

# A Critical Discourse Analysis of President Barack Obama's "*Statement on Iran Nuclear Agreement*"

By Ali Qassim Ali (PhD) and Nazar Abdulhafidh Ubeid (PhD)

Dept. of English, College of Arts, Univ. of Basrah.

## Abstract:

This study examines President Barack Obama's Speech on "*Statement on Iran Nuclear Agreement*" in terms of Aristotelian rhetoric appeals which are Ethos, Pathos, and Logos. Aristotle considers them as three main persuasive strategies. The present study attempts to highlight how language is used by the speaker to present the three dimensions of argumentative persuasion and to manipulate them to present his stance as an authoritative speaker. He tries to explore the contents of ethos, pathos and logos. The results show that these three appeals are used in a persuasive way in this political speech.

Key words: CDA, Aristotle, Rhetoric, Persuasion, Political discourse, Barack Obama.

## 1. Introduction

Because of the difficult history between the United States and Iran, such a statement is considered as historical accord that could lead to a 'safer world'. Thus, president Obama attempts to persuade audience of such deal.

Human Language is used to express thoughts and ideas. It has so many different forms and aspects depending on various situations and different speaker's / writer's intentions. Rhetoric is generally known as an art that is related to the capability of writers or speakers to inform, persuade, or motivate audiences in specific situations.

Aristotle considers rhetoric as a counterpart of both logic and politics, and calls it "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion." He also states that "rhetoric is a combination of the science of logic and of the ethical branch of politics ..." Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. (Trans. W. Rhys Roberts: I: 2:1358a). Aristotle also provides three persuasive audience appeals, logos, pathos, and ethos for understanding, discovering, and developing arguments for particular situations.

In Political discourse, speakers' aim is to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. Lohrey (1981: 341) states that "politics relies on language as its tool of trade." Then language itself is the most important indicator of the type of discourse. The term 'political discourse' may suggest two types: first, direct political discourse, and second indirect political discourse. The political contexts generally discuss concepts like: power, conflict, control, or domination.

Power and dominance are considered the main presupposition of (CDA). In this respect, the present study attempts to reveal the social power rather than the personal power in Obama's speech. This social power presents the dominance of the United States and its administration over others in the word. Logically speaking, this involves control. However, political speech is a vital politician's tool for announcing policy and persuading people. Thus one of the main functions of the text (written or spoken) in political discourse is to manage the mind of the addressee.

Meyer (2007) emphasizes that rhetoric means the intentional use of language to influence an audience. The study of political discourse reflects the relationship between politics and other sciences such as politics, linguistics, sociology, and psychology. However, political discourse is based mainly on argumentation and persuasion. According to Aristotle's rhetoric, argumentation and persuasion are achieved through these three appeals: Ethos, Pathos and Logos which enable the speaker to persuade his audience with his ideas and interests. In fact, this depends upon how the speaker manipulates these rhetoric appeals.

## 2. Aristotelian rhetoric

Aristotle's rhetoric has a significant role in the art of persuasion. Frogel (2005: 23) states that Aristotle's book *The Rhetoric* is a primary text for the study of rhetoric till now. It is supposed that Aristotle wrote several works on rhetoric, but what comes to the present time are three main books collected in one book called *The Art of Rhetoric*. Throughout reading this book, one can determine Aristotle's point of view toward rhetoric. This book, however, presents three different persuasive strategies: Ethos (reliability and credibility of the speaker), Pathos (emotional appeal) and Logos (rational argumentation).

### 2.1 Ethos

Ethos represents the personality of the speaker. Accordingly, the speaker would do his best in order to be credible. It is important for the audience to think that the speaker's ideas are true or acceptable. Beard (200: 37) suggests that ethos is "persuasion through personality and stance." Moreover, there are three main

characteristics of the credible speaker. (a) practical intelligence, (b) a virtuous character, and (c) good will. The addresser (persuader) attempts to draw the addressee's (persuadee's) attention to his credibility and reliability. Cockcroft (2004: 196) shows that ethos, the first level of persuasion, is the strongest appeal because it indicates all those presuppositions shared between the persuader and the persuaded.

## 2.2. Pathos

Pathos represents the emotion of the audience. It is the second level of persuasion. It is also the second level of recognition which is the speech recognition. Halmari (2004: 116) states that pathos is the means by which positive emotions and connotations are created in the minds of the listeners (addressees). The orator's main task is to identify the preferences and valued goals of the audience in order to achieve persuasion. Poggi (2005: 314) suggests that pathos is triggered whenever the values of the party to be persuaded are invoked. Hence, pathos is the emotion appeal which creates some kind of connection with orator (persuader). According to Aristotle, emotions such as anger, pity, and fear powerfully influence rational judgements.

In this regard, Amossy (cited in Dylgjeri 2014: 178) writes:

Pathos is directly linked with an audience. Audience is a collective subject of speakers on which an orator tries to impact by own argumentation. Thus having audience is one of the necessary conditions for communication. In Aristotle's "rhetoric", Pathos is the power with which the writer's (speaker's) message moves the audience to his or her desirable emotional action. Thus a good orator should know for sure which emotion would effectively impact on audience considering their social status, age and other features. It is important to know not only how the orator can express but how he or she can by help of discourse cause favourable emotions.

Consequently, the speaker seeks to evoke particular feeling among an audience who is always a supporter for him to be more credible.

## 2.3. Logos

*Logos* is the Greek root word from which the English *logic* is derived. So, it isn't surprising that, in speaking, logos is often equated with logical reasoning" or an argument based on reasoning. It is an appeal to logic, and is a way of persuading an audience by reason. It represents the reasoning and the logical

argumentation. As a matter of fact, logos is the persuasive appeal which bridges the gap between the orator and the audience. It is the means by which the orator attempt to use a specific reasoning for specific audience.

However, Aristotle distinguishes between two types of arguments: deduction and induction. Deduction can be defined as "the process of using knowledge or information you have in order to understand something or form an opinion or the opinion that you form" (Della 2003: 409). An induction can be described as "process of thought that uses known facts to produce general rules or principles (Della 2003: 829). In deductive reasoning, a rhetorician starts with a general case and deduces specific instances. On the other hand, inductive reasoning begins with specific observations gathered from various sources and situations and draw a general conclusion. The study uses Aristotelian rhetoric as a frame to examine how president Obama uses language to persuade his audience.

## 2.4. Figures of Ethos, Pathos and Logos

Figures of speech are usually used to evoke emotional responses, to make an argument more reasonable and to promote the authority and credibility of the speaker. However there are certain figures that are used for those three persuasive appeals: pathos, ethos and logos. Below are those figures as retrieved from: <http://rhetoric.byu.edu/Figures/Groupings/of%20Pathos.htm> >

### 1. Figures used to provoke emotional response (pathos)

adhortatio : A commandment, promise, or exhortation intended to move one's consent or desires.

adynaton: The expression of the inability of expression —almost always emotional in its nature.

aganactesis: An exclamation proceeding from deep indignation.

apagoresis: A statement designed to inhibit someone from doing something.

aposiopesis: Breaking off suddenly in the middle of speaking, usually to portray being overcome with emotion.

apostrophe : Turning one's speech from one audience to another, or addressing oneself to an abstraction or the absent—almost always as a way of increasing appeal through emotion.

cataplexis : Threatening/prophesying payback for ill doing.

conduplicatio : The repetition of a word or words in adjacent phrases or clauses, either to amplify the thought or to express emotion.

congeries:

deesis: The vehement expression of desire put in terms of "for someone's sake" or "for God's sake."

descriptio: Vivid description, especially of the consequences of an act, that stirs up its hearers.

diacope : Repetition of a word with one or more between, usually to express deep feeling.

ecphonesis: An emotional exclamation.

enargia: Enargia, or vivid description, can be inherently moving, especially when depicting things graphic in nature.

energia: Energia, the vigour with which one expresses oneself, can obviously be emotionally affecting.

epanorthosis: Amending a first thought by altering it to make it stronger or more vehement.

epimone: Persistent repetition of the same plea in much the same words, a direct method for underscoring the pathetic appeal.

epiplexis : Asking questions in order to chide, to express grief, or to inveigh.

epitrope: A figure in which one turns things over to one's hearers (often pathetically).

excitatio: To excite an audience, especially out of a stupor or boredom.

exuscitatio: Stirring others by one's own vehement feeling.

inter se pugnancia: Using direct address to reprove someone before an audience openly.

mempsis: Expressing complaint and seeking help.

ominatio : A prophecy of evil. As the term's name connotes, this can be "ominous" in tone.

paenismus: Expressing joy for blessings obtained or an evil avoided.

pathopoeia: A speech or figure designed to arouse emotion.

perclusio: A threat against someone, or something.

synonymia: The use of several synonyms together to amplify or explain a given subject or term. A kind of repetition that adds force.

## **2. Figures used to design the appeal of (*logos*), logic, or processes of formal reasoning.**

enthymeme :The informal method of reasoning typical of rhetorical discourse. A truncated syllogism.

sorites : A chain of claims and reasons which build upon one another. Concatenated enthymemes.

syllogismus: The use of a remark or an image which calls upon the audience to draw an obvious conclusion.

aetiologia: A figure of reasoning by which one attributes a cause for a statement or claim made.

ratiocinatio: Reasoning (typically with oneself) by asking questions.

anthypophora: A figure of reasoning in which one asks and then immediately answers one's own questions.

apophasis: The rejection of several reasons why a thing should or should not be done and affirming a single one, considered most valid.

contrarium: Juxtaposing two opposing statements in such a way as to prove the one from the other.

expeditio: After enumerating all possibilities by which something could have occurred, the speaker eliminates all but one.

proethesis: When, in conclusion, a justifying reason is provided.

prosapodosis: Providing a reason for each division of a statement, the reasons usually following the statement in parallel fashion.

paromologia: Admitting a weaker point in order to make a stronger one.

dirimens copulatio: A figure by which one balances one statement with a contrary, qualifying statement

commoratio: Dwelling on or returning to one's strongest argument.

## **3. A. Figures used to establish credibility (*ethos*)**

anamnesis: Calling to memory past matters. More specifically, citing a past author from memory.

litotes: a means of expressing modesty (downplaying one's accomplishments) in order to gain the audience's favour.

## **B. Figures that can damage credibility (ethos)**

paronomasia: Using words that sound alike but that differ in meaning (punning).

### 3. Methodology and Data

This study aims to study persuasive strategies in President Obama's speech on "*Statement on Iran Nuclear Agreement*" in the third of April 2015. The transcribed text of the speech is retrieved from: <[www.AmericanRhetoric.com](http://www.AmericanRhetoric.com)>. The speech is analysed according to Aristotelian rhetoric on the basis of Aristotle's Rhetorical Triangle that he introduces in his work *Rhetoric*, specifically the three elements of this triangle, or what is also called the Aristotelian Triad: ethos, pathos and logos. Typically, Aristotle's Rhetorical Triangle is represented by an equilateral triangle suggesting that these three appeals should be balanced within a speech. However, which appeal the orator favours in his or her speech depends on both of the audience and the purpose of the speech.

The text of the speech is primarily statistically analysed according to a computer-driven analysis available at <<http://www.wordcounter/>>. Accordingly, the speech comes in 34 paragraphs, 2548 words, and 130 sentences.

The purpose of the speech is to reassure others (friends and allies of the United States) of their national security and make them feel free of fear or worry. It urges the audience to support Obama's slogan during the negotiation of this deal which is "peace is the best option." This means that president Obama invites both his nation and other nations to believe in the option of peace which is guaranteed better than war. The speech is chosen for its historic, international and contemporary importance on the levels of politics, economics, and sociology. It records a historical event which is significant for the international peace and safety. However, the study focuses mainly on how Obama uses language persuasively.

### 4. Data Analysis

Paragraphs 1 to 6 can be considered as an introduction, then paragraphs 7 to 14 which constitute the outline of the deal. President Obama presents the main available options in paragraphs 15 to 23: reach a robust and verifiable deal, bomb Iran's nuclear facilities, and pull out of negotiations. Iranian people is the main target of paragraph 24 of the speech. Obama tries to give the sense of protection to America's friends and allies in paragraphs 25 to 28. Undoubtedly, part of his

interests in the speech goes to the views of the American people for which he devotes paragraphs 29 and 30. The manipulation of history for persuasion appears in paragraph 31. Paragraphs 32 and 33 summarize the main aim behind this speech which is to give the sense of protection for the American people inside and the Arab Gulf countries and Israel outside.

#### 4.1. Ethos Applied

Obama declares the nuclear deal with Iran to the audience in the first paragraph. As mentioned earlier, ethos represents the speaker's trust, authority, and credibility. This deal is supposed to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. In the second paragraph, he speaks as both a president and a commander in chief. This gives him the responsibility to keep peace in America, his allies, and the rest of the world. He attempts to show his commitment to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. In the third paragraph, Obama gives implicit indication that Iran aims to get nuclear weapons since a long time ago and this is its ultimate goal.

Throughout paragraphs 3 to 5, one can recognize that Obama is quite adept and mature in using rhetoric figures. So he uses the figure ethos ADHORTATIO which suggests a commandment, a promise, or an exhortation which is intended to move one's consent or desires. Obama urges Iran to be serious in negotiating in diplomatic discussion about all the framework of its nuclear programme. If Iran somehow manages to defy America's demands, there would be sanctions on the Iranian economy. However, the speaker emphasizes the diplomatic option and repeated himself on the idea so many times. He puts in mind that there are four available options on the table:

- 1) Political effort aims at isolating Iran.
- 2) Diplomatic effort to sustain America's coalition and ensure that that Iranian programme is monitored.
- 3) Economic effort that imposes crippling sanctions; and
- 4) Military effort that is prepared for any contingency.

This means that no option is off the table. Throughout these paragraphs, the speaker seems to prefer the diplomatic option and hopes to negotiate with Iran seriously. On the other hand, Obama reminds Iran that America with the world major powers: the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China as well as European Union make an international effort to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear programme.



#### 4.2.1. Use of Pronouns

The use and the analysis of the pronouns refer to the type of relation between the speaker and the audience. Halmari (2004) points out that the analysis of the first person singular pronoun 'I' and first person plural 'we' may strengthen ethos. As a general observation, the speech under discussion reveals the use of first person plural 'we' so many times. This indicates that Obama wants to share responsibility to be closer to his audience, and gives a sense of inclusiveness. Table 1 below shows the distribution of personal pronouns in the study.

Table 1: The Use of Personal Pronouns

Type of pronouns	Pronouns used	Number of occurrences	Percentage %
1 <sup>st</sup> Person Singular	I	25	23.75
2 <sup>nd</sup> person pronouns	You	01	0.95
1 <sup>st</sup> Person Plural	We	32	30.4
	Our	31	29.45
	Us	06	5.7
	Total	95	

In order to enhance his credibility, the speaker focuses upon using the inclusive first person pronoun in nominative and accusative cases. In nominative case 'we', the percentage is (30.4). In the possessive case, the percentage is (29.45). This suggests that the United States and the International community are working together to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. He uses the 1<sup>st</sup> singular pronoun 'I' (23.75). He wants to remind the audience so many times that he is the president and the commander in chief. At the first place, it is his great responsibility to eliminate such thread and to create the sense of protection to all those who care inside or outside America. The percentage of accusative case of the first person pronoun 'us' is (5.7). The second pronoun 'you' is used by the speaker only once (0.95) in paragraph 24 to direct his words to the Iranian people for the sake of friendship, "we are willing to engage you on the basis of mutual interests and mutual respect."

#### 4.2.2. Appeal to Authority

According to Obama's views, peace is the best option. He stresses upon the diplomatic effort and tends to persuade the audience that his administration is able to achieve this challenging objective. Thus, the speaker uses two rhetorical

devices of ethos: *ANAMNESIS* and *EPICNISIS*. Paragraph 31 presents *EPICNISIS* where the speaker refers to some statement by others. He refers to what President Kennedy said during the Cold War: "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate." This statement pushes the audience toward peace rather than war. The speaker reminds the Americans that this is not the first time that they negotiate for peace. Paragraph 31 represents *ANAMNESIS* where he calls to memory past figures like Presidents Nixon and Reagan. He tries to tell his audience that both of Nixon and Reagan negotiated with Soviet Union despite the big difference between the two countries. That all was done for the sake of peace.

### 4.3. Pathos Applied

Pathos is a procedure of moving the addressees' emotions. Obama uses his skill in rhetoric for evoking the feelings of his audience. In paragraph 3, he applies *ANTIRRHESIS* which refers to the strong rejection of opinion or authority of someone. What is rejected here is the fact that Iran "has been advancing its nuclear program." This is unacceptable for President Obama so he moves toward the strategy of containment against disruption. Throughout paragraphs 3 to 5, the speaker uses other techniques of pathos. It is *ADHORTATIO* which refers to commandment, promise, or exhortation intended to move one's consent or desires. Obama introduces the diplomatic solution if "Iran came to the table in a serious way." He mentions, in paragraph 3, the economic sanction. If the diplomatic effort is not implemented, there would be tough sanctions on the Iranian economy. He attempts to persuade the audience that something is better than nothing and something could lead to everything. In other words, negotiations are better than cutting off the diplomatic channels. At the same time, successful negotiations could lead to a comprehensive understanding of the Iranian nuclear programme. In order to win his audiences' emotion, Obama highly emphasizes the idea that if Iran continues to ignore its obligations will face growing consequences. The speaker repeats himself more than once during this speech and reminds the audience of his commitment to prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons.

Throughout paragraph 8 to 11, Obama starts to give the details of the deal. In this case, he uses *DESCRIPTIO* a rhetoric device of pathos. *DESCRIPTIO* means vivid description, especially of the consequences of an act that strip its hearers. This means that Obama describes the basic outlines of the deal. The first step is to prevent Iran from developing weapons grade plutonium. The second is to shut down Iran's path to a bomb using enriched uranium. The third step is monitoring the Iranian programme by international inspectors. Monitoring covers uranium mills, centrifuge production, and storage facilities that support the programme.

Obama tries to reassure the American public and his allies about the Iranian nuclear threat in paragraphs 12 and 13. He forcefully applies another figure of rhetoric, *APAGORESIS*. *APAGORESIS* means a statement designed to inhibit someone from doing something. Obama warns Iran from cheating and that there will be strict limits on their programme for a decade. He exploits the emotion of fear of his audience and focuses upon the fact that "Iran will never be permitted to develop a nuclear weapon." The speaker, throughout these paragraphs, tries to explain the Iranian duties toward the international community and in return shows their rights, for example the relief from certain sanction. Obama continues using the rhetoric device *APAGORESIS* in paragraphs 14 to 16. He emphasizes the use of conditional "if" statements. This means that if Iran meets the required conditions of negotiation, it will peacefully take part in implementing the frame work of this deal and the opposite is entirely true.

#### 4.4. Logos Applied

Logos as mentioned earlier is the means of logic. Obama, in present speech, uses various lexical expressions to refer to security, safer world, and peace. He believes that only the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (P 5 + 1 Nuclear Agreement with Iran) is the global effort for peace. On the basis of the logical use of language, Obama urges the audience to support this historical deal between Iran and the international community. This is only because such a deal ensures that Iran's nuclear programme ought to be peaceful. All agree that the full implementation of this deal may positively contribute to regional and international peace and security. This long term deal is based on verification not trust (paragraph eleven).

There is a difficult history between United States and Iran. So there are deep divisions and mistrust between them. Obama tends to use the conditional 'if' sentences more than once which indicates such mistrust between the two countries. The table below illustrate these conditional sentences:

Table 2: Distribution of conditional clauses

<b>No. of Paragraph</b>	<b>If Clauses</b>	<b>Main clauses</b>
2	if this framework leads to a final, comprehensive deal	it will make our country, our allies, and our world safer
3	but only if Iran came to the table in a serious way	we were prepared to resolve this issue diplomatically
5	if we could achieve a more comprehensive deal.	we continued negotiations to see

10	if it violated the deal	Iran would be a minimum of a year away from acquiring enough material for a bomb
11	If Iran cheats	the world will know it
12	If we see something suspicious	we will inspect it.
14	If Iran violates the deal	sanctions can be snapped back into place
15	If there is backsliding on the part of the Iranians,	there will be no deal.
	if the verification and inspection mechanisms don't meet the specifications of our nuclear and security experts,	
	if we can get this done, and Iran follows through on the framework that our negotiators agreed to	we will be able to resolve one of the greatest threats to our security, and to do so peacefully
23	if they try to cheat	we'll know about it
		and I, or future Presidents, will have preserved all of the options that are currently available to deal with it.
24	if Iran complies with its international obligations	then it can fully rejoin the community of nations
26	If, in fact, Prime Minister Netanyahu is looking for the most effective way to ensure Iran doesn't get a nuclear weapon,	this is the best option
30	If Congress kills this deal -- not based on expert analysis, and without offering any reasonable alternative --	then it's the United States that will be blamed for the failure of diplomacy

There are three main types of conditional sentences: first conditional talks about the result of a possible event or situation in future. The 'if' clause is used for things that are possible but not certain. The main clause says what we think the result will be in this situation. The second conditional indicates imaginary situations. It is used to talk about the opposite of what is true or real. It expresses the present or the future. The third conditional talks about imaginary situations in the past. It is the opposite of what really happened. However, the conditional

sentences in the table above shows that the speaker mostly uses the first conditional rather than the other two types because he explains things and situations which are possible in future: if the deal fully implemented, there will be regional and international security.

On the level of lexical items, Obama uses so many logical lexical to indicate the main idea of his speech: the commitment of security. Tables 3 and 4 below show these lexical expressions:

Table 3: Agenda Word and list of Expressions Support the idea of 'Security.'

<b>No. of Paragraph</b>	<b>Expressions Support the idea of Security</b>
1	will prevent it from obtaining a nuclear weapon.
3	we were prepared to resolve this issue diplomatically
5	to impose the toughest sanctions in history
4	we were joined at the negotiating table by the world's major powers
5	to stop the progress of Iran's nuclear program Iran has met all of its obligations Inspections of Iran's program increased
6	a deal that meets our core objectives Iran will face strict limitations on its program
8	it will not develop weapons-grade plutonium
9	The vast majority of Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium will be neutralized.
11	International inspectors will have unprecedented access not only to Iranian nuclear facilities, but to the entire supply chain that supports Iran's nuclear program
12	With this deal, Iran will face more inspections than any other country in the world.
13	There will be strict limits on Iran's program for a decade.
24	Since Iran's Supreme Leader has issued a fatwa against the development of nuclear weapons
33	But we have an historic opportunity to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons in Iran, and to do so peacefully

Table 4: Expressions with the lexical item 'Security'

No. of Paragraph	Expressions with the lexical item 'Security'
1	I have no greater responsibility than the security of the American people.
15	meet the specifications of our nuclear and security experts we will be able to resolve one of the greatest threats to our security
16	this deal is good for the security of the United States
27	when it comes to our support for Israel's security I've directed my national security team to consult closely with the new Israeli government
28	our commitment to the security of our partners in the Gulf
30	what is ultimately best for the American people and for our national security

The expressions in Table 3 all refer to the fact of security. The American administration and other great powers anticipate that full implementation of this deal will positively contribute to regional and international peace and security. Obama insists that this comprehensive framework will build confidence between Iran and the international community, and will encourage international cooperation. This means that Iran can have nuclear programme for peaceful purposes, consistent with international non-proliferation norms.

On the other hand, the speaker skilfully represents the manifestation of logos in his language. He provides the audience with the use of *EPIPLEXIS* in paragraphs 20 and 22. *EPIPLEXIS* means asking questions in order to chide, to express grief, or to inveigh. Obama asks the critics of the nuclear deal to compare this joint comprehensive plan of action as fully implemented with the worse option of war. He makes some sort of comparison between peace and war. Peace is represented by this deal. War is represented by the failure of the deal. Throughout raising such questions, Obama wants to warn the American people of the collapse of negotiations. In addition, it is unacceptable for him to lose the support of the great major powers.

## 5. Conclusion

This study reveals that President Barack Obama tries to manipulate language persuasively to convince his audience of what he believes in. He balances the use of the three persuasive appeals: ethos, pathos, and logos in his

speech. He tries to build up a rational and logical political discourse. This speech reflects his own personality and what methods he appeals to defend his strategies. Through these strategies he looks forward to settle down the concepts of peace and security in the world and tries to suggest that peace is better than war when it is possible. President Obama uses language skilfully to convince his friends and allies especially Israel and The Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf and to back the Iran nuclear agreement without which could be a great chance for more wars in the struggling Middle East. Apparently, Obama's real objective behind his speech is to give a sense of protection to the United States, the allies, and the world. Thus, Obama succeeds to motivate the national and international communities to get their solidarity.

### **Bibliography**

Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. (Trans. W. Rhys Roberts) (2015). This web edition is available at: <<https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/a/aristotle/>> Last updated Wednesday, July 15, at 15: 08.

Beard, Ardita. (2000). *The Language of Politics*. Florence: Routledge.

Cockcro, R. (2004). "Putting Aristotle to the Roof: Style, Substance and EPL Group." *Language and Literature*, 13 (3): 195-215.

Dylgjeri, A. (2014) "Logos, Ethos and Pathos in Albanian Political Discourse." *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. Vol.4, No.4 June 2014.

Fairclough, N. I. (1985) "Critical and Descriptive Goals in Discourse Analysis", *Journal of Pragmatics*. 9: 739-63.

Frogel, S. (2005). *Rhetoric of Philosophy*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Halmari, H. (ed.) (2004) *Persuasion across Genres: A linguistic Approach*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Lohery, Andrew (1981) "Politics and the Regime of Meanings." In Et Cetera (ed.) *A review of General Semantics*. Vol. 38. No.4: 341.

Meyer, M. (2007). "Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches in CDA." In Meyer, and R. Woodak (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 14-31.

Poggi, Isabella (2005). "The Goals of Persuasion." *Pragmatic and Cognition*, 13:2: 297-336.

Shapiro, M. J. (1981). Language and Political Understanding. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Summers, Della. (2003). Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English: the Living Dictionary. Essex: Longman.

Woodak R. and M. Meyer (eds.) (2001). Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage Publications Ltd.