

---

## Presupposition in the Discourse of Political Reconciliation

### The Case of Obama's Speech to the Islamic World from Cairo University

Hala Nasreddeen,  
Lecturer of Linguistics,  
Faculty of Al-Asun, Sohag University, Egypt.  
Corresponding email: [halasohag@gmail.com](mailto:halasohag@gmail.com)

---

#### ARTICLE DATA

Received: 15 June 2023  
Accepted: 19 Nov. 2023  
Volume: 3  
Issue: (4) Autumn 2023  
DOI: 10.54848/bjtll.v3i4.70

---

#### KEYWORDS

political reconciliation,  
semantic and pragmatic  
presupposition, presupposition  
triggers, common grounds,  
mental images.

---

#### ABSTRACT

The current paper<sup>1</sup> investigates the use of presupposition in the discourse of political reconciliation implied in Obama's Cairo University speech. Semantic presupposition triggers are identified in the speech as establishing the taken-for-granted human values shared by the speaker and his audience in Egypt and the Islamic world. Pragmatic presupposition is at play to call upon the common mental images between America and the Islamic world and hence setting a basis for reconciliation as something inevitable between the two conflicting sides (America and The Islamic World).

---

## 1. Introduction: Political situation and context

Barak Hussein Obama, the ex-president of the United States of America, took the office to find a legacy of a complicated political situation between America and the Islamic world. Turmoil has been the main feature of that situation due to American aggressive policies with a number of Islamic countries. Starting from the Arab-Israeli conflict and Gulf War I, then the so called "war on terrorism" which made its battlefield in Afghanistan and Pakistan after 9/11, Gulf War II and the consequent American occupation of Iraq, and finally, the American-led world prejudice against Iran's use of nuclear energy, all these factors have resulted in an increasing hatred or even an anti-American attitude throughout the Islamic world. Being determined to try to bring this attitude to an end, Obama has been attempting a fundamental change in America's policies with the Islamic world on the basis of mutual respect and cooperation for the benefit of both America and Muslims. His historical speech to the Islamic world in Cairo University (4 June, 2009)

---

<sup>1</sup> The paper is extracted from my Ph.D. dissertation entitled "Rhetoric in Obama's Addresses to the Islamic World: A Political Discourse Analysis" (Unpublished), Dept. of English, Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, 2017.

has been regarded almost as a political agenda of future American political vision concerning the Islamic world. However, reactions to the speech differed widely all over the Islamic world and ranged from optimism to suspicion.

Many political analysts all over the world regard Obama's Cairo University speech to the Islamic world as carrying messages of reconciliation and marking a new tone in America's administrative political discourse with Islamic world. Others regard the speech as a well worded speech which tells no change in the American policy.

## **2. Methodology: Data, theory, and procedures**

The current paper employs the concept of presupposition in political discourse (Yule, 1996; Levinson, 1983; Goffman, 1983; Stalnaker, 1974, 2002) to investigate the language used by Obama in his speech in Cairo University (4 June, 2009) as directed to the Islamic world, and how presupposition is used to call upon the mental images that are shared by all humans all-over the world.

The speech is downloaded from the official website of the White House and the 'American Rhetoric' website. In the process of analysis, the speech is divided into extracts (Appendix A) according to the issue of conflict the extract deals with and the analysis is conducted qualitatively.

## **3. Theory**

### **3.1 Presupposition**

Generally speaking, "in speech act theory and in Paul Grice's (1975) approach to meaning, presupposition is one type of implied meaning: the other types are conversational implicature, inference, and entailment" (Mazid, 2007, p. 354). It is "something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance" (Yule, 1996, p. 25) and that is why Yule argues that it is speakers who have presuppositions and not sentences (P. 25). For example, in the utterance 'Mary's brother bought three horses', the speaker presupposes that there is a person called Mary, she has a brother, and this brother has a lot of money (p. 26). In order to explain how presupposition is analyzed in the current study, a rather detailed account is given below on: 1) the two types through which presupposition is obtained (semantic and pragmatic presuppositions), and 2) how these two types are employed in the analysis.

### **3.2 Presupposition: semantic vs. pragmatic**

Originally, the notion of presupposition originated in semantics (Mey, 2001) where it has been defined as "a logical concept bound up with truth conditional semantics" (Khaleel, 2010, p.523). Truth conditional

semantics in turn studies "the propositional meaning of sentences and the logical conditions for establishing their truth or falsity" (Finch, 2000, p. 184). Thus, semantic presupposition is defined as "a relation between two sentences.... One sentence presupposes another just in case the truth of the second sentence is a necessary condition for the truth or falsity of the first" (Greenfield & Smith, 1976, as cited in Khaleel, 2010, p. 524). In addition, semantic presupposition shows the requisite of 'constancy under negation' (Degano, 2007) that is, if an affirmative sentence conveys a presupposition, it will convey the same presupposition when it is negated" (Yule 1996, p. 29). In order to illustrate how semantic presupposition works, Levinson (1983, p. 178) sets the following example: "John managed to stop in time", which presupposes (or, according to Levinson's terms, 'leads to the inference that') "John tried to stop in time". As for the behavior of the sentence under negation, or 'constancy under negation', the sentence "John didn't manage to stop in time" presupposes that "John tried to stop in time" and thus shows that the presupposed information stays true even if the verb is negated.

Building upon the above examples of presupposing sentences ('John managed to stop in time' and 'John didn't manage to stop in time') where the inference or presupposition comes from the verb 'manage', Levinson (1983) concludes that "presuppositions seem to be tied to particular words"(p. 179). These "presupposition –generating linguistic items" are called "presupposition triggers" (p. 179).

However, presuppositions are not merely 'semantically triggered' or triggered depending on semantic items. In other words, "their potential meaning is not achieved just on the semantic level, but the context plays an important role, giving presuppositions a pragmatic value" (Degano, 2007, p. 364). The pragmatic nature of presupposition (namely, pragmatic presupposition) was introduced by Stalnaker (1974) in an influential early article where he sets the fact that "an utterance needs a context in order to be correctly interpreted, ... with respect to its truth and falsity"( as cited in Mey, 2001, p. 185). For example, 'The cat is on the mat' presupposes that there is some cat and some mat the speaker is referring to (regardless of whether the statement is true or false). The context in which the sentence is uttered might be the pragmatic presupposition that the addresser is complaining about the cat's dirtying the mat (Khaleel, 2010, p. 525).

On the other hand, according to Stalnaker, presupposition should be seen as "a relation between a speaker and a presupposition" (1973, as cited in Degano, 2007, p. 364) rather than as a relation between propositions themselves as referred to in the definition of semantic presupposition above. Namely, what a speaker takes for granted when producing propositions/using sentences are the background assumptions that may be used without being spoken (Stalnaker, 1973, as cited in Khaleel, 2010). These assumptions, the speaker thinks, are shared by the participants in a communicative event and form the 'common ground' which is considered by Stalnaker (2002) the most prominent feature of presupposition. He puts it as "one

presupposes that  $\Phi$  only if one presupposes that others presuppose it as well" (p. 701). Furthermore, Stalnaker assumes that presupposition arises from what he calls presupposition requirements (Stalnaker, 1978, as cited in Mazid, 2007, p. 355). "These are requirements which a sentence places upon a context for the use of the sentence to be felicitous in the context". Accordingly, "presupposition is pragmatic in that it is a matter of the behavior of sentences in a context" (Mazid, 2007, p. 355).

This very notion of common ground has been developed by Goffman (1983) when he refers to 'presupposition' as 'assumption', 'implication', or 'background expectation' and defines it as "a state of affairs we take for granted in pursuing a course of action" (p. 1). He focuses on 'social presuppositions' (i.e. what interactants take for granted or the common ground they share) in language use, particularly speech (everyday conversations), not writing (p. 2). Building upon this view of presupposed or shared knowledge, he assumes that the people involved in an interaction will be able to understand and interpret the intended meaning of one another. Moreover, Goffman rejects the philosophical view of presuppositions where presuppositions are semantically triggered and depend merely on the truth value of statements or propositions without taking into consideration the context of interaction. He advocates the interplay between semantic presuppositions, or what sentences semantically presuppose, and pragmatic presuppositions or whatever presupposed meaning of words and clauses "on the occasion of uttering them in particular contexts" (p. 4).

Following Fairclough (1989), presuppositions depend on the interpretations of the contextual context of a text. This contextual context in turn depends on the historical series of a text or, in other words, the series of background texts which a specific text belongs to, and hence constitute "what can be taken as common ground for participants, or presupposed" (p. 152).

### 3.3 Presupposition triggers

Depending on the above account on presupposition, the model used in the analysis is 'hybrid' where both "semantics and pragmatics are taken into account" (Mazid, 2007, p. 356). This hybrid model is based on the classificatory models of presupposition provided by Levinson (1983), Green (1989), and Yule (1996) and has been adapted by Mazid (1999). The model is outlined below and the symbol  $\gg$  is used to mean presupposes.

1- Existential: definite noun phrases and possessives, e.g. "his car"  $\gg$  "He has a car",  $\gg$  "the X"  $\gg$  "X exists" (Mazid, 1999, p.35).

2- Factive:

- a. Emotive: e.g., regret, be glad, sorry, proud, sad, indifferent to/that: "She is glad that her son got the prize"  $\gg$  "Her son got the prize" (Mazid, 1999, p.35).

b- Epistemic: e.g., be aware/odd, realize, know.

3- Non-factive: e.g., dream, pretend, imagine, "He pretends to be ill" >> "He is not ill" (Yule, 1996, p. 29).

4-Lexical:

a-Implicative verbs: e.g., manage, forget, happen, avoid. "He forgot to close the door" >> "He ought to have closed the door"; "He managed to solve the problem">> "He tried to solve the problem" (Mazid, 1999, p.35).

b- Inchoative (change of state) Verbs: e.g., stop, begin, continue, start, finish, carry on, cease, take, leave, come, go, enter, arrive. "He stopped beating his wife" >> "He used to beat his wife" (Mazid, 1999, p.36).

c- Iteratives: e.g., again, anymore, no longer, any longer, return, come back, restore, repeat. "He did not come again" >> "He came before" (Mazid, 1999, p. 36)

d- Verbs of judging: e.g. accuse, blame, and criticize. "To accuse A of X" >> "A did X and X is bad". "She criticized him for running away" >>"He ran away and this was bad" (Mazid, 1999, p. 36)

5- Structural:

a- Temporal clauses: with 'before', 'since', 'while', 'after', 'during', 'when', 'whenever', e.g., "while Chomsky was revolutionizing linguistics, the rest of social science was/wasn't asleep" >> "Chomsky was revolutionizing linguistics" (Levinson, 1983, p. 182).

b- Cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences: e.g., "It was John that kissed Mary" >> "Someone kissed Mary", "What Mary lost was her handbag" >> "Mary lost something" (Mazid, 1999, p. 36)

c- Questions: "Did he leave?" >> "He either left or did not leave", "Why did he leave early?" >>"He left early" (Mazid, 1999, p. 36).

d- Non-restrictive relative clauses: e.g., "Ahmed, who was absent yesterday, is still sick" >> "Ahmed was absent yesterday" (Mazid, 1999, p.36)

e- Counterfactual conditionals: e.g., "If Hannibal had only had twelve more elephants, the Romance languages would/wouldn't this day exist" >> "The Hannibal did not have twelve more elephants" (Levinson, 1983, p. 184).

f- Comparisons and contrasts: e.g., "Carol is/isn't a better linguist than Barbara" >> "Barbara is a linguist" (Levinson, 1983, p. 183).

6- Pragmatic: Felicity conditions on the successful performance of illocutionary acts may be thought of as a sort presupposition (Green, 1989, p. 82). Thus the command "Close the door" presupposes that the speaker has authority over the addressee.

### 3.4 Presupposition in political discourse

As a type of pragmatic inference, presupposition is meaningful in analyzing political discourse because political discourse is sometimes 'incomplete' and 'implicit' (van Dijk, 1997b) in the sense that "much information is not expressed, but only understood to be implied or presupposed" (p. 91). In other words, speakers do not need to say everything they know or believe (van Dijk, 2004). In addition, "a large part of discourse remains implicit, and such implicit information may be inferred by recipients from shared knowledge or attitudes and thus constructed as part of their mental models of the event or action represented in the discourse" (p. 23). The objective of using such a technique is that it is "a means of conveying meanings whose explicit expression could be interpreted as biased or racist" (p. 23)

Meanwhile, the function of presupposition in political discourse relates to the concept of knowledge management in a given context model as discussed by van Dijk (2003, 2005). Knowledge is defined by van Dijk as 'the common ground or shared social and cultural beliefs, norms and values as well as political attitudes and ideologies' (van Dijk, 2003, p. 87). This knowledge, in turn, depends on the features of the context model of the communicative event (one's intentions, the kind of people one is addressing, the nature of the interaction, the institutional setting and so on) (van Dijk, 2005, p. 76). In political communication, van Dijk (2003) assumes that politicians use presupposition to introduce their own beliefs, positions and ideologies as 'commonly accepted knowledge' and hence manipulate their audience and get consensus. Depending on this view, the audience can be manipulated to believe that the 'assumptions' made by political figures (or authoritative sources) need not be demonstrated or proved (p. 88).

Other definitions of the goals and functions of presupposition are relevant to analyzing political discourse. Following Yule (1996), the goal of most presuppositions is to make the "information that the speaker believes appear to be what the listener should believe" (p. 29). Presuppositions help the writer/speaker establish a common ground, or a conceptual framework that has to be accepted by the audience (Dubois, et al., 1994, p. 379, as cited and translated by Mazid, 2007, p. 5.2).

## 4. Analysis & results

Presupposition is investigated on the semantic level by tracing the presupposition triggers used in the data. The pragmatic level of the analysis is tackled by shedding light on the situational context and the common ground it establishes together with the felicity conditions and how they affect the implied meaning.

### 4.1 Presupposition in Cairo University speech

What follows is a survey of the types of presupposition triggers which bear ideological significance in Cairo speech. The triggers are detected for each part of the speech separately and according to the model

adapted by Mazid (1999) outlined in section (3.3) above in order to investigate their significance in relation to the part they occur in.

The triggers most prevalent in the speech are existential triggers. These triggers give rise to presuppositions of existence where the speaker/addresser is "assumed to be committed to the existence of the entities named" (Yule, 1996, p. 27) or, in other words, 'presupposes that they exist as things, and not simply as a consequence of an activity' (Richardson, 2007, p. 63). Existential presuppositions are expressed by definite noun phrases, proper names, possessive constructions and 'this-' and 'that-' clauses (Beaver, 1997). There are other types of presupposition triggers as: factives (the presupposed information following an epistemic or an emotive verb can be treated as a fact) (Mazid, 1999, p. 169), structural (certain sentence structures conventionally and regularly presupposing that part of the structure is already assumed to be true) (p. 169), and wh-questions (in English, the wh-question construction is conventionally interpreted with the presupposition that the information after the wh-form is already known to be the case) (Yule, 1996, pp. 28-29).

- **The introduction (Appendix A, extract A1)**

- i- Existential triggers**

- a- Definite noun phrases**

- ... **the harmony** between tradition and progress.
- The good will** of the American people.
- **The relationship** between Islam and **the West**.
- The sweeping change** brought by modernity and globalization.
- ... **the continued efforts** of these extremists to engage in violence against civilians.
- The cooperation** that can help all of our people to achieve justice and prosperity.
- The truth** that America and Islam are not exclusive and need not be in competition.
- ... nor can I answer in the time that I have this afternoon all **the complex** questions that brought us to this point.
- But I am convinced that in order to move forward, we must say openly to each other **the things** we hold in our hearts and that too often are said only behind closed doors.
- That is what I will try to do today, to speak **the truth** as best I can.
- Humbled by **the task** before us and firm in my belief that **the interests** we share as human beings are far more powerful than **the forces** that drive us apart.
- Freedom in America is indivisible from **the freedom** to practice one's religion.
- **These needs** will be met only if we act boldly in the years ahead.

- 
- That is **the responsibility** we have to one another as human beings.
  - We must face **these tensions** squarely.

### **b-Possessive constructions**

- So long as **our relationship** is defined by **our differences**, we will empower those who sow hatred rather than peace, those who promote conflict.
- That experience guides **my conviction** that partnership between America and Islam must be based on what Islam is, not what it isn't.
- Recognizing **our common humanity** is only the beginning of our task.
- Given **our interdependence**, any world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail.
- **Our problems** must be dealt with through partnership, **our progress** must be shared.

### **ii- Factives**

#### **a-Epistemic**

- I also **know** civilization's debt to Islam.
- I also **know** that Islam has always been a part of America's story.

### **iii-Structural triggers**

#### **a- Temporal clauses**

- **When** a financial system weakens in one country, prosperity is hurt everywhere
- **When** a new flu infects one human being, all are at risk.
- **When** one nation pursues a nuclear weapon, the risk of nuclear attack rises for all nations.
- **When** violent extremists operate in one stretch of mountains, people are endangered across an ocean.
- **When** innocents in Bosnia and Darfur are slaughtered, that is a stain on our collective conscience.

#### **b-Counterfactual conditionals**

- These needs will be met only **if we** act boldly in the years ahead.
- **If we** understand that the challenges we face are shared and our failure to meet them will hurt us all.

#### **c-Comparisons and contrasts**

- ... partnership between America and Islam must be based on what **Islam is, not what it isn't**.
- **Just as** Muslims do not fit a crude stereotype, **America** is not the crude stereotype of a self-interested empire.



As a tool for conveying implicit meaning (Levinson, 1983; Yule, 1996; Verschueren, 1999), Obama uses presupposition in this introductory part of Cairo speech in order to delineate the frame according to which he relates the ideology of reconciliation and cooperation for his Arab and Muslim audience.

Starting from the existential presupposition triggers outlined above, Obama stresses his appreciative vision of what he knows to be of sensitive and even of religious value for the Muslims. By using definite noun phrases, he is "assumed to be committed to the existence of the entities named" (Yule, 1996: 27). When he describes Al Azhar and Cairo University as "the harmony between tradition and modernity", he presupposes his knowledge of the fact that Islam as a divine religion does not contradict with modern sciences and technologies taught in Cairo University. The significance of this idea in particular and its mention at the beginning of a reconciliatory speech is that Obama is keen to show his respect for Islam as a religion adopting education and scientific progress. It is a successful way to get easily to the hearts of Muslim peoples and attract their attention to listen to a man who shows respect to their religion at a time when Islam is accused of being a religion of terrorism by the West. Showing respect to Islam is also a sign of his 'good intentions' behind the visit and the speech. This idea is reinforced by attaching his people and the Muslim communities in America to this image of appreciation and 'good will' toward Islam and Muslims: "I'm also proud to carry with me the good will of the American people and a greeting of peace from Muslim communities in my country: Assalamu Alaikum".

Obama presupposes the existence of 'a relationship' of 'cooperation and coexistence' between Islam and the West but it is spoiled with 'conflicts and religious wars'. When speaking about the tension between Islam and the West in recent times, Obama uses the existential presupposition trigger "the sweeping change of modernity and Globalization" to admit the existence of a powerful Western trend that contradicts and fights "the traditions of Islam". This is again a commitment made by Obama that the traditions of Islam, as a divine religion, are being threatened by the West. This assertion moves in the same direction that Obama is taking to convince Muslims that he understands the reason for their prejudice against The West.

Having asserted the existence of a profound relationship that lasted for centuries and the reasons leading to the endangering and even the spoiling of this relationship, Obama asserts the results of all this. There exist 'continued efforts' of extremists who engage in violent attacks against civilians and this creates 'differences' between America and the West on the one hand and the Islamic world on the other. Thus, 'our existing relationships' are now distorted by 'our existing differences' and this needs 'the cooperation' amongst all of us to be revived and enhanced because it already 'exists'.

Obama wants to say that 'yes' the 'cooperation' exists because there is a 'truth' that both America and Islam are not self-centered empires and both embrace and encourage cooperation with other nations. He

uses the possessive construction 'my conviction' to refer to his strong belief that Islam is contrary to the negative image imparted upon it as a result of the violence of some extremists who do not represent but themselves.

Then, Obama asserts the existence of 'complex questions' that caused all this tension in the relationship between America and Islamic nations and that there are 'things' that have to be revealed and 'truth' to be spoken out in order to accomplish the 'task' of resolving this conflict. He also asserts that this 'task' can be attainable because there are 'interests' that both nations share and these are more powerful and more effective than the existing 'forces' which 'drive us (America and the Islamic nation) apart'.

Obama speaks about freedom and stresses that 'the freedom' which America calls for is indivisible from 'the freedom' to practice one's religion and includes this type of freedom amongst 'the needs' existing and have to be met. Finally, towards the end of the introductory part of the speech, Obama puts much emphasis upon these needs by referring to the endeavor to meet them as 'the responsibility' which both America and Muslims should shoulder. In addition, he relates them to 'these tensions', to indicate that 'if these needs are not satisfied, they will lead to more of these tensions'. In the same ideological line, Obama asserts that satisfying existing 'needs' is enhanced by two things we both share: 'our common humanity' and 'our interdependence'. Therefore, he ends up this part by asserting a conclusion: we do share existing 'problems' which we have to solve and an existing 'progress' that we have to share.

All the above ideas induced by Obama in the introduction to Cairo speech are given more emphasis by other types of presupposition triggers. The epistemic factive in " I also **know** civilization's debt to Islam" to express respect to Islam's role in civilization, and in " I also **know** that Islam has always been a part of America's story" to indicate that the presupposed information coming after the factive verb 'know' can be treated to be true (Yule, 1996, p.27). The structural triggers in this succession of temporal clauses indicate the notion of 'common humanity' introduced in the argument by Obama. The 'counterfactual conditionals' presuppose that the information in the 'if-clause' is not true at the time of the utterance ( p. 29). This asserts the idea of 'needs and challenges to be met' and, furthermore, 'failure in this task will harm us all'. The comparisons and contrasts given above between America and the Islamic world bring to the surface the core solution for all this 'circle of discord' between the two nations: America should look at the true spirit and ideals of Islam, and Islamic nations should look at America's ideals, principles, and her contribution to world progress.

Pragmatically speaking, the situational context of the speech is politically sensitive as the speech is delivered at a time featured by discord and agonies for both America and the Islamic world. However, this context is correctly exploited by Obama to introduce the main lines of his strategy toward the Islamic world

by presupposing that the ideals he is calling for are commonly shared by all humanity (**i.e. our common humanity**). He makes this commonality the basis upon which 'problems, needs, tensions' are being tackled and 'responsibilities' and 'progress' are to be shared.

One further pragmatic aspect of some presupposed meanings in this introductory part is the felicity condition of sincerity. This is apparent in Obama's quoting from the Holy Qur'an: "Be conscious of God and speak always the truth" to ensure his sincerity and truthfulness.

- **The issue of violent extremism (Appendix A, extract A2)**

**i- Existential triggers**

**a- Definite noun phrases**

- **The victims** were innocent men, women and children from America and many other nations who had done nothing to harm anybody.
- **These are not opinions** to be debated. **These are facts** to be dealt with.
- **The enduring faith** of over a billion people is so much bigger than **the narrow hatred** of a few.
- Islam is not part of **the problem** in combating violent extremism; it is an important part of promoting peace.
- I also believe that events in Iraq have reminded America of **the need** to use diplomacy and build international consensus to resolve our problems whenever possible.
- So America will defend itself, respectful of **the sovereignty** of nations and **the rule of law**.

**b- Possessive constructions**

- The first issue that we have to confront is violent extremism in all **its forms**.
- We will, however, relentlessly confront violent extremists who pose a grave threat to **our security**.
- It is **my first duty** as president to protect the American people.
- The situation in Afghanistan demonstrates **America's goals** and **our need** to work together.
- They have affiliates in many countries and are trying to expand **their reach**.
- We do not want to keep **our troops** in Afghanistan. ... we seek no military bases there. It is agonizing for America to lose **our young men and women**.
- And despite the costs involved, **America's commitment** will not weaken.
- **Their actions** are irreconcilable with the rights of human beings, the progress of nations, and with Islam.
- I also believe that events in Iraq have reminded America of the need to use diplomacy and build international consensus to resolve **our problems** whenever possible.
- **Iraq's sovereignty** is its own.

- It (9/11 trauma) led us to act contrary to **our traditions** and **our ideals**

## ii- Factives

### a-Epistemic

- Now, we also **know** that military power alone is not going solve the problems in Afghanistan and Pakistan

## iii- Structural triggers

### a-Counterfactual conditionals

- We would gladly bring every single one of our troops home **if we could be confident that there were not violent extremists in Afghanistan**, and now Pakistan, determined to kill as many Americans as they possibly can.

### b- Non-restrictive relative clauses

- We will, however, relentlessly confront violent extremists **who pose a grave threat to our security**.

- And that's **why I ordered the removal of our combat brigades by next August**.

- That is **why we will honor our agreement with Iraq's democratically-elected government**, to remove combat troops from Iraqi cities by July and to remove all of our troops from Iraq by 2012.

When discussing the issue of violent extremists, and by using existential presupposition triggers of definite noun clauses, possessive constructions and 'this-' and 'that-' clauses, Obama is committed to the fact that there are innocent 'victims' of men and women killed by Al-Qaeda in the attacks of 9/11, from America and other nations, and that the attacks caused immense 'fear and anger'. The purpose of this is to stress the ideas that extremism is blind and against all humanity and that America's suffering of this trauma is 'understandable'. He warns against the threat of Al-Qaeda to kill on even a wider scale and asserts that this is not just an 'opinion' that can be discussed; it is a 'fact' that should be faced with a suitable reaction. At this point, he moves in the direction of revealing his ideology towards violent extremism. He justifies previous American wars against Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and paves the way for more decisions of war to 'fight' extremism which exists in 'various forms' and face extremists who intend to 'expand their reach'. He sets the purpose for this struggle against extremism: extremism poses a great threat to 'the security' of America. Accordingly, as the president of America, 'his first duty' is to protect American people'.

Having established his ideology, which stands for the ideology of his administration and previous American administrations as well, here comes Obama's new strategy. It is the strategy of 'cooperation depending on shared values and interests': 'since we share common humanity, we have to cooperate in fighting extremism which is against this humanity' because these extremists have killed people of all faiths including Muslims. Following this line of thought, he presupposes that the existing 'narrow hatred of a few extremists' is far less than the existing 'strong faith' of over a billion of people (the Islamic nation).

Moreover, Islam is not part of 'the existing problem' in fighting extremism, it is part of promoting peace. In addition, this strategy of 'cooperation' has a complementary trend. This is declared in Obama's committedness to the existence of 'the sovereignty' of nations and 'the rule of law' when America defends itself.

More ideological content is presupposed in this discussion through the existential presupposition 'their actions' when referring to the proposition that violent extremists commit actions that entirely contradict with human rights, the progress of nation, and the principles of Islam. This presupposition strengthens the call for inviting the Islamic nation to cooperate in fighting terrorism.

There are a number of genitive constructions that generate existential presuppositions working in the same direction of the ideological line regarding American policies in Afghanistan. America has a strategy and specific goals behind her war against extremism and seeks the assistance of Muslims and other nations to fight it. These constructions can be explained as follows: we Americans, do not want to keep 'our troops' and lose 'our young men and women' in wars in Afghanistan; there are the 'America's goals' and 'America's commitment' to achieve these goals; and the situation in Afghanistan demonstrates 'our need' as Americans and Muslims to work together. One further point worth mentioning here: Obama, as standing for America, assumes committedness or America's committedness to certain principles in the existential triggers 'our traditions' and 'our ideals'. These two existential presuppositions help in convincing the audience in the Islamic world that 'America has traditions and ideals in spite of her military action in Afghanistan'.

Other types of presupposition triggers are in action in Obama's account of the issue of violent extremism. The epistemic factive 'know' in " we also **know** that military power alone is not going to solve the problems in Afghanistan and Pakistan" presupposes that the information after the verb can be treated as a fact. Hence, Obama's proposition after 'know' implies a criticism of the policy of the previous American administration and paves the way for a new policy to be introduced by Obama and his administration. The counterfactual conditional "if we could be confident that there were not violent extremists in Afghanistan, and now Pakistan" presupposes that: since America cannot be confident that violent extremists have gone away from Afghanistan and Pakistan, she cannot remove her troops from these two countries. This is an implied message of the continuation of America's wars in two Islamic countries. This same message of continuation of war is reinforced by the non-restrictive relative clause " We will, however, relentlessly confront violent extremists who pose a grave threat to our security". The reason explained in that relative clause is that 'the extremists pose a great threat to America's security'.

The issue of Iraq is discussed in relation to fighting violent extremism in order to contrast the American situation in both Iraq and Afghanistan. Obama makes a confession of and a commitment to 'the need' to 'use

diplomacy and build international consensus to resolve our problems whenever possible'. There is a new ideological content implied/communicated in this presupposition to mark a shift in American foreign policy towards using diplomacy instead of war. In addition, he assumes committedness to keep 'Iraq's sovereignty'. The non-restrictive relative clauses in "That's why I ordered the removal of our combat brigades by next August", and "That is why we will honor our agreement with Iraq's democratically-elected government, to remove combat troops from Iraqi cities" convey new information (Beaver, 1997) about America's future policy in Iraq and presuppose the truth of the presupposed proposition following the relative pronoun.

- **The situation between the Israelis, Palestinians and the Arab world Appendix A, extract A3)**

#### **i- Existential triggers**

##### **a- Definite noun phrases**

- For more than 60 years, they've endured **the pain of dislocation**.
- They endure **the daily humiliations**.
- ... For Palestinians to point **to the displacement** brought about by Israel's founding and for Israelis to point to **the constant hostility** and attacks throughout its history.
- **The only resolution** is for **the aspirations** of both sides to be met through two states.
- **The obligations** that the parties have agreed to under the Road Map are clear.

##### **b- Possessive constructions**

- Israelis must acknowledge that just as **Israel's right** to exist cannot be denied, neither can **Palestine's**.
- Israel must also live up to **its obligation** to ensure that Palestinians can live and work and develop their society.
- the Arab states must recognize that the Arab Peace Initiative was an important beginning, but not the end of **their responsibility**.
- They endure **the daily humiliations**.

The Presuppositions made by Obama in this part depend on the common ground that he and his audience share about the Arab-Israeli conflict. The existential presupposition triggers of the definite descriptions expressed by definite noun phrases and possessive constructions are used to introduce and describe the different angles of this issue. Through such triggers, Obama assumes to be committed to the existence of these angles from where he proposes his vision concerning the issue. The first of these angles is the living conditions of both the Palestinians and the Israelis. The Palestinians endured 'the pain of dislocation' and 'the displacement' and still endure 'the daily humiliations' under occupation. The Israelis suffered and are still suffering from 'the constant hostility and attacks'. The second angle is that: 'the only resolution' that answers 'the aspirations of both sides' is 'through two states'. The third angle is that: in order to resolve this

Palestinian-Israeli conflict, both sides should acknowledge 'the other party's right to exist'. In addition, Israel should come up to 'its obligations' towards the Palestinians and the Arab states should observe 'their responsibilities' in the Arab Peace Initiative. The implied message here is that: both sides have suffered and both have to cooperate to achieve peace.

- **The issue of nuclear weapons (Appendix A, extract A4)**

**i- Existential triggers: definite noun phrases and possessive constructions**

- ... **our shared interest in the rights and responsibilities** of nations on nuclear weapons.
- Iran has defined itself, in part, by **its opposition to my country**.
- ... to move forward without preconditions on **the basis of mutual respect**.
- And any nation, including Iran, should have **the right** to access peaceful nuclear power if it complies with **its responsibilities** under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

**ii- Structural triggers**

**a-Counterfactual conditionals**

- And any nation, including Iran, should have the right to access peaceful nuclear power if it complies with its responsibilities under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

**b- Questions**

- The two indirect questions in: The question now is not **what Iran is against** but, rather, **what future it wants to build**.

Concerning the issue of nuclear weapons, Obama states his attitude, which stands for the attitude of his administration as well. This attitude is based on an international concern about 'the shared rights and responsibilities' of all nations which have nuclear weapons. Then, he directs his speech to speak about Iran in particular because this issue caused tension between Iran and America. He suggests unconditioned talks with Iran on 'the basis of mutual respect'. This noun phrase induces the presupposition that Obama is assumed to be committed to this mutual respect in spite of 'Iran's opposition' to 'his own country'. He does not deny 'Iran's right' to access nuclear power for peaceful purposes with the condition that it should observe 'its responsibilities' under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The existential triggers of possessive constructions used with Iran's rights and responsibilities assume Obama's committedness to the existence of these rights and responsibilities. Thus, he tries to manufacture the consent of Iran's administration.

Other types of presupposition triggers include the counterfactual conditional 'Iran should have the right to access peaceful nuclear power if it complies with its responsibilities under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Obama presupposes Iran's rejection of the treaty because the information given in the if-clause is

presupposed to be untrue. The question: 'what Iran is against?' presupposes the reality that Iran is still in opposition with America. The indirect question: ' what future it wants to build' presupposes doubts about Iran's cooperation with the international community about the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

- **The issue of democracy (Appendix A, extract A5)**

- That does not lessen **my commitment**, however, to governments that reflect the will of the people
- ... **the ability** to speak **your mind** and have a say in how you are governed, confidence in **the rule of law** and **the equal administration of justice**, government that is transparent and doesn't steal from the people, **the freedom to live as you choose**.
- America respects **the right of** all peaceful and law-abiding voices to be heard around the world.
- So no matter where it takes hold, **government of the people** and by the people sets a single standard for all who would hold power.

Through existential presupposition triggers, Obama assumes to be committed to the principles he is calling for to maintain democracy around the world. He expresses his 'commitment' to the governments that truly reflect the will of the people; he respects 'the right of all peaceful voices' who work for the welfare of their peoples; and he encourages the government of the people and by the people.

Regarding the democracy that all people yearn for, through a succession of existential triggers, he assumes to be committed to the existence of: 'the ability' to speak 'your mind' and have a say in how you are governed, confidence in 'the rule of law' and 'the equal administration of justice', government that is transparent and doesn't steal from the people, and 'the freedom' to live as you choose. The value of all these triggers in Obama's messages is that they help to persuade the audience of Obama's model of democracy.

- **The issue of Religious freedom (Appendix A, extract A 6)**

#### **i- Existential triggers**

- That is **the spirit** we need today. People in every country should be free to choose and live their faith based upon the persuasion of the mind and the heart and the soul.
- **The richness** of religious diversity must be upheld, whether it is for Maronites in Lebanon or the Copts in Egypt.
- Freedom of religion is central to **the ability** of peoples to live together.

#### **ii- Structural triggers**

##### **a-Counterfactual conditionals**

- And if we are being honest, fault lines must be closed among Muslims as well as the divisions between Sunni and Shia have led to tragic violence, particularly in Iraq.



Obama visualizes/envisions an image of 'the spirit' that embraces religious freedom according to his experience as a child in Indonesia. He used to see "Christians worship freely in an overwhelmingly Muslim country". He sees that faith can be lived according to 'the persuasion of the mind and the heart and the soul'. This succession of the existential triggers of the definite noun clauses presuppose Obama's ideology about religious freedom. He rejects the tendency of some Muslims to "measure one's faith by the rejection of somebody else's faith". He advocates the upheld of 'the richness of religious diversity' for Maronites in Lebanon or the Copts in Egypt. He puts much emphasis on the importance of religious freedom by proposing that it is 'central to the ability of peoples to live together'. Thus, according to Obama's ideology, the ability of people to live together is profoundly affected by religious freedom. The counterfactual conditional presupposes that, at present, Muslims are not honest regarding religious freedom as they fight amongst themselves because of religious divisions. The message here implies a direct criticism for Muslims in this regard.

- **The issue of women's rights (Appendix A, extract A7)**

**i- Existential triggers**

- ... issues of **women's equality** are by no means simply an issue for Islam.
- ... **the struggle for women's equality** continues in many aspects of American life and in countries around the world.
- **Our common prosperity** will be advanced by allowing all humanity, men and women, to reach **their full potential**.

Obama presupposes that the issue of 'women's rights' does exist and is not restricted to Islam: in America and many countries around the world 'the struggle for women's equality' continues. Then he relates the 'existing' prospect of 'common prosperity' of both the Islamic nation and America to letting both women and men take full chance to reach what they aspire to. The ideological content communicated in this point is that 'prosperity of mankind depends on both men and women. Therefore, they both should get full chance toward self-development.

they concern expectations, desires, interests, claims, attitudes towards the world, fears, etc." (Caffi, 1993, p. 3324, as cited in Mey, 2001).

Thus, in terms of presupposition, Obama depends on creating the mental models necessary for insinuating the policy of reconciliation he calls for. In order to achieve this end, he depends upon creating common grounds with his audience.

## 5. Discussion

The presuppositions made by Obama in Cairo University speech reflect the interplay between both pragmatic presupposition which relates to the context in which the utterance or proposition has been used (Levinson, 1983) and takes its bases in the assumed shared knowledge between the speaker and his addressees (Bekalu, 2006) on the one hand, and the linguistic expression of these presuppositions in the form of presupposition triggers on the other hand.

In order to set an agenda for a new American policy with the Islamic world, Obama exploits the common ground that is shared all over the world about the issues of colonialism, globalization, war against terrorism after the trauma of 9/11, war in Iraq, and other issues of religious freedom, democracy and women's rights. Upon this common ground, Obama sets his presuppositions in an attempt to create the mental image necessary for making his propositions convincing.

As shown and detailed in the analysis of the introduction of Cairo speech, the presuppositions Obama makes by the different types of triggers move basically in three directions: to express Obama's different attitudes toward the Islamic world, desires, and expectations; to project his point of view on the issues of tension; and to make the idea of reconciliation understandable and acceptable.

The respectful and appreciative attitude shown in Obama's presuppositions in the introductory part (i.e. the harmony, the good will) indicate the good intentions behind his speech and trigger consent amongst his audience about the addresser and what he is going to say. Another attitude makes Obama's propositions more convincing is his description of the global changes which contradict with the traditions of Islam as "sweeping".

Obama's tackling of some of the issues of tension between the Islamic world and America depends on the common-ground knowledge that he shares with his audience. Regarding the issue of violent extremists, for example, Obama calls back to the minds of his audience the traumatic effects of 9/11 on America, and the continuous killing of people of different faiths at the hands of the extremists. The presuppositions he makes for fighting extremism display Obama's point of view on how to deal with the issue of violent extremists. Since these are points of view or opinions, there is an implied call to have them considered by the Islamic world. Moreover, the purpose of Obama in this regard is to make his audience believe in what he believes in.

When discussing the Palestinian/Israeli conflict, Obama states his position about the sufferings of the Palestinians and the justice of their aspiration to have their own state. He exploits this commonly accepted knowledge to introduce his position about Israel and its right to exist and defend itself. By creating this balance in his stand about the aspirations of both Palestinians and Israelis, he manipulates his audience and

gets consensus (van Dijk, 2003, 2007) not only in relation to the Palestinian case but also to the interests of Israel. This same strategy of building upon the common ground with his audience as well as managing their knowledge concerning the main issues of conflict between America and the Islamic world is applied by Obama when discussing issues of nuclear weapons, democracy, religious freedom, and women's rights.

As for the ideology of reconciliation, what presupposed in Obama's words is satisfying the interests that both America and Muslims share: the common humanity they share, the problems that must be dealt with through partnership, and the progress that must be shared for the welfare of both sides.

In relation to America's foreign policy with friend countries (i.e. Turkey, and Indonesia in the present study), Vaughn et al. (2014) argue that Obama calls for democratic exceptionalism which emphasizes the language of "cooperation, partnership, discussion, negotiation, openness, transparency, bridging differences, respecting diversity, and promoting civil society, the rule of law, freedom of the press, and human rights" (p.131). This tone of democracy is struck in Obama's speeches in both Turkey and Indonesia. The propositions presupposed in the two speeches and investigated in the analysis sections reflect this new tendency of cooperation in Obama's foreign policy. He asserts Turkey's friendship and alliance with America, and Indonesia's friendship, partnership, and mutual interests shared with America. These propositions are taken to background the ideology adopted by Obama in the sphere of a new American foreign policy.

As for the Obama's tackling of the issues of tension between America and the Islamic world in his speeches in Turkey and Indonesia, they echo the same tone of presupposed information in the speech of Cairo University. The purpose of these presuppositions, as detailed in the analysis section is to manufacture the audience's consent to what Obama is calling for: 'America is not and will not be at war with Islam'; the resolution of issues of conflict through shared efforts, and the maintenance of cooperation in issues of nuclear weapons and religious freedom.

According to the results of analysis of presupposition above, it is obvious that Obama relies heavily on using existential triggers of presupposition. The power of such triggering mechanisms is 'to manufacture the consent of the audience to the message expressed' (Wodak, 2007). This consent-manufacture is obtained because "presupposed content, under ordinary circumstances, and unless there is a cautious interpretive attitude on the part of the hearer, accepted without (much) critical attention (whereas asserted content and evident implicatures are normally subject to some level of evaluation)" (p. 214). For example, propositions presupposing the existence of entities like: shared task, shared goal, common humanity, mutual respect, and mutual interest indicate the speaker's (Obama) being committed to the existence of these entities and

hence making his audience take them for granted. Consequently, this paves the way to make his argument to achieve cooperation in facing difficulties and challenges sound logical (Machin & Mayr, 2012).

### References

- Beaver, D. I. 1997. Presupposition. In: J. van Benthem & A. Ter Meulen (Eds.), *The handbook of logic and language* (pp. 939- 1008). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science,
- Bekalu, M. A. (2006). Presupposition in news discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 17 (2), 147- 172.
- Caffi, C. 1993. Pragmatic presupposition. In: R.E. Asher (Ed.). *An Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (pp. 3320–3327). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Degano, C. (2007). Presupposition and dissociation in discourse: A corpus study. *Argumentation*, 21, 361–378. doi:10.1007/s10503-007-9058-7
- Dubois, J. et al. 1994. *Larousse Dictionnaire de Linguistique et des Sciences de Lange*. Paris: Larousse.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Finch, G. (2000). *Linguistic terms and concepts*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Goffman, E. (1983). Felicity's condition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89 (1), 1- 53.
- Greenfield, M. & Smith, H. (1976). The structure of communication in early language development. In N. Waterson, & C. Snow (Eds.), *The Development of communication* (pp. 311-319). New York: John Wiley.
- Green, G. M. (1989). *Pragmatics and natural language understanding*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). ‘Logic and conversation.’ In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics (Vol. 3): Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Khaleel, L. M. (2010). An analysis of presupposition triggers in English journalistic Texts. *Journal of College of Education for Women*, 2 (21). Retrieved from [www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=1945](http://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=1945)
- Levinson. S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. London, Washington DC: Sage Publications.
- Mazid, B. (1999). *Ideology and control in some speeches and newspaper genres: A politicolinguistic approach to discourse analysis* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Faculty of Arts, Ain Shams University.
- Mazid, B. (2007). Presuppositions and strategic functions in Bush's 20/9/2001 speech. A critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 6 (3), 351- 375.
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Obama, Barack (2009, June) *Remarks by the President on a New Beginning, Cairo University*. Cairo, Egypt. The White House, Office of the Press Secretary. Retrieved from: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/Remarksby-the-President-at-Cairo-University-](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarksby-the-President-at-Cairo-University-)

6-04-09/

- Richardson, J. (2007). *Analyzing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. NY: Palgrave, Macmillan.
- Stalnaker, R. C. (1973). Presuppositions. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 2, 447–45.
- Stalnaker, R. C. (1974). Pragmatic presuppositions. In: A. Rogers, B. Wall, & John P. Murphy (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Texas Conference On Performatives, Presuppositions, and Implicatures* (pp. 135- 147). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Stalnaker, R. C. (1978). Assertion. In: P. Cole (Ed.), *Pragmatics: Syntax and semantics* (pp. 315–332). New York: Academic Press.
- Stalnaker, R. C. (2002). Common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 25, 701– 721.
- Vaughn, S., Mercieca, R, & Jennifer, R, (2014). *The rhetoric of heroic expectations: Establishing the Obama presidency*. Texas: A&M University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Political discourse and racism. Describing others in Western parliaments. In S. H. Riggins (Ed.), *The language and politics of Exclusion: Others in discourse* (pp. 31- 64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage,
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). The discourse knowledge interface. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 85- 109). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). [Politics, ideology and discourse](#). *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (Volume on Politics and Language, Ruth Wodak, Ed.), 728-740.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Contextual knowledge management in discourse production: A CDA perspective. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 71– 100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2007). [The study of discourse: An introduction](#). In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies*. 5 vols. (pp. xix-xlii). Sage Benchmarks in Discourse Studies. London: Sage.
- Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Wodak, R. (2007). Pragmatics and critical discourse analysis: A cross disciplinary inquiry. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 15 (1), 203- 225.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University.

## **Appendixes**

### **Appendix A, Obama's speech in Cairo university**

#### **Extract A 1**

Good afternoon. I am honored to be in the timeless city of Cairo and to be hosted by two remarkable institutions. For over a thousand years, al-Azhar has, had stood as a beacon of Islamic learning. And for over a century, Cairo University has been a source of Egypt's advancement. Together, you represent the harmony between tradition and progress.

I'm grateful for your hospitality and the hospitality of the people of Egypt. And I'm also proud to carry with me the good will of the American people and a greeting of peace from Muslim communities in my country: Assalamu Alaikum.

We meet at a time of great tension between the United States and Muslims around the world, tension rooted in historical forces that go beyond any current policy debate. The relationship between Islam and the West includes centuries of coexistence and cooperation but also conflict and religious wars.

More recently, tension has been fed by colonialism that denied rights and opportunities to many Muslims and a Cold War in which Muslim majority countries were too often treated as proxies without regard to their own aspirations. Moreover, the sweeping change brought by modernity and globalization led many Muslims to view the West as hostile to the traditions of Islam.

Violent extremists have exploited these tensions in a small but potent minority of Muslims. The attacks of September 11, 2001, and the continued efforts of these extremists to engage in violence against civilians has led some in my country to view Islam as inevitably hostile not only to America and Western countries but also to human rights.

All this has bred more fear and more mistrust. So long as our relationship is defined by our differences, we will empower those who sow hatred rather than peace, those who promote conflict rather than the cooperation that can help all of our people achieve justice and prosperity. And this cycle of suspicion and discord must end.

I've come here to Cairo to seek a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world, one based on mutual interest and mutual respect, and one based upon the truth that America and Islam are not exclusive and need not be in competition. Instead, they overlap and share common principles, principles of justice and progress, tolerance and the dignity of all human beings.

I do so recognizing that change cannot happen overnight. I know there's been a lot of publicity about this speech, but no single speech can eradicate years of mistrust nor can I answer in the time that I have this afternoon all the complex questions that brought us to this point.

But I am convinced that in order to move forward, we must say openly to each other the things we hold in our hearts and that too often are said only behind closed doors. There must be a sustained effort to listen to each other, to learn from each other, to respect one another, and to seek common ground.

As the holy Quran tells us: "Be conscious of God and speak always the truth."

That is what I will try to do today, to speak the truth as best I can. Humbled by the task before us and firm in my belief that the interests we share as human beings are far more powerful than the forces that drive us apart.

Now, part of this conviction is rooted in my own experience. I'm a Christian. But my father came from a Kenyan family that includes generations of Muslims. As a boy, I spent several years in Indonesia and heard the call of the azaan at the break of dawn and at the fall of dusk.

As a young man, I worked in Chicago communities where many found dignity and peace in their Muslim faith. As a student of history, I also know civilization's debt to Islam. It was Islam at places like al-Azhar that carried the light of learning through so many centuries, paving the way for Europe's Renaissance and Enlightenment. It was innovation in Muslim communities...

It was innovation in Muslim communities that developed the order of algebra, our magnetic compass and tools of navigation, our mastery of pens and printing, our understanding of how disease spreads and how it can be healed. Islamic culture has given us majestic arches and soaring spires, timeless poetry and cherished music, elegant calligraphy and places of peaceful contemplation. And throughout history, Islam has demonstrated through words and deeds the possibilities of religious tolerance and racial equality.

I also know that Islam has always been a part of America's story. The first nation to recognize my country was Morocco. In signing the Treaty of Tripoli in 1796, our second president, John Adams, wrote:

"The United States has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Muslims." And since our founding, American Muslims have enriched the United States. They have fought in our wars. They have served in our government. They have stood for civil rights. They have started businesses. They have taught at our universities. They've excelled in our sports arenas. They've won Nobel Prizes, built our tallest building and lit the Olympic torch. And when the first Muslim American was recently elected to Congress, he took the oath to defend our Constitution using the same holy Quran that one of our founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson, kept in his personal library.

So I have known Islam on three continents before coming to the region where it was first revealed. That experience guides my conviction that partnership between America and Islam must be based on what Islam is, not what it isn't. And I consider it part of my responsibility as president of the United States to fight against negative stereotypes of Islam wherever they appear.



But that same principle must apply to Muslim perceptions of America. Just as...

Just as Muslims do not fit a crude stereotype, America is not the crude stereotype of a self-interested empire. The United States has been one of the greatest sources of progress that the world has ever known. We were born out of revolution against an empire.

That same principle must apply to Muslim perceptions of America. Just as Muslims do not fit a crude stereotype, America is not the crude stereotype of a self-interested empire. The United States has been one of the greatest sources of progress that the world has ever known. We were born out of revolution against an empire. We were founded upon the ideal that all are created equal, and we have shed blood and struggled for centuries to give meaning to those words - within our borders, and around the world. We are shaped by every culture, drawn from every end of the Earth, and dedicated to a simple concept: *E pluribus unum*: "Out of many, one."

Now much has been made of the fact that an African-American with the name Barack Hussein Obama could be elected president.

But my personal story is not so unique. The dream of opportunity for all people has not come true for everyone in America, but its promise exists for all who come to our shores. And that includes nearly 7 million American Muslims in our country today who, by the way, enjoy incomes and educational levels that are higher than the American average.

Moreover, freedom in America is indivisible from the freedom to practice one's religion. That is why there is a mosque in every state in our union and over 1,200 mosques within our borders. That's why the United States government has gone to court to protect the right of women and girls to wear the hijab, and to punish those who would deny it.

So let there be no doubt...

... let there be no doubt, Islam is a part of America. And I believe that America holds within her the truth that regardless of race, religion, or station in life, all of us share common aspirations: to live in peace and security, to get an education and to work with dignity, to love our families, our communities, and our God. These things we share. This is the hope of all humanity.

Of course, recognizing our common humanity is only the beginning of our task. Words alone cannot meet the needs of our people. These needs will be met only if we act boldly in the years ahead. And if we understand that the challenges we face are shared and our failure to meet them will hurt us all.

For we have learned from recent experience that when a financial system weakens in one country, prosperity is hurt everywhere. When a new flu infects one human being, all are at risk. When one nation pursues a nuclear weapon, the risk of nuclear attack rises for all nations.

When violent extremists operate in one stretch of mountains, people are endangered across an ocean. When innocents in Bosnia and Darfur are slaughtered, that is a stain on our collective conscience.

That is what it means to share this world in the 21st Century. That is the responsibility we have to one another as human beings. This is a difficult responsibility to embrace, for human history has often been a record of nations and tribes, and, yes, religions subjugating one another in pursuit of their own interests.

Yet in this new age, such attitudes are self-defeating. Given our interdependence, any world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail. So whatever we think of the past, we must not be prisoners to it. Our problems must be dealt with through partnership, our progress must be shared.

Now, that does not mean we should ignore sources of tension. Indeed, it suggests the opposite. We must face these tensions squarely. And so, in that spirit, let me speak as clearly and as plainly as I can about some specific issues that I believe we must

finally confront together.

#### **Extract A 2**

The first issue that we have to confront is violent extremism in all its forms. In Ankara, I made clear that America is not and never will be at war with Islam.

We will, however, relentlessly confront violent extremists who pose a grave threat to our security because we reject the same thing that people of all faiths reject, the killing of innocent men, women and children. And it is my first duty as president to protect the American people.

The situation in Afghanistan demonstrates America's goals and our need to work together. Over seven years ago, the United States pursued al-Qaida and the Taliban with broad international support. We did not go by choice. We went because of necessity. I'm aware that there's still some who would question or even justify the offense of 9/11. But let us be clear. Al-Qaida killed nearly 3,000 people on that day.

The victims were innocent men, women and children from America and many other nations who had done nothing to harm anybody. And yet al-Qaida chose to ruthlessly murder these people, claimed credit for the attack, and even now states their determination to kill on a massive scale. They have affiliates in many countries and are trying to expand their reach.

These are not opinions to be debated. These are facts to be dealt with. Make no mistake, we do not want to keep our troops in Afghanistan. We see no military -- we seek no military bases there. It is agonizing for America to lose our young men and women. It is costly and politically difficult to continue this conflict.

We would gladly bring every single one of our troops home if we could be confident that there were not violent extremists in Afghanistan, and now Pakistan, determined to kill as many Americans as they possibly can. But that is not yet the case.

And that's why we're partnering with a coalition of 46 countries. And despite the costs involved, America's commitment will not weaken. Indeed, none of us should tolerate these extremists. They have killed in many countries. They have killed people of different faiths but, more than any other, they have killed Muslims. Their actions are irreconcilable with the rights of human beings, the progress of nations, and with Islam.

The holy Quran teaches that whoever kills an innocent is as -- it is as if he has killed all mankind.

And the holy Quran also says whoever saves a person, it is as if he has saved all mankind.

The enduring faith of over a billion people is so much bigger than the narrow hatred of a few. Islam is not part of the problem in combating violent extremism; it is an important part of promoting peace.

Now, we also know that military power alone is not going to solve the problems in Afghanistan and Pakistan. That's why we plan to invest \$1.5 billion each year over the next five years to partner with Pakistanis to build schools and hospitals, roads and businesses, and hundreds of millions to help those who've been displaced.

That's why we are providing more than \$2.8 billion to help Afghans develop their economy and deliver services that people depend on.

Now, let me also address the issue of Iraq. Unlike Afghanistan, Iraq was a war of choice that provoked strong differences in my country and around the world. Although I believe that the Iraqi people are ultimately better off without the tyranny of Saddam Hussein, I also believe that events in Iraq have reminded America of the need to use diplomacy and build international consensus to resolve our problems whenever possible.

Indeed, we can recall the words of Thomas Jefferson, who said: "I hope that our wisdom will grow with our power and teach us that the less we use our power, the greater it will be."

Today America has a dual responsibility to help Iraq forge a better future and to leave Iraq to Iraqis. I have made it clear to the Iraqi people...

I have made it clear to the Iraqi people that we pursue no basis and no claim on their territory or resources. Iraq's sovereignty is its own. And that's why I ordered the removal of our combat brigades by next August. That is why we will honor our agreement with Iraq's democratically-elected government to remove combat troops from Iraqi cities by July and to remove all of our troops from Iraq by 2012.

We will help Iraq train its security forces and develop its economy. But we will support a secure and united Iraq as a partner and never as a patron.

And finally, just as America can never tolerate violence by extremists, we must never alter or forget our principles. 9/11 was an enormous trauma to our country. The fear and anger that it provoked was understandable. But in some cases, it led us to act contrary to our traditions and our ideals.

We are taking concrete actions to change course. I have unequivocally prohibited the use of torture by the United States. And I have ordered the prison at Guantanamo Bay closed by early next year.

So America will defend itself, respectful of the sovereignty of nations and the rule of law. And we will do so in partnership with Muslim communities, which are also threatened. The sooner the extremists are isolated and unwelcome in Muslim communities, the sooner we will all be safer.

### **Extract A 3**

**Now, the second major source of tension that we need to discuss is the situation between Israelis, Palestinians and the Arab world.** America's strong bonds with Israel are well-known. This bond is unbreakable. It is based upon cultural and historical ties and the recognition that the aspiration for a Jewish homeland is rooted in a tragic history that cannot be denied.

Around the world the Jewish people were persecuted for centuries. And anti-Semitism in Europe culminated in an unprecedented Holocaust. Tomorrow I will visit Buchenwald, which was part of a network of camps where Jews were enslaved, tortured, shot and gassed to death by the Third Reich.

Six million Jews were killed, more than the entire Jewish population of Israel today. Denying that fact is baseless. It is ignorant, and it is hateful.

Threatening Israel with destruction or repeating vile stereotypes about Jews is deeply wrong and only serves to evoke in the minds of the Israelis this most painful of memories while preventing the peace that the people of this region deserve.

On the other hand, it is also undeniable that the Palestinian people, Muslims and Christians, have suffered in pursuit of a homeland. For more than 60 years, they've endured the pain of dislocation.

Many wait in refugee camps in the West Bank and Gaza and neighboring lands for a life of peace and security that they have never been able to lead. They endure the daily humiliations, large and small, that come with occupation.

So let there be no doubt, the situation for the Palestinian people is intolerable. And America will not turn our backs on the legitimate Palestinian aspiration for dignity, opportunity and a state of their own.

For decades, then, there has been a stalemate. Two peoples with legitimate aspirations, each with a painful history that makes compromise elusive. It's easy to point fingers.

For Palestinians to point to the displacement brought about by Israel's founding and for Israelis to point to the constant hostility and attacks throughout its history, from within its borders as well as beyond.

But if we see this conflict only from one side or the other, then we will be blind to the truth. The only resolution is for the aspirations of both sides to be met through two states, where Israelis and Palestinians each live in peace and security.

That is in Israel's interests, Palestine's interests, America's interests and the world's interests. And that's why I intend to personally pursue this outcome with all of the patience and dedication that the task requires.

The obligations -- the obligations that the parties have agreed to under the Road Map are clear. For peace to come, it is time for them and all of us to live up to our responsibilities.

Palestinians must abandon violence. Resistance through violence and killing is wrong and it does not succeed. For centuries, black people in America suffered the lash of the whip as slaves and the humiliation of segregation. But it was not violence that won full and equal rights. It was a peaceful and determined insistence upon the ideals at the center of America's founding.

This same story can be told by people from South Africa to South Asia, to Eastern Europe to Indonesia. It's a story with a simple truth: violence is a dead end. It is a sign neither of courage nor power to shoot rockets at sleeping children or to blow up old women on a bus. That's not how moral authority is claimed, that's how it is surrendered.

Now is the time for Palestinians to focus on what they can build. The Palestinian Authority must develop its capacity to govern with institutions that serve the needs of its people.

Hamas does have support among some Palestinians, but they also have to recognize they have responsibilities, to play a role in fulfilling Palestinian aspirations, to unify the Palestinian people, Hamas must put an end to violence, recognize past agreements, recognize Israel's right to exist.

At the same time, Israelis must acknowledge that just as Israel's right to exist cannot be denied, neither can Palestine's. The United States does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements.

This construction violates previous agreements and undermines efforts to achieve peace. It is time for these settlements to stop.

And Israel must also live up to its obligation to ensure that Palestinians can live and work and develop their society. Just as it devastates Palestinian families, the continuing humanitarian crisis in Gaza does not serve Israel's security, neither does the continuing lack of opportunity in the West Bank.

Progress in the daily lives of the Palestinian people must be a critical part of a road to peace. And Israel must take concrete steps to enable such progress.

And, finally, the Arab states must recognize that the Arab Peace Initiative was an important beginning, but not the end of their responsibility. The Arab-Israeli conflict should no longer be used to distract the people of Arab nations from other problems. Instead, it must be a cause for action to help the Palestinian people

develop the institutions that will sustain their state, to recognize Israel's legitimacy and to choose progress over a self-defeating focus on the past.

America will align our policies with those who pursue peace, and we will say in public what we say in private to Israelis and Palestinians and Arabs.

We cannot impose peace. But privately, many Muslims recognize that Israel will not go away. Likewise, many Israelis recognize the need for a Palestinian state.

It is time for us to act on what everyone knows to be true. Too many tears have been shed, too much blood has been shed.

All of us have a responsibility to work for the day when the mothers of Israelis and Palestinians could, can see their children grow up without fear, when the holy land of the three great faiths is the place of peace that God intended it to be, when Jerusalem is a secure and lasting home for Jews and Christians and Muslims and a place for all of the children of Abraham to mingle peacefully together as in the story of Isra -- as in the story of Isra, when Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed -- peace be upon them -- joined in prayer.

#### **Extract A 4**

**The third source of tension is our shared interest in the rights and responsibilities of nations on nuclear weapons.** This issue has been a source of tension between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran. For many years, Iran has defined itself, in part, by its opposition to my country. And there is, in fact, a tumultuous history between us.

In the middle of the Cold War, the United States played a role in the overthrow of a democratically elected Iranian government. Since the Islamic revolution, Iran has played a role in acts of hostage taking and violence against U.S. troops and civilians. This history is well known.

Rather than remain trapped in the past, I've made it clear to Iran's leaders and people that my country is prepared to move forward. The question now is not what Iran is against but, rather, what future it wants to build.

I recognize it will be hard to overcome decades of mistrust, but we will proceed with courage, rectitude, and resolve. There will be many issues to discussion between our two countries, and we are willing to move forward without preconditions on the basis of mutual respect.

But it is clear to all concerned that when it comes to nuclear weapons, we have reached a decisive point. This is not simply about America's interests.

It's about preventing a nuclear arms race in the Middle East that could lead this region and the world down a hugely dangerous path.

Now, I understand those who protest that some countries have weapons that others do not. No single nations should pick and choose which nation holds nuclear weapons. And that's why I strongly reaffirmed America's commitment to seek a world in which no nations hold nuclear weapons.

And any nation, including Iran, should have the right to access peaceful nuclear power if it complies with its responsibilities under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. That commitment is at the core of the treaty. And it must be kept for all who fully abide by it. And I am hopeful that all countries in the region can share in this goal.

### **Extract A5**

#### **The fourth issue that I will address is democracy.**

I know there has been controversy about the promotion of democracy in recent years. And much of this controversy is connected to the war in Iraq. So let me be clear. No system of government can or should be imposed by one nation by any other. That does not lessen my commitment, however, to governments that reflect the will of the people.

Each nation gives life to this principle in its own way, grounded in the traditions of its own people. America does not presume to know what is best for everyone, just as we would not presume to pick the outcome of a peaceful election.

But I do have an unyielding belief that all people yearn for certain things: the ability to speak your mind and have a say in how you are governed, confidence in the rule of law and the equal administration of justice, government that is transparent and doesn't steal from the people, the freedom to live as you choose. These are not just American ideas. They are human rights. And that is why we will support them everywhere.

Now, there is no straight line to realize this promise. But this much is clear. Governments that protect these rights are ultimately more stable, successful and secure. Suppressing ideas never succeeds in making them go away. America respects the right of all peaceful and law-abiding voices to be heard around the world, even if we disagree with them. And we will welcome all elected, peaceful governments, provided they govern with respect for all their people.

This last point is important because there are some who advocate for democracy only when they're out of power. Once in power, they are ruthless in suppressing the rights of others.

So no matter where it takes hold, government of the people and by the people sets a single standard for all who would hold power. You must maintain your power through consent, not coercion. You must respect the rights of minorities and participate with a spirit of tolerance and compromise. You must place the interests of your people and the legitimate workings of the political process above your party.

Without these ingredients, elections alone do not make true democracy.

Thank you.

#### **Extract A6**

**The fifth issue that we must address together is religious freedom.** Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance. We see it in the history of Andalusia and Cordoba during the Inquisition. I saw it firsthand as a child in Indonesia where devout Christians worshipped freely in an overwhelmingly Muslim country.

That is the spirit we need today. People in every country should be free to choose and live their faith based upon the persuasion of the mind and the heart and the soul.

This tolerance is essential for religion to thrive. But it's being challenged in many different ways. Among some Muslims, there's a disturbing tendency to measure one's own faith by the rejection of somebody else's faith.

The richness of religious diversity must be upheld, whether it is for Maronites in Lebanon or the Copts in Egypt.

And if we are being honest, fault lines must be closed among Muslims as well as the divisions between Sunni and Shia have led to tragic violence, particularly in Iraq.

Freedom of religion is central to the ability of peoples to live together. We must always examine the ways in which people protect it. For instance, in the United States, rules on charitable giving have made it harder for Muslims to fulfill their religious obligation.

That's why I'm committed to work with American Muslims to ensure that they can fulfill zakat. Likewise, it is important for Western countries to avoid impeding Muslim citizens from practicing religion as they see fit, for instance, by dictating what clothes a Muslim woman should wear.

We can't disguise hostility towards any religion behind the pretense of liberalism. In fact, faith should bring us together. And that's why we're forging service projects in America to bring together Christians, Muslims and Jews.

That's why we welcome efforts like Saudi Arabian King Abdullah's interfaith dialogue and Turkey's leadership in the Alliance of Civilizations.

Around the world, we can turn dialogue into interfaith service so bridges between peoples lead to action, whether it is combating malaria in Africa or providing relief after a natural disaster.

#### **Extract A7**

The sixth issue -- the sixth issue that I want to address is women's rights.



I know, and you can tell from this audience, that there is a healthy debate about this issue. I reject the view of some in the West that a woman who chooses to cover her hair is somehow less equal. But I do believe that a woman who is denied an education is denied equality.

And it is no coincidence that countries where women are well-educated are far more likely to be prosperous. Now let me be clear, issues of women's equality are by no means simply an issue for Islam. In Turkey, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, we've seen Muslim-majority countries elect a woman to lead.

Meanwhile, the struggle for women's equality continues in many aspects of American life and in countries around the world. I am convinced that our daughters can contribute just as much to society as our sons.

Our common prosperity will be advanced by allowing all humanity, men and women, to reach their full potential. I do not believe that women must make the same choices as men in order to be equal. And I respect those women who choose to live their lives in traditional roles. But it should be their choice.

That is why the United States will partner with any Muslim-majority country to support expanded literacy for girls and to help young women pursue employment through micro-financing that helps people live their dreams.

#### **Extract A8**

Finally, I want to discuss economic development and opportunity. I know that for many, the face of globalization is contradictory. The Internet and television can bring knowledge and information but also offensive sexuality and mindless violence into the home.

Trade can bring new wealth and opportunities but also huge disruptions and change in communities. In all nations, including America, this change can bring fear; fear that, because of modernity, we lose control over our economic choices, our politics, and most importantly, our identities, those things we most cherish about our communities, our families, our traditions and our faith.

But I also know that human progress cannot be denied. There need not be contradictions between development and tradition. Countries like Japan and South Korea grew their economies enormously while maintaining distinct cultures. The same is true for the astonishing progress within Muslim majority countries from Kuala Lumpur to Dubai.

In ancient times and in our times, Muslim communities have been at the forefront of innovation and education. And this is important because no development strategy can be based only upon what comes out of the ground nor can it be sustained while young people are out of work.

Many Gulf States have enjoyed great wealth as a consequence of oil, and some are beginning to focus it on broader development. But all of us must recognize that education and innovation will be the currency of the 21st century. And in too...

And in too many Muslim communities, there remains underinvestment in these areas. I am emphasizing such investment within my own country. And while America, in the past, has focused on oil and gas when it comes to this part of the world, we now seek a broader engagement.

On education, we will expand change programs and increase scholarships like the one that brought my father to America.

At the same time, we will encourage more Americans to study in Muslim communities. And we will match promising Muslim students with internships in America, invest in online learning for teachers and children around the world and create a new, online network so a young person in Kansas can communicate instantly with a young person in Cairo.

On economic development, we will create a new core of business volunteers to partner with counterparts in Muslim majority countries. And I will host a summit on entrepreneurship this year to identify how we can deepen ties between business leaders, foundations and social entrepreneurs in the United States and Muslim communities around the world.

On science and technology, we will launch a new fund to support technological development in Muslim majority country and to help transfer ideas to the marketplace so they can create more jobs. We will open centers of scientific excellence in Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia and appoint new science envoys to collaborate on programs that develop new sources of energy, create green jobs, digitize records, clean water, grow new crops.

Today, I'm announcing a new global effort with the organization of the Islamic Conference to eradicate polio. And we will also expand partnerships with Muslim communities to promote child and maternal health.

All these things must be done in partnership. Americans are ready to join with citizens and governments, community organizations, religious leaders, and businesses in Muslim communities around the world to help our people pursue a better life.