freedom of expression and the issue of blasphemy. The emphasis on the Islamic ideologies is enhanced by the individualization by using name of the Muslim Prophet (SAWW) as well as identity “Prophet”. Islamophobia belongs to the religious discourse, specifically about Islam. It belongs to the radical image of Islam which is used throughout the world in negative sense. Morsi holds that the term Islamophobia is acquired and promoted by the West but unfortunately this concept is against the basic principles of the United Nations.

After establishing the history and nature of Islamophobia and the issue of blasphemy, he invites the international community to join his group (paragraph 25, Appendix D). This is an attempt to fracture the binary of power in the background of the divide between the West and the Muslim world. He mixes the discourses from religion, politics, international cooperation and peace and harmony. His style shifts from assertive /argumentative to intimate.
The mixing also exposes change of his stance on the issue under study, in this instance of discourse. He is no more resisting the dominant group rather he invites them to work together to stop the incitement against the Muslims and Islam. The struggle of Morsi to fracture the binary of dominant and subordinate exposes his powerless position in the context of international politics. Morsi again uses the strategy of nomination but from the other group this time. He nominates the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United States and brings them into the religious discourse and imposes responsibility of protecting Muslim ideologies on them. Nomination exposes an attempt he made again to fracture the power relations with the dominant group (see Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b).

His style in the next part takes a shift to assertive again (paragraph 26, Appendix D). He also takes a break from the genre of political speech to debate and political discourse is mixed again with religious discourse. All this helps him to resist the power of the dominant group. He demolished the ideologies of the dominant group about the Muslims and Islam. He intensifies the negative approach of the West towards Islam and Muslims. The strategy of inclusion is used to break the binary of power and establish his ideologies. His emphasis on the importance of the Muslim ideologies automatically de-emphasizes the Western ideologies. He strives to make the Muslim ideologies prominent and true in the context of the international politics (see van Dijk, 1993, 1995a, 1996).

He takes a shift from the Muslim stance to the Western stance and discusses the idea of freedom of expression (paragraph 27, Appendix D). He starts with individualized and formal style and instead of presenting, he mixes the genre of critical analysis here to make his argument more forceful and more convincing to the international community. By mixing genres, discourses and styles, he reinforces his version of the concept that is responsible for dealing with the extremist and violent ideas. This is an attempt to establish the fact that any other idea of freedom of expression is not true or correct. The argument implicitly rejects the Western idea of the same concept.

The next thing he does is giving contrast of his idea that what freedom of expression is not, and it is the concept that “deepens the ignorance” and “disregards
others”. The contrastive idea of the concept is led to the other group i.e. US/ the West/ UN. The negativity of the second concept reflect the perception of Morsi about the other group specially on the debate of the freedom of expression. He not only rejects this concept but rejects the Western ideologies on this issue. The rejection again exposes his resistance for the dominant group and his attempts to either come out from the binary of power relations himself or to consider his group and the other group as one (see Fairclough, 1992a, p. 91,92). After establishing his stance firmly, he ends the argument by criticizing the violent reaction against the video which was never done before in the speech. Morsi’s interdiscursive references most of the time show resistance than consent for the dominant discourse as well as ideologies.

4.3.3 Intertextual Analysis of the Speech of President Karzai

Context

Karzai is associated with the subordinate group in the context of the study. He belongs to a country where Western forces were present at the time of the study. The political context of Afghanistan was complicated. There were two groups at work; Afghan government and the groups fighting against the government. Government of Karzai was considered in favour of the Western policies while the resisting groups were against the West and the government. In this context Karzai holds an identity as an ally of the Western powers. However, he has another identity in the context of the divide between the freedom of expression and the issue of blasphemy that is a member of the group Muslims. His identity as Muslim makes him a member of the subordinate group and supporter of the issue of blasphemy. The two identities are somehow in clash with each other in the context

4.3.3.1 Manifest intertextuality

Hamid used all the five elements of manifest intertextuality in his speech. i.e discourse representations, presuppositions, negation, irony and metadiscourse.

4.3.3.1.1 Discourse representations

Hamid Karzai used free indirect discourse in the form of discourse representations.
4.3.3.1.1a Free indirect discourse.

*Every year our gathering in this prestigious hall .... more secure and prosperous world.*
(paragraph 1, Appendix E)

Hamid Karzai begins his speech with free indirect discourse (paragraph 1 Appendix E) where he mixes his voice with the voices of all the member countries of the United Nations. He uses free indirect discourse to express his ideologies about the performance of the United Nations. He implies that for the United Nations and the member countries all the nations have equal status and importance and the organization is expected to work above regional, ethnic and religious boundaries to serve humanity. Apparently, he states the major agenda of the United Nations but inwardly these are the expectation of him and his country from the United Nations Organization and all the member countries. These expectations are for “safer, more secure and prosperous world”. Many countries in the world have already achieved these goals but many of them are facing issues in these three areas and among them his country is suffering the most. Afghanistan is going through hard times in all three department since decades and people of Afghanistan expect from the United Nations to solve these issues and give the people of Afghanistan right to live safe, secure and prosperous life. He might have intentions to challenge the basic agenda of the United Nations for not fulfilling its promise in Afghanistan, but the pluralization and the indirect tone took away the force that can be a part and parcel of a challenge.

Thus, his discourse shows more consent and appreciation for the dominant group than any other feeling. In the context of the situation of Afghanistan at the time of the speech he is delivering, it is explicit that he belongs to the subordinate group. He as a subordinate who totally agrees with the agenda of the dominant and it is reflected in his discourse. Another aspect that shows the consent for the dominance of the West and the US is the mixing of his voice with the voices of all the member countries. This can also be seen as an instance of inclusion (Chilton 2004, Fairclough 1989). He includes himself in the group that is comprised of the political leaders of almost all the member nations of the United Nations i.e. use of “we” in this context.
The General Assembly is a unique opportunity to engage in sincere and result-oriented dialogue with a view to addressing the challenges that confront us all (paragraph 1, Appendix E).

In this instance of discourse Karzai individualizes as well as specifies the General Assembly and mixes his voice with the voice of the United Nations in general and General Assembly in specific. He speaks the ideology of the General Assembly mixed with his own voice. Apparently, this mix is the reinforcement of the purpose of the establishment of the General Assembly. The words “unique”, “sincere” and “result oriented” reflect the basic principles of the assembly. The word “unique” implies that importance of the organization as an exceptional forum for the nations of the world to discuss as well as solve their issues from various aspects. He establishes that it is the only forum which brings all the nations together. The function of the General Assembly, focused by him, is to create an opportunity for dialogue to the member nations for “addressing the challenges” faced by them. Explicitly he establishes and enforces the identity of the General Assembly, but an indirect reference can be felt that is an expectation as well as complaint from the United Nations of the Western world which were not able to solve the problems of Afghanistan. Karzai is unable to express his ideologies in explicit way due to suppression of his ideologies by the dominant group (Fairclough 1989, van Dijk 1995).

4.3.3.1.2 Presupposition

It is a matter of grave concern that our world remains strewn by daily occurrence of violence, hatred, and injustice. (paragraph 3, Appendix E)

Karzai brings in the issue of blasphemy in the initial part of his speech. He assumes that the violence is a hot issue throughout the world including hatred and injustice. The word “violence”, “hatred” and “injustice” are important as well as relevant to the context to his speech. The presupposition here implies that the issues of violence, hatred and injustice are common in the world and there are many factors which cause these issues. The implication generalizes these issues to un-intensify the issue of blasphemy (see van Dijk, 2001b). It can be felt in the use of “daily” which is used to hold that the situation created is one of the things that happen in the world on
daily bases and the reaction and the protest of the Muslims on the release of the video are just one instance of the many which happen commonly.

The reasons behind the violence can be different but the outcome is the same. The nature of the reaction is the same. The reasons for such issues and reactions for him are injustice and hatred. Both the reasons “hatred” and “injustice” reveal the binaries of power and powerless because for injustice and hatred two individuals and groups are involved and both hold different positions which are contrastive. One who does unjust has the power and the one who suffers that unjust is powerless. In case of hate both the parties can be at one level for hating each other but the powerful will express this hatred and will supress the powerless to show the hatred. Powerless might hate the powerful but it might not be possible for powerless to oppress the powerful. This also shows that the power is already acquired by the powerful in the context of hatred and injustice (see van Dijk, 1989, Wodak & Meyer, 2009, ch.3).

On the other hand, the presupposition also exposes Karzai’s acceptance that the situation created after the release of the video is an instance of violence, justice and hatred. This at same time shows reveals his position as a subordinate political actor and a supporter of the Western ideologies as well. The use of “our” indicated his attempt to stand out of the binary of power relations between the dominant and the subordinate, Muslims and the Western world and blasphemy and freedom of expression. His attempt to break the binary is a sign of his powerlessness. The facture of binary is his struggle to merge the boundaries of the subordinate and dominant accepting that just one group in present in the context of the world politics and that is the dominant group and his group if exists is just a supporter or an ally of the dominant group. The merging of the boundaries of power can be related to Foucault’s (1979) idea of relational power. According to Foucault (1979) power never remains with same person/group, it shifts from one to the other person/group.

*the menace of Islamophobia is a worrying phenomenon that threatens peace and coexistence among cultures and civilizations.* (paragraph 3, Appendix E)

The effect of presupposition depends on the concepts which are assumed to create it. Islamophobia is an emerging term in the context of international politics with
reference to the peace and stability of the globe. The terms imply the negative, radical and threatening image of Islam which has created distance between the Muslims and the other world. A forceful word “menace” is used to explain Islamophobia which establishes the drastic nature of the concept and discourse related to it. In the next part of the statement he explains it himself as “a worrying phenomenon”, “threatens peace and co-existence”. Islamophobia is related to the beliefs and practices of the religion, but it depicts a specific picture that is created and propagated by the Western world and is different from the concept prevalent among the Muslims throughout the world.

Karzai shows concern on the concept of Islam the way it is received by the Western World. He in this way challenges the Western ideologies about his group which is reflected in his concerns and consequences of promoting this concept. He strives to establish the fact that negative representation of Islam is a thread for the peace of the globe because it harms the unity and highlights the differences among different cultures and civilizations in a negative way. Apparently, he is concerned about the peace and stability of the world but implicitly he promotes his ideologies. The negative picture he draws of the promotion of the negative image of his group is actually an attempt to positivize the image of his group. Additionally, he finds that the promotion of Islamophobia is more crucial than political clashes and divisions because it involves the clashes of the culture and civilizations and the hatred will also be promoted for cultures and civilizations. In the global world of today these clashes are deadly because the world is a global village and people from different cultures and civilizations are living together as a community. Such clashes will affect almost all the nations of the world and will make this world a hell on earth. Through the intertexts and presuppositions, he struggles to de-intensify the negative image of his group but in all his attempt he never owns his ideologies as different rather he takes the whole globe as one group. His strategies expose his powerless position in the binary of power in the context of international politics (van Dijk, 2006, Fairclough & Wodak, 1997).

4.3.3.1.3 Negation

We cannot accept this, and we will be the opponents of those who do this. We will not allow anyone to do this by word or deed (paragraph 24, Appendix E)
He comments on the release of the video in a very direct manner but use of “we” makes it less effective. The negation here cancels the presupposition that the Muslims will favour the idea of the freedom of expression. The first negation establishes that the Muslims will resist the Western ideologies if they are in clash with the Muslim ideologies while second one negates the presupposition that the Muslims will compromise with anything from the West against their ideologies. The statement has force which is unusual for subordinate discourse. The expression “by words or by deeds” reject any type of violation against the Muslim sacred beliefs. He constructs strong Muslim identity through negation which implies that the Muslims have the capacity to resist or suppress anything that is responsible to hurt their religious emotions. He represents himself as a member of the group i.e. the Muslim world instead of an individual Muslim or just a leader of a Muslim country. Hence, he is not only striving to establish his ideological stance but also attempts to structure the stance of his group. Another aspect of the struggle of Morsi is that he constructs his identity, intentionally or unintentionally, as a dominant member within his own group. His discourse reflects the dominance through negation of the presuppositions present in the statement (see Van Dijk, 2001a).

*We strongly condemn these offensive acts, ... terrible losses of innocent lives* (paragraph 2, Appendix E)

The negation is present in all the three sentences. The first sentence does not have a negative marker but the presupposition present in it is negated by Karzai. The negative effect is created with the use of the word” condemn” which can also be considered semantic negation. The negative presupposition here disproves all the actions of blasphemy against the beliefs and faith of Islam. The absence of negative marker here shows that the disapproval is indirect and more general. One thing that specifies it is the nomination of the events and actions against Islam i.e. film and cartoon. The nomination intensifies the negative actions of the other group to suppress the religious ideologies of the Muslims (see Fairclough, 1989, van Dijk, 1977, 2001a). However, he never nominates the subject and uses “we” which is more inclusive, general and ambiguous as well because nobody can guess who “we” are. Is this Afghanistan? Or Afghanistan and his allies? but Afghanistan is an ally of the US and the West and they are the other group in this context. It cannot be referred to Karzai.
alone. This complexity exposes his difficulty in nominating the subject or relating himself with the subject which could have made him member of the suppressive and powerless group.

The next sentence has a negative marker and it is used to comment on the protests made as a reaction of the release of the video. Karzai negates the presupposition that the protests were justified. He believes that initiation of the protests which turned into violence, took lives. The negation is connected with the previous one. In the previous sentence he censures the idea of freedom of expression, which goes with the ideologies of the Muslim world that protested against the video. While criticizing the Western idea of the freedom of expression his approach was indirect and negation was also hidden. In contrast to that he censures the protests against the video in a direct manner using intertexts with negative sense i.e. “incite violence and chaos” and “terrible losses of innocent lives”. The negativity of these terms is associated with the Muslims who protested against the video.

The ideologies exposed in the negation reveal that Karzai is emphasizing the negative image of his own group by intensifying the negative actions of them (see van Dijk, 2001a). He contextualized the discourse about the protests Muslims made in contrast to the discourse about the freedom of expression. He is dealing with both the aspects of the divide established that he strives to win the consent of the dominant group and yearns to merge his ideologies with the ideologies of the dominant group to construct pro-west image in the context of the issue under discussion (see van Dijk, 1977, 1996).

We cannot negate the fact that this organization is in dire need of a comprehensive reform, enabling it to better reflect the new challenges and realities of our time (paragraph 18, Appendix E).

This statement reflects the negation of the presupposition that the United Nations is working according to the expectations of the people because it is unable to meet the challenges of the modern world. The negation is in fact negating “cannot” another negation “negate”. Karzai’s statement depicts the weaknesses of the United Nations which is done by negating the positive picture of the organization. However,
the expression “cannot negate” is an indirect way to comment on the weak side of the organization. The indirect manner implies the defensive nature of the speaker. The defensive tone exposes that the binary of power is present between Karzai and the organization where the United Nations stands as dominant and Karzai as a member of subordinate group.

He claims that the United Nation should revise its policies and in the context under discussion he is not satisfied with the way UN and the West handled the problems of Muslims. His struggle to establish the ideologies of his group even in a feeble and indirect way establishes his identity as a member of the subordinate group i.e. Muslims. However, his struggle to establish his ideologies as a subordinate is reflected in the statement. He is not in a position of totally rejecting the Western ideologies at the international political context which is due to his identity as an ally of the West. The criticism and rejection of the UN, US or the West is rejection of his identity as their supporter and an ally which is not possible to reject. On the other hand, the other identity of him as that is as head of a Muslim state, has some demands and expectations which are tried to be fulfilled in this statement. The negation discloses his problems of having multiple identities in the context of the international politics. When these identities emerge ideologies, which are in clash which each they create a very complex situation for the discourse user (see van Dijk, 1996, 2001a, 2001c).

4.3.3.4 Metadiscourse

*We must work to defeat the protagonists ... the voices of tolerance and understanding.*
(paragraph 3, Appendix E)

Karzai in this statement urges that there is a need to defeat the people who create conflict. The word “civilization” with conflict specify the conflict between different civilizations that can be taken as religion is this context. This specification implies that some people are trying to create conflict between Islam and the rest of the world (the west). The use of the strategy of inclusion to (use of we) is used to blur the boundaries of the power binaries. Modal verb “must” exposes his attempt to stay at distance from his discourse, the point where metadiscourse works. In this instance metadiscourse exposes a subordinate political actor who in an international context wants to express
his ideologies and resist the opposite ideologies or the ones which threaten the identity of his group (Fairclough, 1989, ch.2).

On the other hand, he is compelled to keep a positive image in front of the international community specifically the West. He promotes the idea that the ideologies of the different group should be respected as well as protected internationally. He uses the word “tolerance” in this context which is a key word for those who suppress the idea of religious ideologies and promote the concept of freedom of expression. However, the way he used it, voices the mind of the Muslims who were victims of religious importance by the people who released the video. Similarly, the word “understanding” also depict that religious values of Islam are misunderstood and misinterpreted by the West. There is a need to overcome this problem.

4.3.3.1.5 Irony

*I call upon leaders in the West, … in all its many forms and manifestations.* (paragraph 2, Appendix E)

The statement is an invitation by Karzai to the Western leaders to confront the concept and phenomenon of Islamophobia. This statement is responsible for creating situational irony. The irony lies in the fact that the concept of Islamophobia is initiated by the West specially the Western media and politicians after some events which occurred internationally. The statement implies Karzai’s attempt to ignore the history behind Islamophobia. The history that exposes the negative image of the West; both media and politics. His invitation lacks force due to his position in the binary of power relations in the context of international politics. The irony also implies that the subordinate political actor de-intensifies the negative actions of the other group i.e. the spread of Islamophobia. The expectations expressed by Karzai in the statement highlights the positive representation of the West in the context of the divide between the Muslims and the West. Furthermore, Karzai’s discourse also suggests the powerless nature of his group which has been suppressed through the phenomenon of Islamophobia and now instead of resisting that discourse they expect form the same group to undo it. Hence, irony in this instance of discourse exposes the weak position of Karzai who is highly influenced by the dominant group (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.123).
4.3.3.2 Interdiscursivity

Karzai opens his speech with typical address to the audience by nominating them separately (paragraph 1, Appendix E). Initially his style is formal and tone highly polite. The rhetorical mode is descriptive which is utilised to describe the goals and objectives of the United Nations and its institutions like General Assembly and the Security Council. The mode and tenor are utilized to depict the positive picture of the organization. The style exposes his discourse too polite to fit in the context he is speaking that implies that the genre of the international political speech takes a shift and it turns to be more like a promotional speech. The context of the speech puts it in the political discourse which is mixed by Karzai in a way that promotes the actions, institutions and performance of the organization. Instead of utilizing the organization as a forum to discuss matters related to the international politics, he gets involved in the discourse that focusses on the organization and nothing else.

He shifts from political context to the religious context to initiate the discourse about the issue of blasphemy (paragraph 2, Appendix E). The rhetoric mode shifts from descriptive to assertive. He mixes the style by bringing in the serious and firm but indirectly. He brings in discourses to enhance the effect of the situation created by the clash between the issue of blasphemy and freedom of expression. By the end of the paragraph assertive rhetorical mode shifts to argumentative as well as expository. The indirect style directs the shifts of style and genres to unspecified subject. This reveals his inability to nominate the other group to associate the negative image on the present context to that group. The aggressive, direct and assertive mode expose his ideologies which are in clash with the dominant and he strives to resist them. However, shift in the last sentence of the paragraph, reverted all the aggressive attitude from the other group to his own group. This act weakens his position as he intensifies the weak/powerless image of his group. The effect of resistance in the previous sentences disappears and he is exposed as an ally of the Western world. An ally who gives his consent to the dominant group and supports his actions and says even if they are supressing his own ideologies. Through indirect mode and formal style, he keeps himself away from the discourse that belongs to him, his ideology and is mark of his identity.
In the next paragraph he brings in snatches from the divide under discussion between the Muslim world and the Western world (paragraph 3, Appendix E). He continues the indirect style and shifts the rhetorical mode to explanatory and descriptive. The religious discourse is brought in to merge with the political discourse. Both the discourses are merged which recontextualized the discourse of blasphemy. The recontextualization here de-intensifies the emotional and ideologically crucial image of the issue of blasphemy. Furthermore, another discourse is mixed in the international political discourse that is islamophobia. The discourse related to this phenomenon exposes the negative ideologies of Islam which are already constructed by the West among their people and media (see van Dijk, 1996, 1997). The intertexts present in this instance of discourse “menace”, “threaten” and “peace” belong to the discourse of war. Their present in this context exposes the severity of the divide that is created between the Muslim world and the West when Western ideologies came in clash with the Muslim ideologies. Genre of political speech also takes a shift to political discussion and analysis. The indirect mode through this paragraph exposed his strategy of inclusion. The boundaries that define the two distinctions of the two groups are merged and the international politics is taken as one institution that belongs to all the nations. He shifts his identity as a member of the group, Muslim world to the identity of international politician and represents himself as member of the dominant group.

After establishing his identity, he gets suggestive and requests the international community (including him) to work together to finish the division and hatred. He fanaticises the future by bringing in positive intertext from different discourses. Apparently, he shows his concern to make the world happy and peaceful person but actually the negativity in his discourse directs towards the dominant group. He finds conflicts of civilizations responsible for the problems of the world. In the context of the present study, the people who made the video are responsible for the division and clash. Hence, he avoids nominating the responsible people and they belong to the dominant group. His attempts to merge the boundaries by fracturing the binary of power relations and strives to be one with the dominant group (see Fairclough, 1992a, p. 91). In this position, whatever is directed to the dominant group is directed to himself and his group too.
In the next paragraph (4, Appendix E), he takes a shift to the internal political discourse of Afghanistan. The moment the discourse shifts, the style also shifts. The indirect mode and inclusive way changes into direct mode i.e. “we”, “us” changed into “my”. The disruptive-cum-narrative style was used to establish the positivity in the internal political discourse of Afghanistan with relation to the past. However, in the context of the discourse of terror, his is exposed as dependent on the other nations to control the law and order situation in his country. He tries to construct the positive image of his country instead of the group he belongs to. The internal political discourse is dominating in this context, but other discourses are also mixed (paragraph 5, 6, Appendix E). While discussing terrorism, he stays restricted to the internal political discourse (paragraph 7, Appendix E). His hesitation in this regard also reveals that he is unable to resist the dominance of the other group. Karzai not only mixes the discourse of internal politics of his country, he also brings in other related discourses (paragraph 11, 12, 13, Appendix E) with the same effect. The style also shifts from descriptive to argumentative, assertive to narrative. The mode and tenor of styles is mixed by Karzai to elaborate the internal political matters of his country and the relationship of his country with other countries which is not relevant in the present context.

The international political discourse is brought in only when he discusses the matters of other countries. He shifts rhetorical modes, but formal tenor prevails throughout. He never shifts from that to conversational style and the address words are used regularly i.e. “Mr. President. in short, the mix of discourses, style and genres establish his subordinate position in the binary of power relations. In nutshell, the interdiscursive references present in speech reveal his struggle to win the consent of the dominant group at different levels i.e. from internal political and non-political matters to regional and international relations. The shifts and mix of style, genres and discourses are the evidences of his powerless position in the context of the international politics (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.123-124). While commenting on the global international issue, he was more inclined to support the Western policies (paragraph 16,17, Appendix E). When it came to the issues between the West and the Muslims world (his own group), he expresses his solidarity with them but the indirect style, discourses and genres which indicate towards the weaknesses of his group were used which implied that the apparent solidarity keeps a consent and affirmation for the Western policies.
4.3.4 Intertextual Analysis of the Speech of Present Yudhoyono

4.3.4.1 Manifest intertextuality

Yudhoyono used all the five elements of manifest intertextuality in his speech. i.e. discourse representations, presuppositions, negation, irony and metadiscourse.

4.3.4.1.1 Discourse representations

Yudhoyono used free indirect discourse in the form of discourse representations only.

4.3.4.1.1a Free indirect discourse

The price of inequality between nations and within nations ... national peace and security (paragraph 17, Appendix F)

Indonesian president Yudhoyono establishes a background in the context of the divide between the West and the Muslims to comment on the solutions of the problems between the two groups. He suppresses his voice and mixes it with other voices for this purpose. The voices are unspecified and general, but they are similar to the agenda of the United Nations about the peace process around the globe. The elements of free indirect speech are used to explain the importance of equality and justice at the international as well as national political context which can cause serious damage to the peace and stability of individual nations as well as the globe.

Apparently, it is an aspiration for the peace of the whole world which is the responsibility of all nations and their leaders but actually, it is an attempt to highlight and protect the Muslim ideologies, especially in the background of the problem under discussion. Islamophobia is damaging the image of Islam and it led to hatred between the Muslims and the West. Here, the president tries to clarify the reasons behind the birth of islamophobia and radical Islam. He states “inequality” is the major cause of “grievances” and lead to radicalism. It establishes that major factor behind the tension between the Muslims and the West is inequality. This is an indirect criticism on the policies of the West and the United Nations. The indirect nature of the statement
exposes the suppression of the subordinate ideologies and dominance of the dominant group (for detailed discussion on ideology and dominance see van Dijk 1995a).

4.3.4.1.2 Presupposition

As a nation that celebrates its diversity of culture and religions, Indonesia calls for mutual respect and understanding among peoples of different faiths (paragraph 12, Appendix F)

Yudhoyono presupposes the cultural diversity in the most positive sense to establish the importance of understanding and respect among the people from diverse backgrounds. The presupposition and the assumptions behind it (i.e. Indonesia is a tolerant country) are used in the context of the divide between the West and the Muslims which is created by the intolerance between the two. The context of the presupposition leads it to the divide rather then restricting to the internal political context (Schaffner, 1997) of Indonesia. The solution for problems like religious intolerance is respect and understanding of the opinion of the other group. The presupposition exposes an indirect attack on the West with reference to the issue of blasphemy and release of the video. The indirect approach refers to not only the subordinate position of the president in the present context but also his indifference about the matter somehow. He is just commenting like an outsider, so the statement also has elements of meta discourse along with the presupposition. He moves straight to the movie in the next lines.

Despite initiatives undertaken by states at the United ... now causing an international uproar (paragraph 12, Appendix F).

Settling a background in a neutral manner about the religious differences, now he comes to the international discourse in the context of the issue of blasphemy i.e. “religious defamation”. Yudhoyono individualizes “The Innocence of Muslims” in the presupposition which leads to the intolerant action of the West which created the divide between the West and the Muslims. The concept of “religious defamation” which is established as negative is associated with “The Innocence of Muslims”, this association exposes the negative actions of the West i.e. release of the movie which is blasphemous and responsible of hurting the religious emotions of the Muslims. The intertext “ugly face” is also meaningful. It defined the movie which is articulated as freedom of
expression for the West. He contests the freedom of expression in contrast with the religious freedom. He conforms that the international “uproar” is caused by the movie not by the protesters or the Muslims religious ideologies. This makes him exposed as supporter of the religious freedom instead of the western brand of freedom of expression. The presupposition here reveals his position as a subordinate political actor who resists the dominant political actors to protect his religious identities as well as ideologies.

The statement also attempts to covert the international community that the violence as a result of the video was responsible for the deaths and damage in protests. Instead he categorically states that it was initiated by the release of the Movie. It is an example of exposing the negative actions of the other group to save the ideologies of “our” group. Yudhoyono’s discourse does not show any explanation or justification rather he states the fact is clear cut way. The direct approach is a sign that he rejects and resists the suppression of his ideologies and rejects the Western stance about the situation that culminated the divide (Foucault, 1979, Fairclough, 1989, 1992b). Another aspect of the presupposition, that shows the struggle of the political leader to establish the ideologies of his group, is articulating the situation as “international uproar”. The international community restricted the issue of blasphemy to the Muslims and never stated it as international problem. It is for them an immature attitude which is not appropriate in the modern world of globalization and technology (See Obama’s speech). Yudhoyono rejects the Western idea about the religious ideologies and represents his idea. His idea blames the West for the negative role played that hurt the Muslims’ religious emotions and finds this an international issue. The international status of the issue rejects the idea that only a few Muslims (who are probably having political or other negative intentions) are reacting on the release of the video which is stated by Obama and Ban Ki Moon in their speeches.

4.3.4.1.3 Negation

*In a global regime of compassion and tolerance, no war is possible.* (paragraph 13, Appendix F)
In this statement president Yudhoyono mixes his voice with the voices of an idealized world, the world where there is no war because there is rule of tolerance and compassion. The impossibility of war in the present world cannot be imagined. The statement is an inspiration. He strives to resist the war from the world specially the Muslim world. The intertexts “compassion” and “tolerance” reject the presupposition that a tolerant and compassionate place can also have a war. The rejection in this statement is exposing some fact that is to be accepted by the audience and which is already accepted by Yudhoyono. The fact is that the world lacks “compassion” and “tolerance” and he does not refer to the world in general, but he specifies the world in terms of “global regime”.

United Nations is the only institution in the world which can be referred to as “global regime” because it has the representation of the whole world. Now, in this scenario, it is clear that the leader is criticizing the international organization in the context of the situation created after the release of the movie which is responsible for the violence or “war” between the Muslims and the international community. He already pointed it out in the previous paragraph that religious diversity can exist peacefully only when there is understanding and tolerance for the faith and beliefs of one another. In this statement, he explains it further and establishes that the instances of violence in the background of the religious beliefs between the Muslims and the West is due to lack of tolerance from the West for the Muslims’ ideologies which is violated in the movie “The Innocence of Muslims”. The violent protests from the Muslim world are in reaction of the damage which was done by the video by hurting Muslims religious emotions. The presupposition in a firm rather indirect way attacks the Western attitude with relation to the issue of blasphemy and finds them responsible for the violence and damage culminated by the video (see Fairclough, 1992a, p.17).

*Freedom of expression is therefore not absolute* (paragraph 13, Appendix F)

Yudhoyono in this statement rejects the presupposition that freedom of expression is absolute as an idea. The rejection in the context of the study is a challenge to the dominant ideologies. The dominant group believes freedom of expression is an idea that is positive and leads to the peaceful, tolerant, understanding and united world and this idea is in clash with the religious ideologies of the Muslims. The clash that is
responsible for violence, intolerance, misleading and divided world which is reflected in the situation after the release of the video. Yudhoyono does not reject the western ideology i.e. freedom of expression rather he finds it relative and situation/context dependent. The rejection of the other group ideology is all he does as there is nothing to present his own ideology in contrast with the dominant one. This shows he attempts to de-intensify and negativize the ideologies of the other group and then in this way he negativizes their actions also which are led by their ideologies. The negativizing of the dominant ideologies automatically goes in favour of Muslim ideologies. He uses pithy statements to comment on the issue which apparently are based on the facts and delivering his point of view about different aspects of the divide between the two groups, but this commentary legitimizes the ideologies of his group. This is an example of the power discourse where two groups are connected in a binary of power where strength of one group is weakness of the other group (Foucault, 1984, Fairclough, 1989, 1992a).

*But of course, this dialogue should not remain a dialogue... faiths can come together and care for one another* (paragraph 13, Appendix F)

Yudhoyono believes that the divide between the Muslims and the West can be bridged with understanding each other's ideologies and tolerance for these ideologies. The peaceful solution to the issue is dialogue between the groups. Yudhoyono through negative presupposition establishes the negative picture of the other group who limit their interests about the global issue to dialogues and never take actions (see van Dijk, 1995a, 2006). It leads to the differences among different communities and creates divisions and hatred. Hence, he emphasizes that fact that the West is not serious in solving problems of the people in the context of differences of cast and religion. He exposes the dark picture of the international politics which is biased and not neutral.

In the context of the study the blame for the religious extremism and violence goes to the West because of biased attitude towards the religious groups i.e. Muslims, who follow different path in politics and religion. Instead of accepting and respecting their diversity the West finds it against their ideologies which hurts their religious emotions and in reaction to that they protest. The explanation about that matter exposes the negative character of the dominant group and supports the religious ideologies of
the Muslims. He finds the protests were just reaction of the event that happened prior to them that is the release of the video. The intertext “actual cooperation” is ironic because it exposes the reality behind the dialogues for tolerance and compassion of the international community which in practical is nothing that’s why the global intolerance in the context of religion and culture is increasing day by day.

*Most disputes are intractable: they simmer for ... really long-drawn-out affairs* (paragraph 15, Appendix F)

In this statement Yudhoyono negates the presupposition that most of the global disputes and issue are perpetual and insolvable. He believes the issues are “simmered” by the opponent forces which make them look like big and more crucial than they are because mostly they are “interactable”. This point of view lessens the intensity of the divide between the Muslims and the West. The statement is also an attempt to establish that the clash between the two groups is handled in way which made it look negative and severe but actually it is not. The issue of blasphemy is intensified as an instance of extremism and violence by the dominant group and the idea of freedom of expression is promoted as moderate and positive ideology for the peace of the globe but Yudhoyono d-intensifies it by generalizing the fact that no dispute of the globe is unsolvable with tolerance and understanding.

This shows his attempt to expose the international community as intolerant and uncompassionate specially for Muslim ideologies. The international community can bring people of the world together who belong to different faith and beliefs. It can bridge the divides, finish misunderstanding and promote tolerance which looks hard but actually it is not. The negation is yet another example of exposing the negative actions and intentions of the dominant group which help the other group to construct the negative image of the subordinate group (see van Dijk, 1995a).

4.3.4.1.4 Metadiscourse

*Hence, I call for an international instrument to effectively prevent incitement to hostility or violence based on religions or beliefs* (paragraph 12, Appendix F)
Yudhoyono’s use of metadiscourse exposes his ideologies as a Muslim as well as member of the international community. The statement directly talks about his point of view about the divide that is establishment of an “instrument” that is responsible for preventing religious incitement and violence based on it. However, he uses an adverb before the statement “hence” that shows his strategy of metadiscourse. Whatever he said in the statement is changed by the adverb from direct to indirect. It suggests that whatever he believes and expresses in the statement may not be his thinking but some fact which are mentioned before “hence” made him decide that he should believe on this stance. His attempt to stay at a distance from whatever he says is explicit here. The distance he created helps him to establish his ideology as general and universal ideology (van Dijk, 2008).

Hence, nobody can deny the peaceful and tolerant globe so does he. His stance for peace directed towards his identity as a Muslim leader opens more aspects of meaning. It is his attempt to protect his ideologies as a Muslim in the backdrop of the issue of blasphemy. The emphasis is on the positivity of the actions and ideologies of his group. His discourse never resists the discourse of the other group rather presents his ideologies in contrast with the dominant ideologies. They contest the dominant ideologies themselves. In this process the discourse user himself never gets involved. Unlike the other subordinate leaders i.e. Karzai, Zardari, he does not explain or justify in direct manner rather he states in firm and direct way. The distance is not for the purpose of showing his indirect support to the dominant group or to expose the internal political weaknesses of his country. He presents his comment logically in contrast with the argument of the dominant discourse which help him to establish his ideologies while keeping a distance from the discourse (Fairclough, 1992a, p.122-123).

\textit{In such a world, the voice of the moderates—the voice of reason and compassion—would be heard clearly over the din of prejudice and bigotry} (paragraph 11, Appendix F).

The metadiscourse in the present instance is present in the paraphrasing of the idea present first. The intertext enclosed in the hyphens explains further the idea he presents before hyphen. He paints the picture of a world that is above religious incitement and violence in the name of religion. A place that is tolerant to accept the
diversity of faith and culture. He presents the idea of moderation and explains in hyphen as reason and compassion. The words “reason” and “compassion” are added to clarify his idea of “moderates” i.e. the people who work to finish the misunderstanding and hatred among the diverse groups and work for peace. The moderates according to Yudhoyono should have reason as well as compassion to overcome the differences among the nations. The hyphenated text exposes his attempt to establish that the international community is not able to follow reason and compassion to work as a moderate between and among the groups which suffer due to division on the basis of different identities and ideologies (see Fairclough, 2003, van Dijk, 1989, 2006).

4.3.4.1.5 Irony

*Despite initiatives undertaken by states at the United Nations and other forums, the defamation of religions persists* (paragraph 12, Appendix F)

The statement comments on the efforts of the international community to promote tolerance in the world. The irony lies in “initiatives undertaken” as they were just initiatives and could not change the situation in the context of religious tolerance. The initiative might have been taken in this context specifically or work for the global tolerance over all. In both the cases it was not effective because the Movie was made, and conflicts are created. Yudhoyono implicitly criticizes the efforts of the international community which were not fruitful enough to overcome the issue which are based on religions and cultural differences. It also refers to the fact that the conflicts based on the religious differences are not taken seriously. There is a huge difference between the Muslims and the West when it comes to the approach towards religion. Western countries find religion a personal belief that has nothing to do with politics while in the Muslim world religion is considered an important foundation for political structure. This clash influences the international community while deciding on different issues, specifically the ones based in religion. Irony in this instance is an attempt to expose the nonserious attitude of the international community in dealing with the conflicts rooted in religious differences. It is busy at many forums to find out the solution of all the international disputes but it there is no positive result and the conflicts still persist. He nominates the issue of religious defamation and its example in the release of the blasphemous movie *Innocence of Muslims*. Another aspect of irony is present in the
initial part of the statement. It states that the international community is working for the solution of disputes, but it never points the nature of the disputes. Hence, the statement also attacks the indifference of the international community in solving issues of the Muslims.

For many years peace has been treated as if it were a science and there are whole libraries about how it can be achieved and preserved (paragraph 12, Appendix F)

Yudhoyono here again attacks the international community’s fruitless attitude towards the solution of the global conflicts. He criticises the international approach to bring peace in the world due to lack of practical approach to achieve. It just remained in discussions and dialogue rather than in practice. He bitterly criticises the actions of the dominant group by exposing the faulty policy of the international community for the establishment of the global peace. The irony in the statement is an attempt to establish that the international community is not seriously interested in the peace process rather they just show that they are working for it. They work more on theoretical aspects of the establishment of global peace by writing books, doing research and discussing about different aspects. There is no practical application of any of these paper work. The intensification of the negative picture of the other group is achieved by exposing their nonpractical attitude towards the peace process of the globe (van Dijk, 2008, p.37).

4.3.4.2 Interdiscursivity

President Yudhoyono starts his speech with “Bismillahirrahmanirrahim, Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh” that is Islamic way of starting and greeting and belongs to the religious discourse. So, right from the beginning he owns his identity as Muslim which locates him in the subordinate group in the context of the study. The mix of the religious discourse with the political discourse reflects his struggle to establish his identity as a Muslim and with the same identity his position and role in the international politics. He takes start with formal and pleasant style which is typical for most of the leaders who address the United Nations General Assembly. However, his style is different from other subordinate political leaders who came under discussion in the present study. He is firm, confident and clear in discourse. He
establishes himself as a stakeholder in the international political order (paragraph 1, Appendix F). His role in the United States is the role of his group as well that is the Muslim world. He mixes discourse of international politics and cooperation with discourses of conflict from different counties where United Nations with assistance of international community got success to resolve the conflicts.

However, the shift from past to recent the Syrian conflict is brought in. His style changes from pleasant to sarcastic and blaming. He directly attacks the United Nation for situation in the Syria on which “UN is in paralysis”. The mode is formal and rhetorical mode is a mix of descriptive and narrative. Description is followed to explain the role of the international community in the peace process in the Muslim country while narrative stance is used to narrate the horrible condition of the Syrian people. Narration as well as description helps him to expose the pathetic picture of the international community and their horrible policies and actions which are responsible for the sufferings of the Syrian people.

Yudhoyono goes the discourse of international politics at UN forum and comment in a direct and clear manner on different aspects of the United Nations (Paragraph 2, Appendix F). However, when it comes to the performance he brings in the discourse from the Muslim world i.e. Syria. The negativity of the Syrian conflict is utilized to negativize the action of the international community which also reflects the marginalization of the Muslims by the international community (see van Dijk, 1993, 1995b; Fairclough, 2003). His special focus is on the Security Council (paragraph 3, Appendix F) to play its role in solving the conflict like Syria. The shift to the intimidating rhetorical mode shows his strong position in this context. His style is alarming while commenting on the future of the international collaboration on the platform of the United Nations if it is not able to handle the conflicts.

After an intimidating style while mixing the discourse from past present. He moves to hopefulness. He shifts the rhetorical mode from threatening to pleasant to drop the discourse of world wars and to bring in freedom (paragraph 4, Appendix F). The past it depicted in a scary manner “wrecked” and in contrast to it, confident and pleasant present is presented by mixing discourses of freedom, economy, peace, international cooperation and security. In short, the negative aspects of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century
are contrasted with the positive aspects of 21st century by mixing different discourses. In this shift of past and present the rhetorical mode is also shifted from narrative to expository and descriptive.

The positive picture of the present is soon shifted to reverse when he brings in the discourse of 21st century peace and conflict situations, demands and requirements. He follows aggressive style to criticize the international community for “outdated” strategies on peace and conflict on the present world. The rhetorical mode shift to intimidating and accusing from pleasant mode of the previous paragraph. He exposes the political strategies of the Western community for the Muslim world (Middle East) which he finds faulty and biased. The negative depiction of the strategies of the dominant group reveal resistance of the subordinate group who is more inclined towards fracturing the power relations and hegemonic relations in the context of the study (see Gramsci, 1979; Fairclough, 1992a, p.91).

Along with the shift of discourses, genre shift is also reflected. He mixes genre of international political speech with other genres i.e. political debate, political controversy, political analysis and political history. His discourse oscillates from international political discourse to the political discourse of the Muslims world (Syria, Middle East) to establish the unfair political deeds of the international community which created and further enhanced the conflicts. He further strengthens his stance by bringing in the discourses from Korea and China to establish the mismanagement of the international peace process by the Western community (paragraph 5,6, Appendix F).

The weaknesses of the international community are further enhanced by bringing in the discourse of bigotry, hatred, tolerance and extremism which add into the revelation of the western ideologies as negative and oppressive (paragraph 8,9, Appendix F). He brings in various metaphors in the context of the conflicts enhanced by the strategies of the international community. This makes his attack on their ideologies and strategies harsher. The metaphoric language helps him to achieve a strong position in the binary of international power relations. Tenor and mode followed here reflect his strong position and ability to protect the ideologies of his own group. Unlike other subordinate leaders he does not need to bring in internal political discourse
of his country to prove himself worthy. He mixes discourse, genres and style to establish the background to defend the Muslims in the backdrop of the divide between them and the West.

After exposing the faulty Western political strategies, he directs himself to the issue of blasphemy. He sets a background to fight for his ideologies by bringing in the discourses of tolerances and compassion and prove them not present in the context under discussion. The discourse from politics and religious are one to one. His style is formal and firm with descriptive and explanatory rhetorical mode. The style shifts rapidly from descriptive to sarcastic and ironic which is used as a weapon to depict the positive image of his group (Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b). He exposes the other group and its ideologies using different discursive strategies.

He criticises the mishandling of the sensitive issues by the international community for whatever reason and states an example from his own country. The internal political discourse of Indonesia is brought to make the world understand the ways to retain peace and compassion in with a country that is diverse in nature. The internal political discourse here is used in positive sense which was not the case in the speeches of Zardari and Karzai. His style shifts with reference to the topic he is involved in. The discursive strategy of nominalization is used to point out the things he talks about in a categoric manner. His style is clear and plain rather firm. He talks in a direct mode while discussing the blasphemous movie and situations and things related to that incident. Genres are also mixed in this context which unveil him as a subordinate who knows how to defend himself and his ideologies (paragraph 12, 13, Appendix E).

While commenting on the solution of the problem he takes himself as a part of the international community but while criticizing them for their strategies he isolates himself from the dominant group. Instead of bringing in internal political discourse of his country he brings snatches from the discourse of the United Nations both internal and international. Mostly, these snatches expose the inefficiencies of the organization in maintaining the peace process. He shifts to direct mode and declarative rhetorical mode while commenting on the idea of freedom of expression (paragraph 13, Appendix E). He mixes different discourses to establish that the idea of freedom of expression presented by the West in the context of the present study is relevant therefore, it cannot
be taken in contrast of the issue of blasphemy. He attempts to marginalize the ideologies of the West that are in clash with the ideologies of his group (Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, 2003, 2011). He follows direct, firm and declarative style to achieve his goals in the binary of power relations. He mixes genres which also establish his ideologies and emphasize the positive nature of the Muslim stance. The interdiscursive references present in his discourse are hardly able to expose him as subordinate but his association with the Muslim world places him in this category.

He focusses of the solution to the conflict between the Muslims and the West which is created by the release of the video. His discourse is more inclined to expose that the West should change its attitude to reach a peaceful solution. While bringing in the discourse related to the divide between the Muslims and the West he gets sarcastic. The genre of political speech also shifts from political criticism and critical analysis of the events in the international political context. He digs in the political history and brings in discourses from around the world to expose the ideologies of the dominant group which are based on the oppression of the other group. The style also varies with the shift of the discourses and this intermix of the discourses style and genres are reflective of the position of Yudhoyono in the binary of power relations.

He moves from the freedom of expression and role and performance of the international community towards the end to the speech. Before closing he mixes discourses of diplomacy, international cooperation, peace and conflict. The style shift reflects his stance on all these issues. Towards the end he adopts sarcastic rhetorical mode which helps him to depict a negative picture of “them” (see Fairclough, 1992a). Discourse of education in research is mixed here to intensify the nonpractical policies. This emphasized the actions of the international community in the peace process of the world as just paper work and dialogues. In contrast to this approach he brings in practical approach based on the experience of the successful nations in this regard. The practical approach is the positive approach which contextualises in the internal political discourse of Indonesia. The positive depiction of the actions of his group in contrast to the negative depiction of the other group shows his struggle to achieve a power position in the binary of the world political power relations and hegemony (see Gramsci, 1971; van Dijk, 1993, 1995a; Fairclough, 1989, 1992a, 1992b, 2003). The interdiscursive
references of Yudhoyono reject the hegemony of the international political power by challenging them and exposing their weakness and biases for the other nations.

**4.4 Conclusion**

This chapter is based in the detailed analysis of the political speeches in taking into account the theoretical framework. The critical and extensive analysis of the data helped finding out answer of the research questions which were set for this study. Moreover, Critical Discourse Analysis proved to be noticeably beneficial in analysing the power relations and hegemony in the discourse of the world political leaders. The following chapter presents a detailed account of findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary

This research was designed to investigate power relations and hegemony in global political discourse. The major focus of the research was to find out intertextual references used by the world political leaders and to examine them for exposing the power relations and hegemonic relations. The discursive practices of the political leaders expose their position and struggle in the power structure. Politicians are always in the struggle for achieving their goals in the power structure. The reason of this struggle is the unstable nature of power that shifts from one to the other group. In the words of Foucault (1976), power works in a network like situation and never stays within a single group. Power relations are discursive as declared by Fairclough (1989) and Foucault (1976) many times in their work. Theories of power and discourse hold that power is everywhere, and it can be seen in all the institutions of the society but for politics, power is the base. Politics is a struggle to gain power, therefore, political relations are made up of the distinction between “us” and “them”. The power relations in the political set up are many times associated with the term “hegemony”. Hegemony is achieved when one group attains the power position and binary of domination and subordination is created (Fairclough, 1992a, 199b, 2003; Gramsci, 1971). This study examined the intertextual references in the discourse of the world political leaders to find out the relations of power and hegemony in a specific context.

The study was set in the background of the divide between the Muslim world and the West on the issue of freedom of expression vs blasphemy. The divide came into prominence after some events took place in the West that hurt religious emotions of the Muslims. These events included the publication of offensive cartoons of the Prophet (SAWW) in Denmark and Norway and the release of the movie trailer Innocence of Muslims that comprised of the blasphemous content, violating/challenging Muslim
ideologies. This forms the background of the present study which was further restricted in the context of the UN general assembly meeting held in September 2012. In the general debate of the general assembly, this controversy was discussed and the release of the video was condemned by the Muslim leaders. America found it an instance of the freedom of expression that is considered as the basic right of people in America. Speeches of six leaders i.e. president of the United States Barak Obama, UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon, president of Pakistan Asif Ali Zardari, president of Egypt Mohamed Morsi, president of Afghanistan Hamid Karzai and present of Indonesia Susilo Yudhoyono were selected. The speeches of all the leaders were analysed following the theoretical framework, that is, Fairclough’s (1992a) concept of hegemony and intertextuality. The researcher has chosen the concept of Fairclough (1992a) for the intertextual analysis of the data selected for the study. She followed the same topics as suggested by Fairclough (1992a) in the theory of hegemony and intertextuality, however, the topics sometimes needed to be shaped according to the context and nature of data. The researcher described the working definitions of the topics while discussing research methodology (see chapter 3).

5.2 Findings

The study aimed at exploring power relations and hegemony in the global political discourse in the backdrop of the divide between the issue of blasphemy and freedom of expression. The findings of the study met the objectives answered the initially posed following research questions

1. How are the power relations created and recreated through the linguistic strategies in the world politics?

The major focus of the study was the investigation of the construction and reconstruction of power relations in the international political set up. The analysis of the data proved that power relations in the political set up are constructed and reconstructed and this process is revealed through the division between “us” and “them”. Power relations are also exposed through the discursive strategies of the political actors i.e. individualization, marginalization, emphasizing and deemphasizing, intensifying and de-intensifying of certain ideologies and assumptions (see Van Dijk,
These strategies are rooted in the linguistic strategies because they are reflected in the linguistic choices of the discourse users i.e. intertextual references.

In the present research, the binary of power relations was set on the division of freedom of expression and religious freedom. The dominant group was found to be in favour of the freedom of expression, which suppressed the religious freedom of the subordinate group. They attempted to deconstruct the religious identities and ideologies of the subordinate group through discursive practices (see Fairclough 1992a, chapter 5). Fairclough (1995a) finds discursive practices as the production and interpretation of the text. In the present study, the dominant group produced the discourse of the freedom of expression and interpreted it as positive and productive while contested the discourse of the religious freedom and interpreted it as negative, outdated and unproductive (see Appendix-A). The dominant group was represented by president Barak Obama because he was defending freedom of expression.

The subordinate group produced the discourse in favour of religious freedom and reacted against the humiliation of their religious rights (see Van Dijk 1994, p.12). The resistance supports Foucault’s (1976) idea of relational nature of the power relations. The dominant group hurt the religious emotions and challenged the ideologies of the subordinate group through emphasizing and intensifying the religious ideologies as negative (see Appendix-A p. ii,7) and by declaring these ideologies misfit in the modern world of technology (Appendix-A p, iv,25). The subordinate group is represented by four Muslim leaders i.e. president Asif Ali Zardari, president Mohamed Morsi, president Hamid Karzai and president Susilo Yudhoyono.

United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki Moon is apparently a neutral figure therefore is out of the binary, but his discourse exposes his ideologies which are more inclined towards the dominant group. Moreover, the important positions in the organizations are enjoyed by the non-Muslims which is another reason for the Western influence on the organization. The intertextual references present in Moon’s speech expose that his ideologies are more in support of the dominant than the subordinate. However, his position in the global political order puts him in a struggle that makes him shift from one to the other side of the binary.
The dominant group de-intensified and deemphasized the emotional attachment of the subordinate group with religious beliefs and debased them by making analogies between the freedom of expression and blasphemy to mitigate the significance of the Muslim ideologies (Appendix-A, iii, 19). The dominant group divided the other group into the protesters against the video and the friends of America. The protesters were portrayed as destructive, cruel and violent and were dissociated from the rest of the Muslim world. This division is created to win the consent of the majority of the Muslim world (see Fairclough, 1989, p 233). The Muslims, other than the protesters, were separated from the group of protested and their ideologies are manipulated to make them realize that the protests in the reaction to the video were irrational. This is an example of exclusion and inclusion at the same time because the majority of the Muslim world is included, and the protesters are excluded from the dominant’s friends group.

The protesters were excluded from the Muslim world and the Muslim world was included in the dominant group just to win the consent of the majority and to isolate the protesters. The suppression of the Muslim ideologies revealed the presence of the power relations between both the group (see Fairclough, 1992a Hegemony). The release of the video was a point of instability for power relations between the dominant and the subordinate groups that were overcome by the dominant with the help of discursive strategies and the power relations were recreated in the global political order.

2. How does the presence of the intertextual and interdiscursive elements in a single discursive event influence the constructing and sustaining of the power relations for the world political actors?

My second focus was the analysis of my data to examine in detail the presence of intertextuality and its role in constructing and sustaining of the power relations with special reference to intertextual and interdiscursive elements.

The intertextual element in the speeches of the political leader exposed their ideologies and position in the global political context. The choice of intertexts, their contextualization and recontextualization by the political leaders were important clues to chase their political ideologies. The focus of dominant political leader was positive self-representation and negative other-representation. The dominant group
marginalized the religious ideologies of the dominant group by using different forms of intertextuality i.e. discourse representations, presuppositions, negation, metadiscourse and irony. He brought in intertexts from history which were already established as revolutionary and positive to intensify the positivity of his ideologies and actions behind those ideologies. He follows the clear line between “us” and “them” which is created by the divide after the release of the movie trailer. However, this line is restructured many times to achieve the power goal. He rejects the Muslims ideologies and stance on the issue of blasphemy to declare it as outdated and impractical which was an example of suppression by the dominant.

At the next level he affiliated himself with subordinate group and presented himself as friend and well-wisher of them but before the binary of power blurred, he divided the subordinate group into protesters and non-protesters. The protesters were targeted and declared enemies of the rest of the Muslim world. This divide within the Muslim world unveiled his struggle to win the consent of the Muslim world and achieve hegemony in the global political order. The neutral group was more inclined to the dominant group and most of the time followed the division within the Muslim world strategy establish the idea of freedom of expression. The intertextual references of Ban Ki Moon were focused negativizing the actions of the protesters. They were presented as negative people who were after political gains instead of protecting the religious ideologies of the Muslim world. The same stance is followed by Obama.

The intertextual element in the discourse of the Muslim leaders echo their struggle to protect their ideologies and establish them in contrast to the ideologies of the other group. The subordinate intertextual elements reflected resistance, acceptance and consent at the same time. They resisted the western idea of freedom of expression and intensify the importance of the establishment of religious ideologies for the Muslim world (i.e. Morsi and Yudhoyono). They accepted the contribution of the west in strengthening the Muslim countries and gave their consent to the dominant group to promote their political strategies (i.e. Zardari and Karzai). They strived to establish themselves as allies of the West which damaged the positive nature of their ideologies (Zardari and Karzai). Their discursive strategies helped them structure the power relations with the dominant where they took the position of the subordinate group. Sometimes, they challenged and resisted the western ideologies and to make a contrast
presented their ideologies (i.e. Yudhoyono). The resistance revealed the relational nature of the global political power (Foucault, 1976). The consent indicated the hegemonic relation between the dominant and the subordinate political leaders (Gramsci, 1971). Hence, the intertextuality in the subordinate discourse exhibited diversity in the relation between the dominant and the subordinate political actors which had affiliation, resistance as well as consent for the dominant political actors. These aspects exposed the construction, sustaining and fracture of the power relations between the dominant and the subordinate political leaders.

Next part of the inquiry was the interplay of power relations as present in the interdiscursive elements of the discourse of the selected participants. The interdiscursive analysis revealed the mixing of discourses, genres and styles. The interdiscursive references in the speech of Obama helped him to establish the superiority of his ideologies and the constructive character of his group. Furthermore, he brought in the discourses, genres and styles in the political discourse and genre of political speech from a variety of internal discourses as well as international discourses.

While snatching in the internal discourse from the Arab and non-Arab countries Obama exposed the limitations of the political structure of these countries. Obama directed the focus of the audience towards the miserable condition of the common people of those countries and cruelty and dishonesty of the leaders. His association with the common people recreated binary of power relations between his group and the other group as it was already created based on the economic, political and technological power of America on the Muslim world. His style shifted from vernacular to conversational, from intimate to intimidating, from narrative to expository and from descriptive to argumentative. The variety of the shifts according to the context of discourse showed his dexterity in marginalizing the religious ideologies of the Muslim world as well as highlighting their negative politics, weak economics, destructive and extremist nature and underlining the sympathetic, constructive, humane, politically strong, tolerant and helpful character of his own group (for details see: 4.1.2).

Ban Ki Moon through interdiscursive referenced focused on dividing the Muslim group into negative and positive and attacking the negative for being responsible for deaths and damage around the globe. Interdiscursivity in his discourse
exposes him as favouring the dominant ideologies more than the subordinate ideologies.

Muslim leaders differ in their use of the interdiscursive elements. Zardari particularly and Karzai also followed highly formal style with elements of respect and faithfulness for the dominant group. The shift in their styles usually exposed negative picture of their countries and political system as well as the kindness, helpfulness and friendly nature of the dominant group. They mostly remained indulged in giving an account of the weaknesses of his past, corrupt dictatorship and sufferings of people in his country. Most of the time they remained in the internal political discourse of their countries and intensified the negativity and mixed personal discourse to construct their identity as a democratic and sympathetic leaders who preferred the welfare of their people. The genres he mixed expose their subordinate position in the global political order.

Morsi and specially Yudhoyono followed different strategies. their interdiscursive references promoted the Muslim ideologies and intensifies the negative image and actions of the western world. Yudhoyono resisted the western ideologies and challenged the power position of the dominant group. He exposed the negative and biased political strategies of the West to suppress and marginalize the religious ideologies of the Muslims. He explicitly criticized the western stance and actions and the destructions which resulted in the global destruction specially in the Muslim countries. He followed assertive and imperative style to enhance the effect of his discourse and justify his ideologies. He mixed discourses and genres to expose the negative picture of the dominant group. He resisted the dominant ideologies and challenged them. The eco-political stability and non-dependency of Yudhoyono strengthened his position in the world political order which was reflected in the resistance he made.

All leaders shared the same discursive strategies, but their targets, contexts and purposes were different from each other. The commonly used discursive strategies were emphasizing/deemphasizing, intensifying/de-intensifying, individualizing and marginalizing. Some aspects of their discourse were the points of difference like what, why and how. The members of the subordinate group who are dependent on the
dominant group for economic or other reasons did not emphasize the negative aspects and intentions of the dominant group and usually, positive and friendly nature of the dominant group is highlighted. However, when there is a need to complain, condemn or react on any of the negative aspects of the dominant group the sub-ordinate either did it indirectly or after mentioning the negative actions of the dominant group, diverted it to some other group or subgroup. Hence, the dominant group used these strategies to expose the negative character of the subordinate group and to glorify even the negative actions of his group and to debase the positive things in the other group as well.

3. How do the subordinate political actors through their intertextual and interdiscursive discourse help the dominant political actors in constructing and sustaining the hegemonic relations?

My third research question focused on the discursive practices of the Muslim leaders as revealed in the intertextual and interdiscursive references they used. The Muslim representatives were after protecting their religious ideologies and defending their right of religious freedom. However, their political history and affiliation, internal politics and economic position influenced their stance. President Zardari, an ally of the economically dependent on the west, avoided discussing the issue directly. He started with criticizing the western stance and isolated that criticism from rest of his speech and strived to show his affiliation with the western group. He focused on positive self-representation but instead of the dominant group he structures the binary from the internal political discourse of his country and negative representation lead towards the other political forces of his own country. He fractured the binary of power to associate himself with the dominant group which helped to structure the hegemonic relations.

Secondly, the divide is created within the internal political discourse of the Muslim leaders i.e. Zardari and Karzai where they associated themselves with one subgroup and their internal opponents in the other subgroups. This subdivision of their own group revealed their attempt to win the positive opinion of the dominant group at any cost. Thirdly, they desperately struggled to show their consent to the dominant group in all their actions as most of the actions were against their group.
Finally, they promoted the positive picture of the dominant group by appreciating their actions overall. They also highlighted the favours they received from the dominant group and from time to time expressed their intentions to associate themselves with the dominant group. They even declared themselves a partner of the international community. The subordinate political actors attempted to construct negative image of the other subgroups and exposed their destructive, deceitful and fraudulent nature to the dominant group (see Appendix C & D) and proved themselves very efficient, active (see Appendix C & D) and always ready to act upon the orders of the dominant group. These discursive strategies exposed their consent for the dominance of the dominant group i.e. hegemony.

The intertextual and interdiscursive references in the speech of Morsi and Yudhoyono showed a different picture of the dominant group. They brought in the issue of blasphemy in a powerful manner and resisted the idea of freedom of expression. Their discursive strategies rejected the western and United Nations’ stance on the issue of blasphemy and the protests culminating it. The intensified negative actions of the dominant group established the issue of blasphemy as violation of fundamental religious ideologies of the Muslim world. Yudhoyono challenged the western stance and criticized their political ideologies for being biased and unfair. They focused on the international political discourse for exposing the negative political ideologies of the west to suppress the Muslims and control them through coercive power. They emphasized the negativity in the Western stance of the freedom of expression.

Hence, the Muslim group was divided into two aspects. Zardari and Karzai helped the dominant group to construct the power relations and achieve hegemony in the binary of global political discourse, however, Morsi and specifically Yudhoyono challenged the power position and resisted it by bringing in the intertextual and interdiscursive elements in their discourse. The first aspect of the subordinate discourse avoided resistance and challenged but the second aspect of the subordinate group challenged the dominant discourse.
5.3 Conclusions

The overall study of both the speeches unfolds the power relations and hegemony in the context of the issue of blasphemy. The emergence of these issues can also be political and historical. The historical, cultural, social and political aspects of the issue are responsible for the divide between the two worlds. The Post-Modern philosophy of the West is accepted throughout the World, which has changed the things globally. The West has influenced and dominated the world from top to the bottom. However, Muslim ideologies and practices resisted it to a greater extent. This resistance is responsible for creating the divide between the Muslim world and the West and is always visible whenever Western ideologies come in clash with the Muslim ideologies. The same resistance was seen in Pakistan intensively after the release of the video in 2012 but it was missing in the speech of the President Zardari. It was expected that he would speak for the people of his country who protested the most on the release of the blasphemous video, but he did not stay in the binary of power relations to resist it. This is how he fractured the power relations to dismantle the binary of subordination and domination. This also showed the clash between the ideologies of a political leader and common public of Pakistan. Hamid Karzai attempted to resist but he could not because of his unstable position in the world political order. The economic and internal political stability influence the position of the subordinate political actors in the global political context.

Obama’s discourse exposed his position as dominant and hegemonic who marginalized, suppressed and negativized the Muslim ideologies using various discursive strategies. His discursive strategies exposed his intentions of reconstructing the reality about and for the Muslims world. He harshly criticised the Muslim stance of the issue of blasphemy. He attempted to recreate Muslim ideologies in the Modern world where for him freedom of expression is more significant and practical than religion. For him religious ideologies are misfit in the Modern World of technology where common people are more powerful than any other phenomenon. He deconstructed the religious ideologies to the next level. He was exposed to be an existentialist who believes in religion but never accepts the sanction and support of religion.
Summing up this part of discussing, it can be said that the issue of blasphemy has generated the discourse of power and hegemony in the global political context. It also created the binary of power relations between the Muslim world and the West which is discursively communicated and received. The West discursively targeted the Muslim ideologies, manipulated and suppressed. The success of the dominant group in suppressing the ideologies of the subordinate group helped it to create and recreated the power relations and hegemony in a particular context at least i.e. UN General Assembly meeting. On the other side of the binary, the discourse of the subordinate political actors worked according to their economic and political background. The interplay of the power and hegemony in the context of the issue of blasphemy was discursive. The world political leaders produced and interpreted the discourse to intensify and de-intensify, to establish and de-establish and to emphasize, deemphasize and construct/reconstruct and deconstruct certain ideologies and identities.

5.4 Recommendations

After this detailed study of discourses in the form of international speeches of the world leaders from two different civilizations, the thesis recommends that the knowledge of the ideologies behind the differences among different nations of the world should be promoted to reduce the distances and differences between the people from different nations and religions. The awareness about the faith and beliefs of different groups can contribute in avoiding political exploitation that leads to violence and extremism. United Nations should work to fill the gaps between the East and the West on the basis of religion. In the global world of ours, there is a need of an international law to determine the boundaries of freedom of expression and religious freedom to avoid the hatred, misunderstanding and violence among people of the world. Political discourse should be studied from different perspectives and following different theoretical concepts to make the people aware of the power structure and discursive strategies used in the global as well as local politics.

The divide between the freedom of expression and the religious freedom can be bridged by generating the tolerant and unbiased discourses from both the sides, connecting the people from different socio-cultural and religious backgrounds and bringing them together. An understanding of the basic beliefs of Islam at the global
level, specifically in the West. It can overcome future destructions and hatred between the two groups. The differences between the Muslims and the West are mostly based on the lack of knowledge and understanding about the ideologies and beliefs of one another. Awareness about Islam and Muslims’ religious emotions can bring them closer.

Future Research: There are some other models of analysis in the theory of Critical Discourse Analysis, which can fit well to analyse this kind of data. I would recommend Political Discourse Analysis, Ideological Analysis, Discourse-Historical Approach and Socio-Cognitive model. I found theory of Intertextuality as comprehensive tool of analysis, apart from some restrictions, more focus on the pragmatic aspects of language. Intertextuality can prove to be a flexible method of analysis that can be applied to other genres of discourse including the genres of political discourse other than speeches to examine the political ideologies and hegemony/power.

The present study was focused on the political aspect of the divide between the freedom of expression and blasphemy and was context dependent. However, the same issue can be approached in the contexts other than political with different nature of data. Even in the political context some other data can be used for the analysis in this area. They can take interview, newspaper article, reviews, questionnaires, surveys and so on to address this issue and unveil the facts in this area.

5.5 My Contribution to the Field of Knowledge

1. An important contribution of my research to the field of knowledge is that I have highlighted an important issue in the world of globalization. It is a contribution in finding out the ways to end the differences among the people having different ideologies and religious beliefs to make our global village a peaceful and tolerant place to live. My research can serve the people of the world to understand one another’s stance in the global context specifically with relation to the divide of the freedom of expression and blasphemy.

2. My research also adds into the field of knowledge by studying the role that language plays in the World politics to construct ideologies that can play a
significant role in dividing or uniting the people of their countries and the world overall.

3. Another significant contribution of my research is that I studied the discourse of the subordinate political actor as a source of hegemony and power for the dominant political actor.

4. My study adds significantly to the field of knowledge as it is an instance of critical discourse analysis of the political speeches that finds out the intertextual and interdiscursive references which are done rarely.
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APPENDIX A

Speech of President Barak Obama (United States of America)

September 25, 2012

1. Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen: I would like to begin today by telling you about an American named Chris Stevens. Chris was born in a town called Grass Valley, California, the son of a lawyer and a musician. As a young man, Chris joined the Peace Corps, and taught English in Morocco. And he came to love and respect the people of North Africa and the Middle East. He would carry that commitment throughout his life. As a diplomat, he worked from Egypt to Syria, from Saudi Arabia to Libya. He was known for walking the streets of the cities where he worked – tasting the local food, meeting as many people as he could, speaking Arabic, listening with a broad smile.

2. Chris went to Benghazi in the early days of the Libyan revolution, arriving on a cargo ship. As America’s representative, he helped the Libyan people as they coped with violent conflict, cared for the wounded, and crafted a vision for the future in which the rights of all Libyans would be respected. And after the revolution, he supported the birth of a new democracy, as Libyans held elections, and built new institutions, and began to move forward after decades of dictatorship.

3. Chris Stevens loved his work. He took pride in the country he served, and he saw dignity in the people that he met. And two weeks ago, he traveled to Benghazi to review plans to establish a new cultural center and modernize a hospital. That’s when America’s compound came under attack. Along with three of his colleagues, Chris was killed in the city that he helped to save. He was 52 years old.

4. I tell you this story because Chris Stevens embodied the best of America. Like his fellow Foreign Service officers, he built bridges across oceans and cultures, and was deeply invested in the international cooperation that the United Nations represents. He acted with humility, but he also stood up for a set of principles -- a belief that individuals should be free to determine their own destiny, and live with liberty, dignity, justice, and opportunity.

5. The attacks on the civilians in Benghazi were attacks on America. We are grateful for the assistance we received from the Libyan government and from the Libyan people.
There should be no doubt that we will be relentless in tracking down the killers and bringing them to justice.

6. And I also appreciate that in recent days, the leaders of other countries in the region -- including Egypt, Tunisia and Yemen -- have taken steps to secure our diplomatic facilities, and called for calm. And so have religious authorities around the globe.

7. But understand, the attacks of the last two weeks are not simply an assault on America. They are also an assault on the very ideals upon which the United Nations was founded -- the notion that people can resolve their differences peacefully; that diplomacy can take the place of war; that in an interdependent world, all of us have a stake in working towards greater opportunity and security for our citizens.

8. If we are serious about upholding these ideals, it will not be enough to put more guards in front of an embassy, or to put out statements of regret and wait for the outrage to pass. If we are serious about these ideals, we must speak honestly about the deeper causes of the crisis --because we face a choice between the forces that would drive us apart and the hopes that we hold in common.

9. Today, we must reaffirm that our future will be determined by people like Chris Stevens -- and not by his killers. Today, we must declare that this violence and intolerance has no place among our United Nations. It has been less than two years since a vendor in Tunisia set himself on fire to protest the oppressive corruption in his country, and sparked what became known as the Arab Spring. And since then, the world has been captivated by the transformation that’s taken place, and the United States has supported the forces of change.

10. We were inspired by the Tunisian protests that toppled a dictator, because we recognized our own beliefs in the aspiration of men and women who took to the streets. We insisted on change in Egypt, because our support for democracy ultimately put us on the side of the people.

11. We supported a transition of leadership in Yemen, because the interests of the people were no longer being served by a corrupt status quo. We intervened in Libya alongside a broad coalition, and with the mandate of the United Nations Security Council, because we had the ability to stop the slaughter of innocents, and because we believed that the aspirations of the people were more powerful than a tyrant.

12. And as we meet here, we again declare that the regime of Bashar al-Assad must come to an end so that the suffering of the Syrian people can stop and a new dawn can begin. We have taken these positions because we believe that freedom and self-determination are not unique to one culture.
13. These are not simply American values or Western values -- they are universal values. And even as there will be huge challenges to come with a transition to democracy, I am convinced that ultimately government of the people, by the people, and for the people is more likely to bring about the stability, prosperity, and individual opportunity that serve as a basis for peace in our world. So let us remember that this is a season of progress. For the first time in decades, Tunisians, Egyptians and Libyans voted for new leaders in elections that were credible, competitive, and fair.

14. This democratic spirit has not been restricted to the Arab world. Over the past year, we’ve seen peaceful transitions of power in Malawi and Senegal, and a new President in Somalia. In Burma, a President has freed political prisoners and opened a closed society, a courageous dissident has been elected to parliament, and people look forward to further reform.

15. Around the globe, people are making their voices heard, insisting on their innate dignity, and the right to determine their future. And yet the turmoil of recent weeks reminds us that the path to democracy does not end with the casting of a ballot.

16. Nelson Mandela once said: "To be free is not merely to cast off one’s chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others." True democracy demands that citizens cannot be thrown in jail because of what they believe, and that businesses can be opened without paying a bribe. It depends on the freedom of citizens to speak their minds and assemble without fear, and on the rule of law and due process that guarantees the rights of all people.

17. In other words, true democracy -- real freedom -- is hard work. Those in power have to resist the temptation to crackdown on dissidents. In hard economic times, countries must be tempted -- may be tempted to rally the people around perceived enemies, at home and abroad, rather than focusing on the painstaking work of reform.

18. Moreover, there will always be those that reject human progress -- dictators who cling to power, corrupt interests that depend on the status quo, and extremists who fan the flames of hate and division. From Northern Ireland to South Asia, from Africa to the Americas, from the Balkans to the Pacific Rim, we’ve witnessed convulsions that can accompany transitions to a new political order. At time, the conflicts arise along the fault lines of race or tribe. And often they arise from the difficulties of reconciling tradition and faith with the diversity and interdependence of the modern world.

19. In every country, there are those who find different religious beliefs threatening; in every culture, those who love freedom for themselves must ask themselves how much they’re willing to tolerate freedom for others. That is what we saw play out in the last two weeks, as a crude and disgusting video sparked outrage throughout the Muslim world.
Now, I have made it clear that the United States government had nothing to do with this video, and I believe its message must be rejected by all who respect our common humanity.

20. It is an insult not only to Muslims, but to America as well -- for as the city outside these walls makes clear, we are a country that has welcomed people of every race and every faith. We are home to Muslims who worship across our country.

21. We not only respect the freedom of religion; we have laws that protect individuals from being harmed because of how they look or what they believe. We understand why people take offense to this video because millions of our citizens are among them. I know there are some who ask why we don’t just ban such a video. And the answer is enshrined in our laws: Our Constitution protects the right to practice free speech. Here in the United States, countless publications provoke offense. Like me, the majority of Americans are Christian, and yet we do not ban blasphemy against our most sacred beliefs.

22. As President of our country and Commander-in-Chief of our military, I accept that people are going to call me awful things every day -- and I will always defend their right to do so. Americans have fought and died around the globe to protect the right of all people to express their views, even views that we profoundly disagree with.

23. We do not do so because we support hateful speech, but because our founders understood that without such protections, the capacity of each individual to express their own views and practice their own faith may be threatened. We do so because in a diverse society, efforts to restrict speech can quickly become a tool to silence critics and oppress minorities. We do so because given the power of faith in our lives, and the passion that religious differences can inflame, the strongest weapon against hateful speech is not repression; it is more speech -- the voices of tolerance that rally against bigotry and blasphemy, and lift up the values of understanding and mutual respect.

24. Now, I know that not all countries in this body share this particular understanding of the protection of free speech. We recognize that. But in 2012, at a time when anyone with a cell phone can spread offensive views around the world with the click of a button, the notion that we can control the flow of information is obsolete.

25. The question, then, is how do we respond? And on this we must agree: There is no speech that justifies mindless violence. There are no words that excuse the killing of innocents. There’s no video that justifies an attack on an embassy. There’s no slander that provides an excuse for people to burn a restaurant in Lebanon, or destroy a school in Tunis, or cause death and destruction in Pakistan.

26. In this modern world with modern technologies, for us to respond in that way to hateful speech empowers any individual who engages in such speech to create chaos around the world. We empower the worst of us if that’s how we respond. More broadly,
the events of the last two weeks also speak to the need for all of us to honestly address the tensions between the West and the Arab world that is moving towards democracy.

27. Now, let me be clear: Just as we cannot solve every problem in the world, the United States has not and will not seek to dictate the outcome of democratic transitions abroad. We do not expect other nations to agree with us on every issue, nor do we assume that the violence of the past weeks or the hateful speech by some individuals represent the views of the overwhelming majority of Muslims, any more than the views of the people who produced this video represents those of Americans.

28. However, I do believe that it is the obligation of all leaders in all countries to speak out forcefully against violence and extremism. It is time to marginalize those who -- even when not directly resorting to violence -- use hatred of America, or the West, or Israel, as the central organizing principle of politics. For that only gives cover, and sometimes makes an excuse, for those who do resort to violence.

29. That brand of politics -- one that pits East against West, and South against North, Muslims against Christians and Hindu and Jews -- can’t deliver on the promise of freedom. To the youth, it offers only false hope. Burning an American flag does nothing to provide a child an education. Smashing apart a restaurant does not fill an empty stomach. Attacking an embassy won’t create a single job. That brand of politics only makes it harder to achieve what we must do together: educating our children, and creating the opportunities that they deserve; protecting human rights, and extending democracy’s promise.

30. Understand America will never retreat from the world. We will bring justice to those who harm our citizens and our friends, and we will stand with our allies. We are willing to partner with countries around the world to deepen ties of trade and investment, and science and technology, energy and development -- all efforts that can spark economic growth for all our people and stabilize democratic change. But such efforts depend on a spirit of mutual interest and mutual respect.

31. No government or company, no school or NGO will be confident working in a country where its people are endangered. For partnerships to be effective our citizens must be secure and our efforts must be welcomed. A politics based only on anger -- one based on dividing the world between "us" and "them" -- not only sets back international cooperation, it ultimately undermines those who tolerate it. All of us have an interest in standing up to these forces.

32. Let us remember that Muslims have suffered the most at the hands of extremism. On the same day our civilians were killed in Benghazi, a Turkish police officer was murdered in Istanbul only days before his wedding; more than 10 Yemenis were killed in a car bomb in Sana’a; several Afghan children were mourned by their parents, just days after they were killed by a suicide bomber in Kabul.
33. The impulse towards intolerance and violence may initially be focused on the West, but over time it cannot be contained. The same impulses toward extremism are used to justify war between Sunni and Shia, between tribes and clans. It leads not to strength and prosperity but to chaos.

34. In less than two years, we have seen largely peaceful protests bring more change to Muslim-majority countries than a decade of violence. And extremists understand this. Because they have nothing to offer to improve the lives of people, violence is their only way to stay relevant. They don’t build; they only destroy. It is time to leave the call of violence and the politics of division behind.

35. On so many issues, we face a choice between the promise of the future, or the prisons of the past. And we cannot afford to get it wrong. We must seize this moment. And America stands ready to work with all who are willing to embrace a better future.

36. The future must not belong to those who target Coptic Christians in Egypt -- it must be claimed by those in Tahrir Square who chanted, "Muslims, Christians, we are one." The future must not belong to those who bully women -- it must be shaped by girls who go to school, and those who stand for a world where our daughters can live their dreams just like our sons. The future must not belong to those corrupt few who steal a country’s resources -- it must be won by the students and entrepreneurs, the workers and business owners who seek a broader prosperity for all people. Those are the women and men that America stands with; theirs is the vision we will support. The future must not belong to those who slander the prophet of Islam. But to be credible, those who condemn that slander must also condemn the hate we see in the images of Jesus Christ that are desecrated, or churches that are destroyed, or the Holocaust that is denied.

37. Let us condemn incitement against Sufi Muslims and Shiite pilgrims. It’s time to heed the words of Gandhi: "Intolerance is itself a form of violence and an obstacle to the growth of a true democratic spirit." Together, we must work towards a world where we are strengthened by our differences, and not defined by them. That is what America embodies, that’s the vision we will support.

38. Among Israelis and Palestinians, the future must not belong to those who turn their backs on a prospect of peace. Let us leave behind those who thrive on conflict, those who reject the right of Israel to exist. The road is hard, but the destination is clear -- a secure, Jewish state of Israel and an independent, prosperous Palestine. Understanding that such a peace must come through a just agreement between the parties, America will walk alongside all who are prepared to make that journey.

39. In Syria, the future must not belong to a dictator who massacres his people. If there is a cause that cries out for protest in the world today, peaceful protest, it is a regime that tortures children and shoots rockets at apartment buildings. And we must remain engaged
to assure that what began with citizens demanding their rights does not end in a cycle of sectarian violence.

40. Together, we must stand with those Syrians who believe in a different vision -- a Syria that is united and inclusive, where children don’t need to fear their own government, and all Syrians have a say in how they are governed -- Sunnis and Alawites, Kurds and Christians. That’s what America stands for.

41. That is the outcome that we will work for -- with sanctions and consequences for those who persecute, and assistance and support for those who work for this common good. Because we believe that the Syrians who embrace this vision will have the strength and the legitimacy to lead.

42. In Iran, we see where the path of a violent and unaccountable ideology leads. The Iranian people have a remarkable and ancient history, and many Iranians wish to enjoy peace and prosperity alongside their neighbors. But just as it restricts the rights of its own people, the Iranian government continues to prop up a dictator in Damascus and supports terrorist groups abroad. Time and again, it has failed to take the opportunity to demonstrate that its nuclear program is peaceful, and to meet its obligations to the United Nations. So let me be clear. America wants to resolve this issue through diplomacy, and we believe that there is still time and space to do so. But that time is not unlimited.

43. We respect the right of nations to access peaceful nuclear power, but one of the purposes of the United Nations is to see that we harness that power for peace. And make no mistake, a nuclear-armed Iran is not a challenge that can be contained. It would threaten the elimination of Israel, the security of Gulf nations, and the stability of the global economy. It risks triggering a nuclear-arms race in the region, and the unraveling of the non-proliferation treaty. That’s why a coalition of countries is holding the Iranian government accountable. And that’s why the United States will do what we must to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

44. We know from painful experience that the path to security and prosperity does not lie outside the boundaries of international law and respect for human rights. That’s why this institution was established from the rubble of conflict. That is why liberty triumphed over tyranny in the Cold War. And that is the lesson of the last two decades as well. History shows that peace and progress come to those who make the right choices. Nations in every part of the world have traveled this difficult path. Europe, the bloodiest battlefield of the 20th century, is united, free and at peace. From Brazil to South Africa, from Turkey to South Korea, from India to Indonesia, people of different races, religions, and traditions have lifted millions out of poverty, while respecting the rights of their citizens and meeting their responsibilities as nations. And it is because of the progress that I’ve witnessed in my
own lifetime, the progress that I’ve witnessed after nearly four years as President that I remain ever hopeful about the world that we live in.

45. The war in Iraq is over. American troops have come home. We’ve begun a transition in Afghanistan, and America and our allies will end our war on schedule in 2014. Al Qaeda has been weakened, and Osama bin Laden is no more. Nations have come together to lock down nuclear materials, and America and Russia are reducing our arsenals. We have seen hard choices made -- from Naypyidaw to Cairo to Abidjan -- to put more power in the hands of citizens.

46. At a time of economic challenge, the world has come together to broaden prosperity. Through the G20, we have partnered with emerging countries to keep the world on the path of recovery. America has pursued a development agenda that fuels growth and breaks dependency, and worked with African leaders to help them feed their nations. New partnerships have been forged to combat corruption and promote government that is open and transparent, and new commitments have been made through the Equal Futures Partnership to ensure that women and girls can fully participate in politics and pursue opportunity. And later today, I will discuss our efforts to combat the scourge of human trafficking. All these things give me hope. But what gives me the most hope is not the actions of us, not the actions of leaders -- it is the people that I’ve seen.

47. The American troops who have risked their lives and sacrificed their limbs for strangers half a world away; the students in Jakarta or Seoul who are eager to use their knowledge to benefit mankind; the faces in a square in Prague or a parliament in Ghana who see democracy giving voice to their aspirations; the young people in the favelas of Rio and the schools of Mumbai whose eyes shine with promise. These men, women, and children of every race and every faith remind me that for every angry mob that gets shown on television, there are billions around the world who share similar hopes and dreams. They tell us that there is a common heartbeat to humanity. So much attention in our world turns to what divides us. That’s what we see on the news. That's what consumes our political debates. But when you strip it all away, people everywhere long for the freedom to determine their destiny; the dignity that comes with work; the comfort that comes with faith; and the justice that exists when governments serve their people – and not the other way around.

48. The United States of America will always stand up for these aspirations, for our own people and for people all across the world. That was our founding purpose. That is what our history shows. That is what Chris Stevens worked for throughout his life. And I promise you this: Long after the killers are brought to justice, Chris Stevens’s legacy will live on in the lives that he touched -- in the tens of thousands who marched against violence through the streets of Benghazi; in the Libyans who changed their Facebook photo to one of Chris; in the signs that read, simply, "Chris Stevens was a friend to all Libyans." They
should give us hope. They should remind us that so long as we work for it, justice will be
done, that history is on our side, and that a rising tide of liberty will never be reversed.

Thank you very much
APPENDIX B

Speech of President Asif Ali Zardari

September 26, 2012

Bismilla hirrahmaan irrahim –

Assalam-o-Alaikum — Peace be upon you.

1. Before I take up my speech, I want to express the strongest condemnation for the acts of incitement of hate against the faith of billions of Muslims of the world and our beloved prophet, Mohammad (Peace be upon him). Although we can never condone violence, the International community must not become silent observers and should criminalize such acts that destroy the peace of the world and endanger world security by misusing freedom of expression. Pakistan moves the United Nations to immediately address this alarming concern and bridge the widening rift to enable the comity of nations to be one again.

2. Mr. President,

I want to congratulate you on your election to this important post.

I want to convey our appreciation of the previous President, His Excellency Nassir Abdulaziz Al Nasser, from our brotherly state of Qatar, who skillfully preceded you.

I would like to further express our appreciation for the laudable work of the honorable Secretary General Ban Ki Moon. We greatly appreciate his leadership in guiding the work of this organization. (will have to be seen again)

3. It is a special privilege to be with you today, representing the brave and courageous people of Pakistan.

Globally, we face enormous challenges. But with collective efforts and commitment we can provide a better future to our people. We must work to end poverty. We must work to protect the planet, and mitigate climate change. We must ensure equal rights to all peoples, and protect the weak & vulnerable. We must pursue justice and fairness for all people. We must pursue the peaceful settlement of international disputes. We must save our current and future generations from the horrors of war.
4. I think of my own three children and the generations of children yet unborn. They, and all the children of the world, deserve safety, stability, and security. These goals have guided me throughout my four years in office as President of Pakistan. These are the goals and principles about which I want to talk to you today.

5. Mr. President,

Pakistan’s engagement with the United Nations lies at the heart of these goals. We are proud of going above and beyond the call of duty in fulfilling our international responsibilities.

6. Pakistan has consistently been among the top UN peacekeeping troop contributors for many years. Today, over 10,000 Pakistani troops proudly wear the UN Blue Helmets in the service of our brothers and sisters around the world.

7. Mr. President,

Our election to the Security Council reflects our commitment to world peace. It is also a vote of confidence by the international community for Pakistan. The UN represents our common aspirations for peace and development. However, it needs reform. The UN system must become more democratic and more accountable. Reform should be based on consensus and democratic principles.

8. Mr. President,

In the last several years, Pakistan has repeatedly suffered from natural calamities. The people of Pakistan appreciate the support of the United Nations and the international community.

9. Mr. President,

Being a democratic country, we believe that legitimate aspirations of any people should be accommodated peacefully. And in a manner consistent with sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity. We support the rights of the Palestinian people and an independent Palestinian State. We also favor the admission of Palestine as a full member of the United Nations.

10. Mr. President,

There are a lot of questions that are asked of Pakistan these days. I am not here to answer questions about Pakistan. The people of Pakistan have already answered them. The politicians of Pakistan have answered them. The soldiers of Pakistan have answered them. We have lost over seven thousand Pakistani soldiers and policemen, and over 37,000 civilians. We have lost our Minister for Minority Affairs, Shahbaz Bhatti and my friend Salmaan Taseer, the Governor of our most populous province of Punjab, to the mindset of extremism.
11. And I need not remind my friends here today, that I bear a personal scar.

    On December 27, 2007 knowing her life was under threat from the mindset she had warned the world against, Pakistan’s first elected woman leader and my wife Shaheed Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto was martyred through the bullets and bombs of terrorists.

12. Terrorism and extremism have destroyed human lives, torn social fabric, and devastated the economy. Our economy, our lives, our ability to live in the shadow of our Sufi saints and our freedom-loving forefathers have been challenged. We have responded. Our soldiers have responded. So I am not here to answer questions about Pakistan. I am here to ask some questions on behalf of my people. On behalf of the two year old baby who was killed in the bombing at Lahore’s Moon Market on December 7, 2009. On behalf of Pervaiz Masih, a Christian Pakistani, who was killed with six others, trying to protect Muslim Pakistanis during a bomb attack on the Islamic University in Islamabad on October 20, 2009. On behalf of Mr. GHA-YYOR, the Commandant of the Frontier Constabulary police force in Peshawar, who was martyred by militants on August 4, 2010. On behalf of the traders and businessmen in Peshawar, Quetta, Lahore and Karachi, of the dozens of marketplaces that have been ravaged by multiple bombings. Over and over and over again. And perhaps most of all, on behalf of my three children, whose mother Shaheed Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto was also martyred by terrorists.

13. Mr. President,

    For more than thirty years, our doors have been open to my Afghan brothers and sisters. For many years, we were left to fend for ourselves and our Afghan guests.

14. Mr. President,

    I remember the red carpet that was rolled out for all the dictators in our country – dictators who promised the international community the moon – while Pakistan was kept in the dark. These dictators and their regimes are responsible for suffocating and throttling Pakistan, Pakistan’s institutions, and Pakistani democracy. I remember the judicial execution of Pakistan’s first elected leader, Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto. I remember the jailing of Pakistan’s elected leaders. I remember the twelve years I, myself spent in prison. And I remember the billions provided by the international community to support those dictatorships. My country’s social fabric, its very character has been altered. Our condition today is a product of dictatorships.

15. Mr. President,

    No country and no people have suffered more in the epic struggle against terrorism, than Pakistan. Drone strikes and civilian casualties on our territory add to the complexity of our battle for hearts and minds through this epic struggle. To those
who say we have not done enough, I say in all humility: Please do not insult the memory of our dead, and the pain of our living. Do not ask of my people, what no one has ever asked of any other peoples. Do not demonize the innocent women, and children of Pakistan. And please, stop this refrain to do more. The simplest question of all is: How much more suffering can Pakistan endure?

16. Mr. President,

I am sure the international community does not want any suffering anywhere, least of all in Pakistan. We believe in fact, that the international community is a partner. This is because it is the common interest of all nations to work together.

17. In Pakistan, I have helped bring about a major strategic shift in how we view working together. Within Pakistan, our democracy has brought about major changes. InshaAllah, this will be the first civilian government in Pakistan’s sixty-six year history to complete its full, five year term. In this time, Parliament has passed unprecedented reforms. We have restored the consensus 1973 Constitution. The National Assembly has enacted wide ranging social reforms. We have established a National Commission on Women and a National Commission on Human Rights. We have established for the very first time a truly Independent Election Commission, to ensure free, fair and transparent elections. Our media is free, uncensored and thriving. Our civil society is flourishing under the protection of democracy. We have created the first social safety net through the women of Pakistan for the weak and less privileged. Millions of families have benefitted. We have aided the poor and at the same time empowered the women of our households. This safety net is called the Benazir Income Support Program. These are the gifts of democracy. This is the dream of Shaheed Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto.

18. Mr. President,

The growing regional pivot in Pakistan’s foreign policy is a reflection of our democratic policy-making. In engaging with our region, we are changing the future. In China our strategic partnership is growing from strength to strength. In Afghanistan, we have begun to engage and deepen our friendship with the entire range of the Afghan political spectrum. We believe that a sovereign, stable and secure Afghanistan is good for the Afghan people. And what is good for the Afghan people is good for Pakistan. While our hearts and homes remain open to our Afghan brothers, it is imperative that the international community support the three million Afghan refugees in Pakistan in their quest to return home with dignity. A brighter Afghan future will only be possible when the search for peace is Afghan-owned, Afghan-driven and Afghan-led. We respect and support the efforts of the Government of Afghanistan for reconciliation and peace. Pakistan will support in
every way possible, any process that reflects Afghan national consensus. Similarly, we approach our relations with India on mutual trust. The contacts between our leadership are expanding. I was encouraged by my discussions with the Prime Minister of India last month in Tehran, who I met for the fifth time in four years.

19. Mr. President,

Our principled position on territorial disputes remains a bedrock of our foreign policy. We will continue to support the right of the people of Jammu & Kashmir to peacefully choose their destiny in accordance with the UN Security Council’s long-standing resolutions on this matter. Kashmir remains a symbol of the failures, rather than strengths of the UN system. We feel that resolution of these issues can only be arrived in an environment of cooperation. By normalizing trade relations, we want to create a regional South Asian narrative. This narrative will provide an environment that will mutually benefit the countries of our region.

20. Mr. President,

Along this road, there are pitfalls. One of them is the tendency to respond to failure through blame. Pakistan does not blame others for the challenges it faces. We believe we should look for win-win solutions. Regional cooperation and connectivity will bring us closer and bind us together. It will make us stakeholders in each other’s futures. Our hosting of a quadrilateral summit next month and our signing of the Afghan Pakistan Transit Trade Agreement are proof of this commitment to regional connectivity. In Pakistan, the lesson we learned, from the last thirty years, is that history cannot be changed. But the future can — a future that is brighter, more prosperous and more secure, not only for Pakistanis, but for all people of the region, and indeed the world.

21. Mr. President:

I must thank the member states of the European Union for recognizing the value of trade to Pakistan. We seek trade, rather than aid. By granting trade concession to Pakistan, the EU has sent a positive message. The trade concessions will help us revive the economy and fight terrorism.

22. Mr. President,

As we embark on this ambitious transformative experience, we are aware that there are threats and pitfalls. One of them is the spread and illegal trade of heroin. Despite the presence of international forces in Afghanistan, the size of the heroin trade has increased by 3000% in the last decade. The heroin industry is eroding the social fabric of our societies. Terrorist activities within our region and indeed all over the world are funded and fueled by the unrestricted production and sale of illegal drugs.
Pakistan has pursued an ambitious agenda to control this menace. We are coordinating with our neighbors and will hold a conference later this year to develop a unified approach to stamping out this drug trade. I call upon this august body, and especially those nations represented here who are actively engaged in the region. In this great hall of international collective action, let us begin this process here, today, together.

23. Mr. President, Excellencies, delegates, fellow citizens of the world:

I have committed my Presidency and my nation’s future to a paradigm shift. A permanent democratic future for Pakistan. It has not been easy. But nothing worth fighting for is easy. We long ago stopped thinking of doing what is easy. Instead, we have committed ourselves to doing what is right. In that regard, I recall the powerful words of my beloved martyred wife and my leader Shaheed Mohtarma Benazir Bhutto when she appeared before this august body sixteen years ago. Her words ring out and can guide us into a new future. She said in 1996:

“I dream of a third millennium in which the gap between rich and poor evaporates; in which illiteracy, hunger, malnutrition and disease are at last conquered;

I dream of a third millennium in which every child is planned, wanted, nurtured and supported; and in which the birth of a girl is welcomed with the same joy as that of a boy.

I dream of a millennium of tolerance and pluralism, in which people respect other people, nations respect other nations, and religions respect other religions.

That is the third millennium I see for my country and all of yours.”

We have made some progress towards achieving these goals.

But so much remains to be done. In her memory and in the name of God Almighty, Pakistan commits to that path again today. Thank you ladies and gentlemen, and may peace be upon you, and your countries, and the people of your countries.

Pakistan Zindabad.
Speech of United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki Moon

September 25, 2012

1. We gather annually in this great hall to look soberly, and without illusion, at the state of our world. This year, I am here to sound the alarm about our direction as a human family. We can all see widespread insecurity and injustice, inequality and intolerance. I see Governments wasting vast and precious funds on deadly weapons – while reducing investments in people. The severe and growing impacts of climate change are there before our eyes – yet too many people in power seem willfully blind to the threat. This is a time of turmoil, transition and transformation – a time when time itself is not on our side. People want jobs and the prospect of a decent life. All too often, what they get instead is divisiveness… delay… and denial of their dreams and aspirations.

2. We need to look no further than this room to see expressions of the thirst for progress. A large number of you are here for the first time – new leaders, installed by new voices, and expected to make decisive breaks with the past. Your people want to see results in real time, now, not the distant future. The United Nations rightly faces the same scrutiny — the same impatience — the same demands for accountability. People do not look to this organization to be simply a mirror reflecting back a divided world. People want progress and solutions today. They want ideas, your leadership and concrete hope for the future. Our duty is to respond to these frustrations and yearnings.

3. My action agenda highlights five imperatives, as I have set out in January this year: sustainable development, prevention, building a more secure world, helping countries in transition and empowering women and youth. I take heart from important steps forward on some of these fronts. Extreme poverty has been cut in half since the year 2000. Democratic transitions are under way in the Arab world, Myanmar and many other countries. Africa’s economic growth has become the fastest in the world. Asia and Latin America are making important advances. Still, we must raise our levels of ambition. We need more from each and every one of you. And the world needs more from our United Nations.

4. Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,
Sustainable development is the key to our hopes for the future. It is my top priority as Secretary-General. Yet poverty and inequalities are still rampant. Our use of resources threatens the planet’s limits. Ecosystems are reaching the breaking point. The world’s best science tells us we must change course before it is too late. Yesterday, the President of the World Bank and I announced that the Sustainable Energy for All initiative is ready to deliver tens of billions of dollars for energy access and efficiency. Tomorrow I will launch a new initiative – Education First. On Thursday we will announce major additional support for the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement.

5. And over the past two years, the 260 partners in our Every Woman Every Child initiative have disbursed $10 billion in new money. We are proving, on the ground, that well-constructed partnerships can, and are, delivering results that none of us can deliver alone. The deadline for the Millennium Development Goals is little more than three years away. We must intensify our efforts to eradicate extreme poverty. The economic crisis cannot be an excuse to default on your commitments to the basics that all people need. Even if we achieve the MDGs, there is still a long way to go. The Rio+20 conference has pointed the way, including towards a set of sustainable development goals. These new goals and the post-2015 development agenda will guide our work for years to come. The MDGs sparked a remarkable global mobilization. These new frameworks must do the same — speaking to and inspiring people across the world.

6. Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Action on climate change remains a major piece of unfinished business. Last December, Member States agreed to reach a legally binding agreement by 2015. Now, you must make good on this promise. Time is running out on our ability to limit the rise in global temperature to 2 degrees centigrade. Changing course will not be easy. But to see this as only a burden misses the bigger picture. Sustainability and the green economy offer compelling opportunities to promote jobs, growth, innovation and long-term stability. The future we want can be ours – if we act now.

7. Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Just as there can be no peace without development, there can be no development without peace. I am profoundly concerned about continued violence in Afghanistan and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I urge Sudan and South Sudan to resolve all remaining post-secession issues. Somalia has made courageous advances and Libya has held its first free elections in half a century. Gains must be nurtured and sustained. And we must keep our focus on preventing conflicts before they erupt — and on settling disputes through peaceful means. Myanmar’s leaders have shown courage and
determination in moving on the path of democracy and reconciliation. The country faces many challenges, from economic reform to the protection of ethnic minorities. As the Government and citizenry work together to meet these responsibilities, the international community and the United Nations must provide the strongest possible support.

8. Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The crisis in the Sahel is not getting sufficient attention and support. Poverty, fragility, drought and sectarian tensions are threats to stability across the region. Unconstitutional changes of government have taken place all too frequently. Extremism is on the rise. Arms are easy to obtain, while jobs are hard to find. The international community needs a major concerted effort to address this alarming situation. Tomorrow, I will outline our ideas for an integrated strategy. Governments and organizations in the region, as well as international partners, will work out the details in the coming weeks. I urge you to engage and give your strong assistance. The situation in the Sahel highlights the need to strengthen early warning for development. Sensors and seismographs across the world help us prepare for natural disasters. We must do more to detect the tremors of distress facing the poorest and most vulnerable. We must also focus greater attention on food security and nutritional resilience. For millions of people, frequent shocks are the new norm. Food prices are increasingly volatile, provoking public anxiety, panic buying and civil disturbance. We need to bolster safety nets. We must ramp up investments in sustainable agriculture – particularly for smallholder farmers. Governments must not impose trade restrictions on grains or other agricultural products. This reduces food supplies and discourages farmers from growing more. Together, we can avoid the food crises we have seen in recent years and achieve our goal of Zero Hunger.

9. Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The situation in Syria grows worse by the day. The crisis is no longer limited to Syria; it is a regional calamity with global ramifications. This is a serious and growing threat to international peace and security which requires Security Council action. I call on the international community – especially the members of the Security Council and countries in the region – to solidly and concretely support the efforts of Joint Special Representative Lakhdar Brahimi. We must stop the violence and flows of arms to both sides, and set in motion a Syrian-led transition as soon as possible. Humanitarian needs are escalating, in and beyond Syria. The international community should not look the other way as violence spirals out of control. Brutal human rights
abuses continue to be committed, mainly by the Government, but also by opposition
groups. Such crimes must not go unpunished. There is no statute of limitations for
such extreme violence. It is the duty of our generation to put an end to impunity for
international crimes, in Syria and elsewhere. It is our duty to give tangible meaning to
the responsibility to protect.

10. Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The winds of change in the Arab world and elsewhere will continue to blow. After
decades of harsh occupation and humiliating restrictions in almost every aspect of their
lives, the Palestinians must be able to realize their right to a viable state of their own.
Israel must be able to live in peace and security, free from threats and rockets. The two-
state solution is the only sustainable option. Yet the door may be closing, for good. The
continued growth of Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territory seriously
undermines efforts toward peace. We must break this dangerous impasse. I also reject
both the language of de-legitimization and threats of potential military action by one
state against another. Any such attacks would be devastating. The shrill war talk of
recent weeks has been alarming — and should remind us of the need for peaceful
solutions and full respect for the UN Charter and international law. Leaders have a
responsibility to use their voices to lower tensions instead of raising the temperature
and volatility of the moment. Building a more secure world also means pursuing our
goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. As long as such weapons exist, we are all at
risk. I look forward to a successful conference later this year on the establishment of a
Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction.
Iran must prove the solely peaceful intent of its programme. The Democratic People’s
Republic of Korea must move toward de-nuclearization of the Korean peninsula. All
relevant Security Council resolutions should be implemented in full and without delay.

11. Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We shall have neither peace nor development without respect for human rights and the
rule of law. The empowerment of women. The protection of children. The treaties and
declarations that have extended the umbrella of protection. They are our touchstones.
Yesterday’s high-level meeting on the rule of law sent a strong message about the
importance of international law, justice and institutions within and among nations. Over
the past two weeks a disgraceful act of great insensitivity has led to justifiable offense
and unjustifiable violence. Freedom of speech and assembly are fundamental. But
neither of these freedoms is a license to incite or commit violence. Yet we live in a
world where, too often, divisions are exploited for short-term political gain. Too many
people are ready to take small flames of difference and turn them into a bonfire. Too many people are tolerant of intolerance. The moderate majority should not be a silent majority. It must empower itself, and say to bigots and extremists alike: “you do not speak for us”. Responsible political and community leaders must step up at this time.

12. Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

With so much at stake, the United Nations must continue to renew itself. We must deliver as one — across disciplines, structures and locations. We are building a global Secretariat to support our global presence. That means shared services, integrated approaches and innovative uses of technology. Staff mobility is a crucial first step. This initiative is long overdue. We will be making a proposal in the weeks ahead, and we will need your support. Let us work together for a streamlined budget process built on trust. Micromanagement serves no one — not Member States wanting quick results, and not we in the Secretariat who share your desire for excellence. As Secretary-General, I need space to manage in a dynamic environment. Let us also prepare ourselves to harness the full power of partnerships across the range of issue areas. I will soon offer specific proposals for strengthening our partnership capacity. This will allow us to deliver more and better results, enhance accountability and improve coherence. Your support will be essential if we are to meet the many important mandates you give the United Nations. A strengthened United Nations is a key enabler for all that we hope to achieve for the world’s people. Let us prove that the UN can reform itself and keep pace.

13. Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have always put people first, and challenges at the centre. We have worked together for solutions to the problems that matter to people by day – and that keep them up at night. You, the world’s leaders, hold in your hands the power of the state… the levers of government… Your people expect you to listen to their aspirations, and to unleash their energies and ideas. The world expects you to work with each other for the common good. Nobody can do everything. But each of us, in our own way, can do something. Together, if all uphold our responsibilities, we can meet today’s tests, seize the opportunities of an era of dramatic change, and give new life to the principles and purposes of our founding Charter.

Thank you.
1. Mr. President, my presence here today in the General Assembly has multiple significance. I am the first Egyptian civilian President elected democratically and freely following a great peaceful revolution hailed by the inside world. This revolution established a genuine legitimacy through the effort of all Egyptians inside and outside Egypt and with the grace of God.

Today, every Egyptian shares this sense of self confidence allowing all of them to claim a higher moral ground. We have taken several steps on the road to establishing the modern state the Egyptians aspire to see – one that is in tune with the present based on the rule of law, democracy and respect for human rights. A constitutional state that does not compromise the values firmly embedded in the souls of all Egyptians. A state that seeks justice, truth, freedom, dignity and social justice.

2. The Egyptian revolution that was founded on the legitimacy that I represent – the legitimacy that I represent before you today – was not the product of a fleeting moment or a brief uprising nor was it a product of the winds of change of spring or autumn.

Rather, this revolution and all the ones preceding it and following it in the region were triggered by a long struggle of genuine national movements that sought a life of pride and dignity for all citizens. It is thereby reflecting the wisdom of history and sending a clear warning to those attempting to place their interests before those of their people.

3. Mr. President, the vision of the new Egypt that we strive to realize for our nation – God willing – also constitutes the frame of action we present to the world and which should guide our cooperation with the international community in a spirit of equality and mutual respect entailing non-intervention in the affair of other states as well as the implementation of international principles, agreements, and conventions. Today, we reiterate our commitment to them, particularly the United Nations Charter, which Egypt took part in drafting.
Through continued work to settle problems and dealing with the root causes without relinquishing the principles of law or well-established values, which if compromised can lead to grave consequences for the international community if those who were rational and reasonable in the world would not pay heed.

4. Mr. President, the first issue which the world must make all effort to resolve on the basis of justice and dignity is the Palestinian cause.

Long decades have passed since the Palestinian people expressed their desire to restore all their full rights and to build their independent state with Jerusalem as its capitol.

Despite the continued struggle of this people through all legitimate means to attain their rights and despite the acceptance of the representatives of the resolutions adopted by the international community as the basis for resolving their problems – despite all of this, this international legitimacy remains unable until now to achieve the hopes and aspirations of the Palestinian people.

These resolutions remain far from being implemented. The fruits of dignity and freedom must not remain far from the Palestinian people.

5. It is shameful that the free world would accept that a party in the international community may continue to deny the rights of a nation that looks to independence over decades.

No matter what justification, it is also shameful that settlements continue on the territory of this people – the Palestinian people – and prevarication continues over implementing international resolutions.

6. From a premise of defending truth, freedom, and dignity and from my duty to support our Palestinian brothers and sisters, I place the international community before its responsibilities which require the achievement of a just and comprehensive peace and putting an end of all forms of occupation of Arab lands and the implementation of relevant international resolutions. I call for immediate movement – serious movement – as of now to put an end to colonization, occupation, and settlement and the alteration of the identity of occupied Jerusalem. I call for a peace that would establish an independent Palestinian state – sovereign Palestinian state, a peace that would achieve the security and stability long sought by the people of the region.

7. On the same basis, I assure you of Egypt’s full support to any course of action Palestine decides to follow in the United Nations.

I call upon you all – just as you’ve supported the revolutions of the Arab people – I call upon you to lend your support to the Palestinians and their endeavor to gain the full and legitimate rights of a people struggling to gain its freedom and establish an
independent state. – an independent state of Palestine based on the inalienable rights of the Palestinians.

We will continue to work next to the Palestinian people, supporting them until they get all their rights with their free will for all the Palestinians and every constituent of the Palestinian people.

8. Mr. President, while are we talking here in this international forum, we have to address a question that remains a source of concern for the whole world – namely, the bloodshed and the tragedy – the human tragedy – in Syria. The bloodshed that must be stopped immediately is our main concern, our first concern.

9. The blood that’s being shed on the land of beloved Syria is far too dear to continue to be shed day and night. The Syrian people, dear to our hearts and the hearts of every Egyptian, deserve to hope for a future of freedom and dignity.

This has been the essence of the initiative I proposed in the holy city of Mecca during last Ramadan and I have reiterated on subsequent occasions to avoid the worst – to avoid the worst – and to prevent the continued suffering of the Syrian people and the conflict turning into a full-scale civil war, God forbid, with negative effects extending beyond Syria and its immediate neighbors.

10. Egypt, along with the three other countries involved in our initiatives, has held meetings that have shown that there are many areas of commonalities. We will continue to work to put an end to the suffering of the Syrian people and provide for them with an opportunity to choose freely the regime that best represents them.

11. After this regime – the current regime comes to an end – the regime that kills its people day and night – after this regime comes to an end, the Syrian people will choose with their own free will a regime that represents and places Syria in its right place among democratic countries so that it can continue to contribute to its Arab common march and its regional and international role based on solid legitimate foundations.

12. I would like to emphasize here that this initiative is open to all. It is not just the purview of its starting parties but it is open to all who wish to contribute positively to resolving the Syrian crisis. This crisis we’re all responsible for. This suffering – we all have to move the world over to put an end to this tragedy. It is the tragedy of the age and our duty is to end this tragedy.

Egypt is committed to pursuing the sincere efforts it has been making to put an end to the tragedy in Syria within an Arab regional and international framework – a framework that preserves the unity of this brotherly state and it would involve all sections of the Syrian people without discrimination based on race, religion, or sex. It
would spare Syria the danger of foreign military intervention which we oppose, of course.

13. Egypt is also committed to supporting the mission of Mr. Brahimi, the joint special representative of the U.N. and the League of Arab States to Syria, and continuing the current efforts aiming at unifying the Syrian opposition and encouraging it to propose a comprehensive unified vision of the steady, democratic organized transfer of power in a manner that preserves the rights of all constituencies in Syria and maintains the essential places in the new Syria. The new Syria after the new Egypt, God willing.

I cannot fail here to reiterate that Egypt will work so that this Arab nation would occupy its rightful place in the world. This nation – this Arab nation – is an integral component of Egypt’s vision of its national security, of the larger homeland that extends from the Arab gulf to the Atlantic Ocean. And it’s a huge field for the opportunities of cooperation and interactions with the countries of the whole world.

14. Egypt also considers the extremely valuable contribution of the Arab world with the wider Islamic sphere is vital to promoting joint action within the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Egypt will make every effort to ensure that the next OIC conference due early next year in Egypt – Egypt will make sure that this will strengthen mutual understandings between the Islamic countries and the rest of the world and would set in motion the principles of dialogue of civilizations to eliminate the causes of misunderstanding employed by fanatics on both sides to wrongly prove that the differences between us are great to achieve political goals completely unrelated to the noble ideals of religions or human values and ethics.

15. Mr. President, our brothers and sisters in the Sudan need more than ever today your support. This country seeks to achieve stability and development and works on building healthy and ideal relations with South Sudan. This nascent state, which we believe is qualified along with our brotherly Sudan, to become the center of cooperation between the Arab World and African countries. Sudan has made great sacrifices in its quest for peace and stability. It has committed itself to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, otherwise known as CPA. It was also the first country to recognize the nascent state of South Sudan.

But let me be frank. It – that is, the Sudan – has not received the support it deserves. It is now high time for the international efforts to rally in support of the Sudan and work on settling differences between the Sudan and its neighboring South Sudan to resolve all outstanding issues.

16. Mr. President, the success of the difficult transition phase that the Somali people have gone through by electing his excellency Hasan Sheikh Mohamoud as their President is a positive step toward stability and unity after a very difficult period. I call upon the United Nations to continue supporting the efforts made by the Somali government and
to fend off those who seek to hinder the efforts and to achieve stability and to construct public institutions and achieve the aspirations of the Somali people for a better future.

17. Mr. President, the principles of justice and righteousness are linked to achieving security and stability, particularly in the Middle East. Over many years, some have wrongfully sought to obtain stability through oppression and tyranny. Some of us, alas, have applauded their bad deeds. But now that the people of the region have obtained their freedom, they will not tolerate and they will not allow being deprived of their rights whether by their own leaders or outside forces. The will of the people, especially in our region, no longer tolerates the continued non-application of any country – any country – to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the non-application of the safeguards regime to their nuclear facilities, especially if this is coupled with irresponsible policies or arbitrary threats. In this regard, the acceptance by the international community of the pre-emptiveness or the attempt to legitimize it is in itself a serious matter and must be confronted to avoid the prevalence of the law of the jungle.

18. Cognizant of the danger that the status quo represents for the security of this important region with its natural resources and trade corridors, Egypt stresses the need to mobilize international efforts to hold a conference on declaring a Middle East free of nuclear weapons zone and all other weapons of mass destruction before the end of the current year 2012 with the participation of all concerned without exception. Let me say it perfectly clear – perfectly clearly. The only solution is to get rid of nuclear weapons. There’s no other alternatives. All weapons of mass destruction. Meanwhile, we also emphasize the right of all countries of the world – all countries of the world and all countries of the region – of course, including Egypt, that they have the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy within the framework of the NPT. And with a commitment – a commitment by all these countries – to honor their obligations in this respect, providing the necessary guarantees to the countries of the region so as to remove any suspicion surrounding the peaceful intentions of these programs.

19. Mr. President, the concepts of justice, truth and dignity encompass, in our view, the frameworks that govern international relations. There’s no doubt that a review of these international relations would undoubtedly reveal the extent of the injustices inflicted upon the African continent. I don’t think I need to go through the previous commitments that were made in this hall to bolster development and economic growth in Africa through aid and investments.

20. The world has a responsibility – the world has a responsibility – to support Africa’s efforts beyond mere promises through providing assistance needed to restore the treasures of African countries stolen over consecutive eras – the last of which was when some thought that supporting unjust regimes would assist in achieving a fake stability that protects their interests while these regimes were spreading corruption and smuggling the wealth of these countries outside the homeland. I’m aware that achieving the desired goals can only be done through the active participation of the people of this
continent and the assumption of the responsibilities. This is something that we, as Africans, are ready and willing to do in our quest for a better future for our countries.

21. Today, we as Africans have to achieve for our continent a new set of ambitious goals that would ensure that Africans are on the right track toward sustainable development and achieve the aspiration for a better future and a re-participation for Africa in the international economic order. I assure you that Egypt will continue to work in support of its brothers and sisters in Africa. Egypt is ready to cooperate with any stakeholder or party in or outside the continent to raise the living standards of Africa through the exchange of expertise and best practices. We look at the current international system and feel that we need to work seriously to repair this international order based on the principle that would renew its legitimacy and maintain its credibility. This is a legitimate demand of people, of nations that express themselves and would like to participate in a new world for a new future for its sons and daughters.

22. The effective role of the General Assembly as a democratic forum that would express the will of the international community and the change in the structure of the Security Council, which still represents an era that’s completely obsolete as far as our country was concerned. Both the General Assembly and the Security Council must be reformed, must be reformed as an outmost priority that has to be dealt with the necessary seriousness. I would like to emphasize the need for the United Nations to give special attention to supporting issues of women and youth. I have proposed during the [incomprehensible audio translation] movements a new initiative to establish a U.N. body solely dedicated to youth issues, giving particular attention to the issues of education, training, employment, and improving youth’s participation in political life. This would bolster the capacity of future generations to achieve their aspirations.

23. Mr. President,

Egypt stresses that the international system will not be fixed as long as we have double standards. We expect from others as they expect from us: that they respect our cultural specificities and religious references and not to seek to impose concepts or cultures that are not acceptable to us or politicize certain issues and use them as a pretext to intervene in the affairs of others.

But Muslims and migrants are going through a number of countries in certain regions in the world in terms of discrimination and violations of their human rights and vicious campaigns against what they hold sacred is unacceptable.

24. This is unacceptable the behavior by some – some individuals. And the insults heard on the Prophet of Islam Muhammad is rejected. We reject this. We cannot accept this, and we will be the opponents of those who do this. We will not allow anyone to do this by word or deed. This runs against the most basic principles of the organization of
where we meet today, and unfortunately today it has now acquired a name, which is Islamophobia.

25. We all have to work together. We must join hands in confronting these regressive ideas that hinder cooperation among us. We must move together to confront extremism and discrimination and incitement to hatred on the basis of religion or race.

The General Assembly as well as the Security Council has a main responsibility in addressing this phenomenon that is starting to have implications that clearly affect international peace and security.

26. The obscenities that I have referred to from a recently released [video] as part of an organized campaign against Islamic sanctities are unacceptable and require a promise of firm stance. We have a responsibility in this international gathering to study how we can protect the world from instability and hatred.

27. Egypt respects freedom of expression – freedom of expression that is not used to incite hatred against anyone – not a freedom of expression that target a specific religion or a specific culture. A freedom of expression that tackle extremism and violence – not a freedom of expression that deepens ignorance and disregards others. But we also, as we have said before and reaffirmed before, we also stand firmly against the use of violence in expressing objections to these obscenities.

28. Mr. President, before I conclude, I must say the severity and recurrence of financial economic crises – must lead us to review the international economic decision-making process that affect the fate of people that do not participate in their preparation yet they’re the first to bear the negative consequences of growth, trade and the environment as well as on the social fabric of society as a result of unfair trade rules and conditionalities imposed on the transfer of technology and access to the necessary finances to development.

There is a need for a new global economic governance. I say there’s an urgent need for a new global economic governance centered on people and aiming at consolidating cooperation between partners in the development on the basis of mutual benefits and interests.

29. Mr. President, I have laid before you our vision – a vision shared by the Egyptian people. I’ve also attempted to briefly outline Egypt’s views on the main issues – the visions of the young and the children, women and the men in Egypt on all important questions that the Middle East, Africa, and the world. From this perspective, I am sure that the United Nations is capable of assuming its intended job in addressing all global and regional challenges through dialogue, understanding, and joint cooperation in accordance with the principles of international law.
Egypt, post-revolution, will spare no effort in dealing sincerely with all the members of this organization. We will always remain at the forefront of international endeavor aiming at achieving freedom, justice and dignity of all peoples as well as social justice for all peoples including security and stability for all our countries.

30. I look forward – I look forward with optimism – great optimism, and I see the peace that we all call for prevailing all over this world. Peace that is based on justice. A peace that would give all their rights undiminished. A peace that does not discriminate between one and another for any reason. This peace will not prevail until we all cooperate, until we all realize that we are all equal and that we share many aspiration and ambitions. A peace whose message I bring to you – a peace of right and justice, stability and development, inter-dependence, love and mutual respect. I don’t believe that this is difficult for all of us if we extend our hand – our hand of cooperation, a sincere intention, and a righteous work. God, as our witness, we are all hopeful that we will see a better future for this world.

I thank you all and peace and prayers be upon you.
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1. Mr. President,

Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Every year our gathering in this prestigious hall is a manifestation of our faith in the fundamental equality of nations, as well as the continued relevance of the United Nations as the key international forum for achieving a safer, more secure and prosperous world. The General Assembly is a unique opportunity to engage in sincere and result-oriented dialogue with a view to addressing the challenges that confront us all.

2. As we speak today, the world is shaken by the depravity of fanatics who have committed acts of insult against the faith of over 1.5 billion Muslims. We strongly condemn these offensive acts, whether it involves the production of a film, the publication of cartoons, or indeed any other acts of insult and provocation. Such acts can never be justified as freedom of speech or expression. Equally, they cannot give reason for the genuine protests to be used to incite violence and chaos with terrible losses of innocent lives.

3. It is a matter of grave concern that our world remains strewn by daily occurrence of violence, hatred, and injustice. In particular, the menace of Islamophobia is a worrying phenomenon that threatens peace and co-existence among cultures and civilizations. I call upon leaders in the West, both politicians and the media, to confront Islamophobia in all its many forms and manifestations.

It is incumbent upon us all to advance the cause of dialogue and cooperation, to fight the forces of division and hatred and to fulfill the promise of a better and brighter future for coming generations. We must work to defeat the protagonists of the conflict of civilizations and support the voices of tolerance and understanding.

4. Mr. President,

My country Afghanistan is testament to the benefits of multi-lateral cooperation and international solidarity. It was a little over a decade ago when many countries from across the world joined the Afghan people in our struggle for peace and against the
forces of extremism and terrorism. At the time, Afghanistan was a country decimated in all regards. For decades, we had suffered unnoticed from violence, deprivation, and from sinister foreign interference. Long before terrorism struck the world as a common security threat, Afghans were the victims of the atrocity of terrorist networks from different parts of the world that had made Afghanistan their haven.

5. Looking back to ten years ago, Afghanistan has transformed remarkably. Democracy has taken root; health services are accessible to the majority of the population, in all corners of the country; millions of students – boys and girls – are enrolled in primary and higher education.

6. Our achievements have not come about easily, and the true aspirations of the Afghan people for peaceful, prosperous lives are yet to be realized. As the world’s fight against terrorism continues unabated, the Afghan people continue to pay the biggest price any nation has paid – in both life and treasure.

7. Terrorism is not rooted in the Afghan villages and towns – it never was. Its sources and its support networks all exist beyond Afghanistan’s borders. Therefore, while the international community’s security is being safeguarded from the threat of terrorism, the people of Afghanistan must no longer be made to pay the price and endure the brunt of the war. It is in deference to the immense sacrifices of the Afghan people, and the precious lives lost from the international community, that the campaign against terrorism must be taken to the sources of terrorism and must be result-oriented.

8. Mr. President,

Today in Afghanistan, we pursue the cause of peace and an end to violence as a matter of great urgency. Peace being the utmost desire of the Afghan people and convinced that military effort alone is not an adequate strategy to bring security, we have initiated the peace and reconciliation process which aims to bring all elements of the armed opposition to peaceful lives in the society.

9. Last year this month, my attendance at the UNGA was cut short by the tragic assassination of Professor Burhanuddin Rabbani, the then Chairman of the High Peace Council. His life was taken by a terrorist who posed as a peace emissary, and by doing so dealt our peace process a serious blow. This year, however, I am proud that late Professor Rabbani’s son, Mr Salahuddin Rabbani, who has stepped up to take the Chair of the HPC, is part of my delegation in New York.

10. As I have repeated often-times, my hand of peace and reconciliation remains extended not only to the Taliban but also to all other armed opposition groups who wish to return to dignified, peaceful and independent lives in their own homeland. What we
ask of them in return is simple: an end to violence, cutting ties with terrorist networks, preserving the valuable gains of the past decade, and respecting our Constitution.

11. To help facilitate the peace process, I ask of the United Nations Security Council to extend its full support to our efforts. In particular, I urge the 1988 Taliban’s Sanctions Committee to take more active measures towards delisting of Taliban leaders as a step to facilitate direct negotiations. In pursuing the path of peace, we remain hopeful for the critical role that our neighbor, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, has to play. Over the recent years, we have engaged our friends in Pakistan in a close dialogue in support of the Afghan peace process. It is a dialogue that, we believe, is critical for Pakistan’s own security, and the security of the wider region and beyond.

12. We are deeply committed to our brotherly relations with Pakistan, but are aware of the challenges that may strain our efforts at building trust and confidence. Such incidents as the recent shelling of Afghan villages risk undermining the efforts by both governments to work together in the interest of our common security.

13. Mr President,

During the past two years, our national priority has been to have Afghanistan’s own security forces assume full security responsibility. The Transition Process will be completed by mid-2013 and NATO and ISAF forces withdrawn from the country by end of 2014.

Apart from advancing Transition and pursuing the peace process, the past year has been one of significant progress for consolidating international commitment and partnership.

14. In Chicago last May, we received the long-term commitment by NATO and other countries for the training, equipping and ensuring the sustainability of Afghanistan’s national security forces. In Tokyo this past July, the international community reaffirmed strong commitment to Afghanistan’s social and economic development during the Transformation Decade, for which we are grateful.

The “mutual accountability framework,” adopted in Tokyo, sets in place a clear structure for a more result-oriented partnership and cooperation. We welcome the international community’s readiness to align aid with our national priorities and channel assistance through the Afghan budget. On our part, we reiterated our determination to improve governance and to collaborate with our international partners to wipe out the cancer of corruption – whether it is in the Afghan government or the international aid system.

15. Mr. President
We recognize that Afghanistan’s destiny is tied to the region that surrounds it – whether in face of our common threats, such as terrorism, extremism, and narcotics, or the opportunities we must grasp to grow and prosper. In this context, the Istanbul Process presents a new agenda for security, confidence-building and cooperation across the region of which Afghanistan is the centre. We will spare no effort to build strong and lasting relations with our neighbors – near and extended.

16. Mr President,

Turning to the international arena, Afghanistan views the situation in Syria with much concern. For over a year now, the thousands of our Syrian brothers and sisters have lost their lives due to an escalating cycle of violence. We welcome the appointment of the new Joint UN-Arab League Special Envoy for Syria, Lakhdar Brahimi. We know from Mr. Brahimi’s well-respected role in Afghanistan, that he brings with him vast experience and a unique ability to the task before him.

17. The continuing plight of the Palestinian people has been a deep source of distress for Afghanistan and the rest of the international community. The people of Palestine have suffered immensely, for far too long. We remain in full support of the realization of the rights of our brothers and sisters in Palestine, including their right to an independent Palestinian State. The time has come for an end to the occupation, and for realizing a just, comprehensive and peaceful solution to the conflict, based on the relevant resolutions of the UN General Assembly and Security Council.

18. And finally, the UN reform remains an important agenda at the international level. Since its inception in 1945, the UN has exercised a key role in promoting a safer and more secure world, improving the lives of citizens worldwide, and safeguarding and promoting human rights. Nevertheless, in view of our ever-changing world, we cannot negate the fact that this organization is in dire need of a comprehensive reform, enabling it to better reflect the new challenges and realities of our time. The reform of the UN Security Council is an issue long overdue. Achieving a reformed Council that is more inclusive, representative and transparent must remain a priority; and we welcome the ongoing progress within the framework of the inter-governmental negotiations (IGN).

Thank you.
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Bismillahirrahmanirrahim,

Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh,

May peace be upon us all,

1. Mr. President,

I am honored to represent my country Indonesia at this year's UN General Assembly debate to discuss how we can find better ways to peacefully resolve or manage conflicts around the world. This, of course, is what the UN is all about: to end the scourge of war, and to create a peaceful and equitable world order based on international cooperation. And in the decades since its founding, the UN has developed a number of instruments to address conflicts in all their manifestations. In those decades, many inter-state and intra-state conflicts have been resolved: Angola, Bosnia, Cambodia, Timor Leste, and many more. The question we must ask now is whether these instruments are adequate to address the whole spectrum of conflicts that the world community now faces.

2. This is clearly evident in the Syrian crisis. The world community is painfully witnessing the worsening violence and unfolding humanitarian catastrophe on the ground; at the same time, the UN is in paralysis in responding to the situation. There is no end to the conflict in sight, and it appears that we have not seen the worst of the crisis. Indonesia therefore reiterates its call for the immediate cessation of violence in Syria, which has taken a high toll on innocent civilian lives.

3. The UN Security Council must now unite and act decisively as mandated by the UN Charter to bring the situation under control. Clearly, whatever the explanation, the present international system for now cannot resolve the Syrian conflict. And there is every likelihood that the community of nations will see similar conflicts in the future. It will be in a different corner of the world, and in a different form, with different actors. It will not help the cause of international peace if, again, we end up being divided and unable to positively alter the course of the conflict.
4. The world community must evolve ways to address them more effectively towards peaceful end. We must adapt to 21st century security challenges. There is no question that the world we live in today is in much better condition than the one in the 20th century. Freedom has spread. The threat of nuclear holocaust is receding significantly. There is no prospect of a world war, the kind of which twice wrecked the 20th century.

5. The global economy has expanded remarkably. Nations are becoming more interdependent. International cooperation and partnerships are flourishing. However, it is only relative peace. Not total peace as yet. We have moved from the era of the Cold War to an era of warm peace. In this "warm peace", the world remains stuck with an outdated international security architecture that still reflects 20th century circumstances; in contrast with the global economic architecture that has done much better to adjust to the 21st century.

6. In this "warm peace", the relationships between the major powers, for the first time, are marked by relative stability and increased cooperation. But the question remains unanswered as to how they will accommodate the growing ranks of emerging powers that are reshaping the world order. In this "warm peace", old enmities and long-standing conflicts can still resurface in the new strategic landscape, even carried on by new generations.

7. In this "warm peace", we are seeing new security challenges and opportunities arising from seismic power shifts that are occurring in some regions. The security implications of the political events in the Middle-East are still unfolding.

8. In this "warm peace", the world community still has to contend with an array of unfinished business: the Arab-Israeli conflict, nuclear disarmament, territorial disputes in the South China Sea, tensions in the Korean Peninsula, and the likes. In this "warm peace", new progress can easily regress. Hard-won peace process can stall or even crumble. Strategic miscalculations in disputed theatres may lead to rising tension and armed clashes.

9. And in this "warm peace", pockets of hatred and bigotry, intolerance and extremism continue to litter our world. Perhaps we will have to live with this warm peace for decades. But I do believe that we can lower the temperature of this warm peace. Where possible, we can resolve the conflicts one by one. We can strengthen the building blocks for peace. We can promote a new globalism that can potentially change the dynamics of conflict resolution.

10. In order to do this, we need to try new approaches and be more imaginative. The first thing we have to do is to evolve a new strategic mindset. Let’s face it: the remnants of Cold War mentality still persist in parts of the geopolitical landscape—not least our own United Nations, where rigid, dogmatic, zero-sum calculations sometimes still
come into play. For long-term peace—a peace born of trust and mutual confidence - we must get rid of that mindset. In this light, we must continue to work towards a reformed UN Security Council. A Council that reflects 21st century strategic reality and provides security to all. We must also work to perfect the instruments of peace, which is robust regionalism.

11. We in ASEAN have seen how such regionalism can be a force for peace and cooperation. As a result of a strong regionalism, all of Southeast Asia have thrived under ASEAN cooperation. Once the cockpit of border wars and the proxy wars of extra-regional powers, Southeast Asia has come together. Since it was founded in 1967, it devoted the early decades of its life as a regional organization to cultivating the habits of dialogue and consultation and cooperation—not only among our members but with our dialogue partners. Thus each ASEAN country adopted a new strategic mindset based on trust and a sense of having a stake in the success and progress of all the others. Today the ASEAN family is united and at peace with itself and with the rest of the world.

At the same time we can also evolve a universal culture of mutual tolerance and mutual appreciation of one another's religious convictions. In such a world, the voice of the moderates—the voice of reason and compassion—would be heard clearly over the din of prejudice and bigotry. In a global regime of compassion and tolerance, no war is possible.

12. As a nation that celebrates its diversity of culture and religions, Indonesia calls for mutual respect and understanding among peoples of different faiths. Despite initiatives undertaken by states at the United Nations and other forums, the defamation of religions persists. We have seen yet another one of its ugly face in the film "Innocence of Muslims" that is now causing an international uproar. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights underlines that in exercising their freedom of expression, everyone must observe morality and public order. Freedom of expression is therefore not absolute. Hence, I call for an international instrument to effectively prevent incitement to hostility or violence based on religions or beliefs. This instrument, a product of international consensus, shall serve as a point of reference that the world community must comply with.

13. For good measure, we also need to promote a continuing process of dialogue among faiths, civilizations, and cultures. But of course this dialogue should not remain a dialogue, but should translate into actual cooperation so that communities in which peoples of different cultures and faiths can come together and care for one another. These communities will become bulwarks for peace and they will make it difficult if not impossible for any kind of armed conflict to erupt.

14. Yet another thing that we must do is to master the art of preventive diplomacy. Most disputes are intractable: they simmer for what seems to be an eternity but by historical
reckoning they are not really long-drawn-out affairs. Sooner or later, there comes a confluence of factors and events that provide a window of opportunity for resolving a dispute and removing conflict from the table of options.

15. This is what we in ASEAN have done with the potential conflicts in the South China Sea. The territorial and sovereignty disputes have been festering there for the better part of a century. But we are managing them with restraint, confidence building and, at present, through earnest negotiations toward a legally binding Code of Conduct in the South China Sea. And finally the culture of peace, mutual tolerance and appreciation, and cooperation must be supported by the right kind of economics. People need to be fed, to be sheltered and to be assured of a future where they have opportunities for a living and a livelihood. That is the only way that peace can be locked in for the long term—when it brings dividends that give human beings a robust confidence in the future.

16. The price of inequality between nations and within nations could be tension born of grievances that can, unless effectively addressed, lead to radicalism and even violence that threaten international and national peace and security. The solution is for all of us is to form a global partnership for poverty eradication and the attainment of the MDGs and after that formulate a post-MDGs development agenda that we can fully carry out. Our experience in the resolution of the intra-state conflict in our province of Aceh proves that if we do enough for peace, and when there is a confluence of favorable circumstances and we are prepared to seize the moment, then peace can be achieved. The peace that we achieve will not only give temporary respite, it will also last for generations.

17. Mr. President,

For many years peace has been treated as if it were a science and there are whole libraries about how it can be achieved and preserved. I have come to the conclusion, however, that peace may have a technology but it is one that is born of experience. That experience can be shared and can be useful in creating new experience. And if there is enough sharing of experiences—and this is what Indonesia is trying to achieve—and if there is sufficient political will to apply what is learned from others to one's unique circumstances, then peace can be widely spread. Peace can be effectively waged. And we would have a gentler, better world.

I thank you.