



**Maysan University
College of Education
Department of English**

**Pragma-Linguistic Study of Complaint in
Selected Written Political Speeches**

A THESIS

**SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL OF THE COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MISAN IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AND LINGUISTICS**

By

Shaima Hamad Saad Al_Moussawi

Supervised by

Asst.Prof. Iqbal Sahib Dishar

A.D

1439 A.H 2019

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
(وقل ربي زدني علما)
صدق الله العلي العظيم
سورة طه (آية 114)

(And say, oh my Lord increase my knowledge)
(TAHA: 114)

To
Muhammad,
Ali and
Fatima

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I thank Almighty Allah for giving me all what I have achieved in all my life. I would like to thank my supervisor Assist. Prof. Iqbal Sahib Dishar who always gives me knowledge and encouragement enthusiastically and guides me with tremendous care and compassion. I am also very grateful to help Dr. Alaa Dafar, Head of English Department at the Faculty of Education, Maysan University for her support, advice and guidance. Also I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Fatima for her help and guidance. I would like to thank the faculty members of the Department of English Language, Faculty of Education, Maysan University for their cooperation, encouragement and support throughout the writing of this letter.

Thanks are due to my family, especially my husband, my mother, and my father for their help. They always support me to achieve my ambitions and never forget me in their prayers. Thanks are due to my brothers and sisters who were beside me in anything.

ABSTRACT

Expressive are those kinds of speech acts which state what the speakers feel. They express psychological circumstances and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, and complaint. Whenever people do with other people they do not always agree or like. They sometimes disagree or they, sometimes do not like. In order to show their disagreement or their disapproval people make a complaint. According to speech act theory speakers give utterances to convey their intents including complaints. Complaints are the main concern of the current study are the most influential contribution of Pragmatics. In the speech act of complaint, "the speaker expresses, displeasure or annoyances as a reaction to past or ongoing action .

This study aims at describing the ways of expressing speech act of complaint by politicians in the nine speeches of US presidents Bush, Obama and Trump. He tries to show the functions of complaints that politicians use in political speeches. It also highlights and identifies complaint strategies used by three politicians. Trosborg's (1994) and Olshtain and Weinbach (1987) models have been selected for analyzing the chosen extracts.

The results reveal that concerning the directive acts identified in the analyzed data, Request for repair is used more than request for forbearance or threat. Further, the strategy of direct accusation is used frequently to express the speech act of complaint employed by the politicians, yet the strategy of modified blame never used.

The study falls into five chapters: chapter one is concerned with preliminaries of the study such as the problem, aims of the study, the hypothesis, the procedures, limits of the study and the value of the study. Chapter two is devoted to the review of literature. Chapter three includes research methodology while chapter four present data analysis of political discourse which covers the analysis of the problem. Chapter five demonstrates conclusions and Suggestions for further research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subjects	No. of Page
Acknowledgements	I
Abstract	II
Contents	V
List of Abbreviations	VI
List of Tables	VII
CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION	
1.1 The Problem	1
1.2 The Aims	2
1.3 The Hypothesis	2
1.4 The procedures	2
1.5 The Limits	3
1.6 The Value	3
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 The Notion of Pragmatics	4
2.3 Scope of Pragmatic	8
2.4 Pragmatics Interfaces	9
2.5 Speech Acts	13
2.5.1 Introduction	13

Speech Act Theory Defined 2.5.2	14
Direct and Indirect Speech Acts 2.5.3	21
Characterizations of Speech Acts 2.5.4	23
Pragmatic Characterizations of Speech Acts 2.5.4.1	23
2.5.4.2 Syntactic Characterizations of Speech Acts	24
2.5.4.3 Semantic Characterizations of Speech Acts	27
Felicity Conditions 2.5.5	27
Classification of Speech Acts 2.5.6	29
Austin's Classification of Speech Acts 2.5.6.1	29
Searle's Classification of Speech Acts 6.2. 2.5	30
Speech Act of Expressive 2.5.7	31
Speech Act of Complaint 2.5.8	32
Classifications of Complaints 5.9 .2	34
Felicity Conditions of Complaint 5.10 .2	35
Previous Studies 2.6	37
Political Texts and Language 7 .2	40
Features of Political Speech 8 .2	43
CHAPTER THREE :RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	46
Introduction 3.1	46
3.2 The Data	46
3.3 Research Type	46
3.4 Models of Complaint	47
3.4.1 Trosborg's Model	47
3.4.1.1 The Directive Acts of Complaint	48

3.4.1.2 Complaints Categories	49
3.4.2 Olshtain and Weinbach (1987)Model	52
3.4.3 Proposed Model	54
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA AND RESULTS ANALYSIS	55
Introduction 4.1	55
4.2 Data Analysis	55
4.2.1 Group(A)	55
Bush 's First Speech 4.2.1.1	55
Bush 's Second Speech 4.2.1.2	56
4.2.1.3 Bush 's Third Speech	69
Group (B) 4.2.2	72
Obama's First Speech 4.2.2.1	72
4.2.2.2 Obama's Second Speech	75
Obama's Third Speech 4.2.2.3	78
Group (C) 4.2.3	82
Trump's First Speech 4.2.3.1	82
Trump's Second Speech 4.2.3.2	90
Trump's Third Speech 4.2.3.3	93
4.3 Results and Discussions	98
4.3.1 Complaint's Strategies and Directive Acts in Group (A)	98
4.3.2 Complaint's Strategies and Directive Acts in Group (B)	99
4.3.3 Complaint's Strategies and Directive Acts in Group (C)	101
4.4 Complaint's Directive Acts and Strategies in All Groups	102

4.4.1 Directive Acts in All Groups	103
4.4.2 Strategies in All Groups	105
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS	106
5.1 Introduction	106
5.2 Conclusions	106
5.3 Recommendations	107
5.4 Suggestions for Further Research	108
Bibliography	110
Appendices	117
Abstract in Arabic	215
Title in Arabic	

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

Abbr.	Equivalent
Prsp	Presupposition
Imp	Implicature
LA	Locutionary act
IA	Illocutionary act
PA	Perlocutionary act
FTA	Face Threatening Acts
S	Speaker
H	Hearer
PD	Political discourse
SUA	Socially unacceptable

LIST OF TABLES

Page	Title	.Table No
------	-------	-----------

98	Distribution of complaint's directive Acts in Group (A)	Table No.(1)
99	Distribution of complaint's Strategies in Group (A)	Table No. (2)
100	Distribution of Complaint's Directive Acts in Group (B)	Table No. (3)
100	Distribution of Complaint's Strategies in Group (B)	Table No. (4)
101	Distribution of Complaint's Directive Acts in Group (C)	Table No. (5)
102	Distribution of Complaint's Strategies in Group (C)	Table No. (6)
103	Distribution of Complaint's Directive Acts in All Groups	Table No. (7)
104	Distribution of Complaint's Strategies in All Groups	Table No. (8)

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Problem

Complaint is actually a part of communication. It is the information which tells about inappropriate condition that is accepted by second party who receives an utterance as a product, service and etc. Complaint as a couple of variations of linguistic forms. It is frequently appeared through statement form, question form and imperative form. In complaining people show their disapproval by those utterances. The power of the speaker's complaint depends on the capacity and the context. The purpose of the complaint cannot be predicted by looking to the linguistic form since it is hauled clearly. Because of the face-threatening nature of complaints, people may decide to either perform this act or opt out bearing in mind in social consequences. Therefore it can say that such a decision is a social one before it is a linguistic one. The study tends to describe complaint strategies which are used in the nine selected political speeches for each of the American Presidents Bush, Obama and Trump.

There have been a limited number of studies accomplished on the speech acts (e.g. Murphy & Neu, 1996, Boxer, 1993; Olshtain & Weinbach, 1993; Boxer & Pickering, 1995; Boxer, 1996). yet; the speech act of complaint was not properly studied, taking the interlocutor's attitude towards the complainer, which is why the study is to be chosen. To the extent of knowledge of the researcher, there is no previous study attempting to investigate the speech act of complaint in the nine American selected political speeches.

1.2 The Aims

Relevant with the problem statements, the study aims are as follow:

1-Finding out the speech act of complaint strategy which are used in the nine selected political speeches.

2-Identifying the meanings of complaint expressions used by (Politician) in political situation.

3-Classifying the type of compliant expression found in the nine selected political speeches.

1.3 The Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that complaint happens whenever the speaker reacts with displeasure or annoyance for an action which has exaggerated the speaker unfavorably .Complaint can naturally cause offence and highly threaten the social relationship between the speaker and the hearer .Therefore , it is important for Politicians to be able to use appropriate strategy to perform complaint in order to avoid or minimize personal conflicts in disputation and communication process.

1.4 The Procedures

In order to verify the hypothesis of the study , the following steps will be followed:

1-presenting a theoretical background regarding the concepts of pragmatic compliant and political discourse

2- Identifying complaint of each political discourse.

3- Applying the analytical framework on the selected political discourse.

4-Describing the complaint strategies in the selected political discourse.

5- Interpreting how complaint expresses the psychological state of the (Speaker).

6-Extracting conclusions based on the results of the analysis and suggesting recommendations possible for future studies.

1.5 The Limits

The present study is devoted to the study of speech act of complaint in nine selected political speeches, three speeches to each of the American Presidents Bush Jr., Obama and Trump; they are related to terrorism, via adopting Trosborg (1994) & Olshtain and Weinback (1987) models.

1.6 The Value

The result of the study is expected to be able to give the readers the following benefits:

a-It can be reference to study pragmatic term especially complaint speech act found in political discourse and how we can identify It or diagnose it.

b-This research will give more information of speech act of complaint through political discourse.

c- for English department students who are interested in pragmatic notions. To give more information for learner who interested in improving this study.

d-The students will obtain more about communication, especially in choosing complaint expression based on appropriate context of situation.

c- It can be used as a reference for the suggestions of further studies.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Chapter two is a review of literature which sheds light on the notion of pragmatics, speech act in general and complaint in particular. Also it provides a more narrative of the act of speech complaint. Moreover, this chapter gives thorough details to all the related topics under the domain of the speech acts of complaint and some topic that is related to political speech.

2.2 The Notion of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics developed in the late 1970s, it explores how people understand and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation Pragmatics is one of the central concepts to this study because of our interest in how meaning is expressed in political speeches. The modern usage of pragmatics was first introduced by Morris (1938:6) who used the term in a broad sense to refer to "the study of the relation of signs to interpreters". As for Linguistic Pragmatics, it was developed as a result of ideas regarding the functions and use of language by philosophers such as Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). Their works had emphasizes a new perspective on language from a pragmatic point of view and besides the semantic meaning of the utterance, John Austin was One of the most famous medieval scientists in pragmatics in the 20th century his conception is directed against oversimplified view of language.

The basic principle of Austin's theory as stated in his book “**How to Do Things with Words**” (a series of lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955) is that no school of thought can afford to study language in itself, without paying any attention to pragmatic aspects. As mentioned in his book, Austin emphasizes that we not only rely on the

sentences that we talk about in our daily conversations but to the speech acts that those utterances are used to perform. Such acts are staples of communicative life, but only became a topic of sustained investigation, at least in the English-speaking world, in the middle of the 20th c. Over the past decade, the problem of speech act and its characteristics has become the focus of attention of researchers interested in speech activity, The interest in the functioning of a living language was stimulated by communication theories as well as by speech act theory (Argyle, 1973 : 44). Bublitz (2011: 300) states that two main ideas are the basis of the theory of language behavior: the first holds that the meaning of an utterance is distinct from the function that the utterance performs (what I call language ability); the second is all operators coincide with the execution of actions. Both these ideas well predate Austin's theory.

Pragmatics has been defined in various ways by different scholars reflecting their goals and objectives. According to Yule (1996:3), pragmatics is the study of meaning communicated by the speaker and not the statement, Pragmatics is the study of 'invisible' meaning or how we recognize what is meant even when it is not actually said (or written) In another meaning, it studies the contextual meaning or those aspects of utterance meaning that are determined by the social contexts in which they occur. Since, pragmatics is strongly related with social context, culture and of course the act of communication, in studying language we have to consider the context in order to understand or interpret utterances. When someone delivers speech to the listeners, they cannot ignore the situation in which speech is uttered Akmajian et al (1995: 377). There is strong relation between utterance and its situation. Linguists pay attentions to the context in their studies. they study the relation between language meaning in speech and its situation by pragmatic approach,

Pragmatics studies how the transmission of meaning depends not only on the linguistic knowledge (e.g. grammar, lexicon etc.) of the speaker and listener, but also on the context of the utterance, knowledge about the status of those involved.

Pragmatics is considered as a study of how contextual factors interact with linguistic meanings in interpreting a language. Unlike semantics; the study of language meaning, pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as expressed by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by listener (or reader) Yule (1996:5) . It is not enough to analyze what a word or phrase means in a statement. This approach also necessarily explores how listeners can make conclusions about what should lead to the interpretation of the meaning given to the speaker; Listeners have to explore what is unsaid or the invisible meaning of speaker utterances. In this way, they get more information than they say. This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how contexts influence what is said. It requires a consideration of how speaker organize what they want to say according to who they are talking to, where and when the situation takes place(ibid: 13). In support to this idea, Crystal (2008:379) proposes that pragmatics is

The study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication.

It can be said that the real pragmatist is synonymous with “communication.” Decisions made by decision makers to file a complaint

or a compliment in verbal interactions are associated with various phenomena, such as supporting an agreement and choosing a tool, deciding to follow or intervene in a conversation or choosing a state of social bookmarking. As a result, communications evolve in accordance with a common user communication solution (Ifantidou, 2013: 94).

Matthews (1997:198) defines language as "the phenomenon of vocal and written communication among human beings." This definition shows the close relation between language and communication. Writing skill plays an important role in communication framework of language. It is used to transfer the information between the addresser and the addressee. Every utterance is determined by the situation, event or occurrence at a given point in time. The study through which meaning in context is derived belongs to the domain of pragmatics.

Black (2006:8) states that pragmatics is the study of how the meaning of a sentence (or other linguistic unit) changes depending on how and where it is expressed, or on the structural ambiguity in language. The following are examples of structural uncertainties, what does "**You have a green light**" mean? Without knowing the intent by the speaker and who the speaker is, it is impossible to conclude because there is no language without a motive, will or intent. The utterance "**you have a green light**" may be interpreted in some meaning: (1) You are holding a green bulb, (2) You have a green light, (3) Otherwise, you can continue the project. Logically, Trosborg (1995:5) states that '**Pragma**' is traced back to the Greek language and refers to activity, deed, affairs. This can be defined in semiotics and linguistics. Levinson (1983:2) explains that the notion of pragmatics was extended within the behaviouristic of semiotics and the scope was expanded and has covered areas such as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics and matters as

different as the psychology of communication and the evolution of symbol system. Linguistic pragmatics was originally designed to focus on the speaker's intentions and examine remarks focused on the cognitive abilities of the recipient and the sociocultural context in which the statement was made when processing the transmitted information.

Pragmatics is the study of communicative action in its socio-cultural context. It is like principles that have to be followed by both the speaker and the hearer to communicate successfully. As a result, by pragmatics it is possible to imply additional meaning to be realized out of all existing options in a certain context. Communicative action includes not only using speech acts (such as apologizing, complaining, complimenting, and requesting), but also engaging in various types of discourse and participating in speech events of different length and complexity (Rose and Kasper, 2001:2).

2.3 Scope of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is interested in the study of the speaker's meaning, not focusing on the phonetic or grammatical form of an utterance, but instead on what the speaker's intentions and beliefs are, the study of the meaning in context¹ and the influence that a given context can have on the message. It requires knowledge of the speaker's identities, and the place and time of the utterance (May, 2001: 44). The study of implicatures, i.e. the things that are communicated even though they are not explicitly expressed, The study of relative distance, both social and physical, between speakers in order to understand what determines the choice of what is said and what is not said, the study of what is not meant, as opposed to the intended

¹(¹) Context includes the total non-linguistic background to a text or utterance, including the immediate situation in which it is used, and the awareness by speaker and hearer of what has been said earlier and of any relevant external beliefs or presuppositions(Crystal,2008:345).

meaning, i.e. that which is unsaid and unintended, or unintentional, [Information structure](#), the study of how utterances are marked in order to efficiently manage the common ground of referred entities between speaker and hearer, [Formal Pragmatics](#), the study of those aspects of meaning and use for which context of use is an important factor, by using the methods and goals of formal semantics Carston (2002:67) . According to Morris (1938), the syntax indicates a connection between characters. Semantics is related to the relationship between a symbol and a goal. Pragmatism, on the other hand, represents the relationship between the individual and the user. Morris was operating within a behavioral framework. He thus saw all the three approaches as only part of the larger semiotics theory. Although this position by Morris continues to influence thinking in pragmatics as an approach to discourse, it is too broad to delimit the real concerns of pragmatics. It is in this understanding that we find the broad definition of characterizing pragmatics as merely language in use (Leech, 1983: 6). When pragmatics is seen as language in use or merely a relationship between the signs and their users as we have already pointed to, it becomes fairly intricate to draw a hard and fast boundary between pragmatics and socio-linguistics, or even discourse analysis, ethnography of speaking, text linguistics and social psychology. This is because all these areas are interested in language in use (Fairclough , 1989 :78)

Semantics is the study of the of meaning: knowledge encoded in the vocabulary of the language and in its patterns for building more elaborate meanings, up to the level of sentence meanings. Pragmatics is concerned with the use of these tools in meaningful communication (Griffiths, 2006:4). Pragmatics is about the interaction of semantic knowledge with

our knowledge of the world, taking into account contexts of use. An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics (Ibid :6).

2.4 Pragmatics Interfaces

The study of Pragmatics has been expanded in many areas. For the purposes of this study, it should be noted that the concept of linguistic pragmatics, which is widespread today, is much more restrictive than the term pragmatics, which was first used by Charles Morris (1938). Morris has a great deal of interest in Semiotics which is the general study of signs and symbols. Pragmatics had been defined as the “study of the relation of signs to interpreters” According to Morris, pragmatics tries to understand the relationship between signs and their users, while semantics tends to focus on the actual objects or ideas to which a word refers, and syntax (or "syntactics") examines relationships among signs or symbols(Wardhaugh,1986: 275). Semantics is the literal meaning of an idea whereas pragmatics is the implied meaning of the given idea. Morris then extends the scope of pragmatics to include psychological, biological and sociological phenomena which occur in the functioning of signs² (Levinson, 1983:77). Today, pragmatics covers other areas of study such as Psycholinguistics, Sociolinguistics, Neurolinguistics, etc. Currently, linguistic pragmatics majorly dwells on those factors of language use that govern the choice individuals make in social interaction and the effect of those choices on others (Crystal, 1987:120).

In the last two decades it has become increasingly clear that language and language use cannot be studied separately and independently of each

²(²) In linguistic discussion, the most widespread sense is when linguistic expressions (words, sentences, etc.) are said to be ‘signs’ of the entities, states of affairs, etc., which they stand for (or, often, of the concepts involved). This relationship between sign and thing, or sign and concept, is traditionally known as signification (Crystal, 2008: 398).

other. This new approach assumes an interaction between grammar (phonology, morphology, lexicon, syntax and semantics) and pragmatics. An analysis of the interfaces between each component of grammar and pragmatics (the 'interface view') can also be applied to hard-pragmatics and soft-pragmatics research. Hard-pragmatics studies the field of language use from philosophical, linguistic and logical points of view, while soft-pragmatics explores phenomena of language use from a social and socio-cultural perspective (Chapman, 2009:6). Pragmatic interfaces eliminate important differences in pragmatical knowledge. Because the first major advertising project was devoted to the study of grammatical and pragmatic interfaces and the combination of soft pragmatics and strong pragmatics. With this merger, many pragmatical phenomena can be considered. The Pragmatic Interfaces series has an interdisciplinary approach that allows scholars in various fields of grammar and phonetics to collaborate with (Hickey ,1988: 34).

Van Dijk (1977: 189) stresses the link between language usage and human life in general, granting pragmatics a bridge like function between linguistics and the rest of the humanities and social sciences. Sociolinguistics and pragmatics both share an interest in [linguistic meaning](#) as determined by usage in a speech community. However, sociolinguists tend to be more interested in variations in language within such communities. Pragmatics helps anthropologists to associate broad language and social phenomena (Thomas, 1995: 22). This shows how it penetrated the field of linguistic anthropology. Pragmatics usually involves the study of intensity, gender, race, identity, and interaction with individual voices, since it usually describes the force that must be performed in a particular language. For example, transcoding research is directly related to pragmatics. This is due to the fact that transcoding

affects practical performance (Verschueren ,1997: 1). At a different level, there is a mutual interest between pragmatics and psycholinguistics in the development of concepts like Imp, Prsp and Illocutionary Force. Pragmatics is likely to be the provider, the tester, refiner or rejecter" (Ibid: 375) because pragmatic theories could rely on rigorous testing by psycholinguists within the discourse being analyzed, the pragmatic aspect is more specialized. It focuses on aspects of what is unsaid or unwritten; yet communicated (Yule, 1985: 97). "'Doing discourse analysis' certainly involves 'doing syntax and semantics', but it primarily consists of 'doing pragmatics'" (Brown and Yule, 1983: 26).

Since semantics and pragmatics are related to the meaning of the expression of a language, knowledge of these two areas is duplicated in this area. Each of them deals with meaning in a different sense. It is important to consider the differences between these two areas before discussing other aspects of pragmatics though the two seem similar at first; there are many dissimilarities that distinguish each field as an individual sub-branch of linguistics. According to Lyons (1977:591), semantics is the study of the meaning of linguistic expressions that are context-independent. It studies, as Morris (1938:6) says, "the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable". Semantic meaning is quite fixed and cannot be changed according to context. Pragmatics, on the other hand, as defined by Levinson (1983:30), is the branch of knowledge dealing with language use.

Leech (1983: 6) notes that, although the semantic meaning is related to the general meaning, the general pragmatic principle is motivated from the point of view of entertainment. He added that the boundary between semantics and pragmatics is associated with the use of parole and language differences. Semantics is related to semantic relations between a

word and a meaning. However, phonology refers to the meaning of the tripartite relationship between the meaning and the intent of the speaker.

Semantics does not depend on context. Semantic meanings are not subject to non-verbal or situational factors. On the other hand, pragmatics explores the influence of various contextual factors on the significance of a particular situation. In other words, the semantics of interpretation depends only on the linguistic origin of sentences and texts, and pragmatics includes the full interaction of all other linguistic and extralinguistic factors (Linell, 1982: 96).

In addition to these differences, Lyons (1987:157) states that semantics is a matter of rules and it deals with literal meaning, whereas pragmatics is a matter of principles, maxims and strategies, and it deals with non-literal meaning. Studying semantics requires searching for general rules bring about the relation between form and meaning. Linguists who study pragmatics work to find pragmatic principles or maxims that are commonly or socially shared between communicators of one society.

2.5 Speech Acts

2.5.1 Introduction

Language is a means of communication. By means of language the speaker conveys information to the addressee. To be more precise, language is used by the speaker to convey his or her meaning (Bates, 1996:14). In pragmatics, the speaker meaning is referred to as the speaker's intention. The process of communication is, then, the expression of the speaker's intention. So, for instance, when the speaker intends to ask a question, he or she will use appropriate words and turn

them into a question. To put it otherwise, the speaker 'will do a question' by using the words. In the process of communication, the speaker 'does many more things' with language, or the speaker expresses many more speech acts via language. In fact, what the speaker says is a speech act unless he or she uses language as a linguistic exercise. (Bilmes , 1986:55).The main idea of the Speech Act Theory is that language users, when pronouncing a sentence in communicative situation, are committing some action or actions: moving the speech organs; mentioning people, places, objects; saying something to the interlocutor; enrapturing or annoying him/her; asking, promising, ordering, apologizing, censuring, etc. These actions are motivated by the intention of the speaker (Bennet, 1976: 67).

2.5.2 Speech Act Theory Defined

Van Dijk & Kintcsh (1983: 84) define speech act as the social action that is performed by a speaker when producing an utterance in some specific context, They mean that a language user can infer the kind of speech acts which are used in the utterance of a sentence from the text and context. Among all the general theories of language usage, speech act theory has probably aroused the widest interest.

According to Levinson (1983: 226), speech act theory has been tackled by psychologists, anthropologists, philosophers and linguists. Anthropologists hoped to find in the theory some account of the nature of magical spells and rituals in general, while philosophers have seen potential applications to, amongst other things, the status of ethical statements, finally linguists have seen the notions of speech act theory as variously applicable to problems in syntax, semantics, second language learning, and elsewhere. Levinson believes that "in linguistic pragmatics,

speech act theory remain, along with presupposition and implicature in particular, one of the central phenomena that any general pragmatic theory must account for". Yule (1998:45) states that in attempting to express themselves, people will not only produce utterances with grammatical structure and words, they perform actions through those utterances. If you are working for a very dictatorial boss with a great deal of power, then your boss says, **"You're fired"**, it more than just a statement. That statement also performs the act of ending your employment. Action performed through utterances generally called speech act. The speaker normally expects that his communicative intention will be recognized by the hearer. Both speaker and hearer are helped by circumstances surrounding the utterances. These circumstances, including other utterances, are called the speech event. It is the nature of speech event that determines the interpretation of an utterance in performing a particular speech act. On a wintry day, the speaker reaches for a cup of tea, believing that it has been freshly made, take a sip, and produces an utterance "The tea is really cold". It is likely to be interpreted as a complaint. If the circumstances are changed into a really hot summer's day with the speaker is being given a glass of iced tea, taking a sip and produces the utterance "The tea is really cold". It is likely to be interpreted as praise (Cruse, 2000:65).

Austin's (1962: 6) Speech Act Theory provides a tool to assist in the pragmatic analysis of discourse. It is concerned with the meanings assigned to speech acts by participants based on their relationship and context. In other words, it is primarily concerned with what the producer of an utterance can do with it as soon as it is produced. Utterances are not simply statements intended to seek or convey information, for instance, but rather turn into actions once pronounced. Austin (ibid.) makes two

important observations. The first is that not all sentences are statements and that much of the conversation taking place among people is made up of questions, exclamations, and commands:

1. Are you serving?

2. Excuse me!

3. Give me the dry roasted ones.

Such sentences are not descriptive and cannot be true or false. His second observation is that even in sentences with the grammatical form of declaratives, not all sentences are used to make statements. The following sentences are therefore, different because they are not uttered just to say things, but rather to do things.

4 .I promise to take a taxi home

5. I give my word.

Austin (Ibid.) claims that these sentences represent in themselves a kind of action. Thus, by uttering (15) and (16) the speaker makes a promise and gives his word respectively; he does not just describe what he wants. Austin calls these sentences Performatives in contrast to descriptive statements, which he calls Constatives (ibid).Austin (1962:91) says that in "to say something may be to do something, or in saying something we do something". He suggests that in issuing an utterance a speaker performs three acts simultaneously, LA, IA, and PA. These three acts have to be performed simultaneously. It is not the choice of the speaker to perform one or two and leave the rest; otherwise the whole communicative process will be aborted. These acts are ordered hierarchically: the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts are,

in fact, three basic components with the help of which a speech act is formed.

Leech (Leech, 1983: 199) briefly defines them as locutionary act: performing an act of saying something illocutionary act, performing an act in saying something and perlocutionary act: performing an act by saying something.

A. Locutionary Act

Austin (1962: 94) suggests that the act of 'saying something' is the performance of a LA. Utterances represent locutions or the full units of speech. He (ibid.:101) first defines locution as it is the act of saying something in the full sense of 'saying

6. He said to me “shoot her” meaning by ‘shoot’ shoot and referring by ‘her’ to her.

LA can be defined in the full sense of 'say' as a verbal or linguistic utterance. The speaker can also perform LA by using non-verbal utterances, which are identifiable to spoken language. These non-verbal utterances are identifiable prosody, spoken and written prosody. In spoken language, prosody consists of the pattern of pause, pitch level, stress tone of voice, and the like; its counterpart in the written language is punctuation and typography (Ibid).

B. Illocutionary Act

IA or illocution, is the most significant act in the hierarchy of speaking and it is absolutely essential to any discussion of speech act. It is an act performed 'in saying something' (ibid: 98). It is identified by explicit performative and it is an act which is internal to the LA. Once the LA has been performed, the IA is performed too. As in the example

7. Shoot her!

He urged (or advised, ordered, etc.) me to shoot her. (Ibid: 101). Austin argues that the IA is connected with the production of “effects upon the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the audience, or of the speaker, or of other persons.” (Ibid). In other words, in order to be successful, IAs must achieve a certain effect on the audience by involving the securing of uptake and by conventionally inviting a response or a sequel (Ibid).

C .Perlocutionary Act

Austin (1962:108) defines a PA, as “what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading”. As in the example

8 .Shoot her!

He persuaded me to shoot her. (Ibid :101)

He (Ibid.) adds a further sense, namely a third sense to the LA and IA. It is a PA. Saying something will often produce certain consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the audience, or of the speaker. he considers that the consequential effects of perlocutions are really consequences which do not include conventional effects, such as the promise speech act by which the speaker commits himself. A distinction needs to be drawn between the real production of real effects and conventional consequences. Searle (1965: 173) defines speech act as a “function of the meaning of the sentence” in the utterance of which it is performed. He uses “illocutionary act” instead of "speech act" when he says, "The production of the sentence token... is the illocutionary act." He expresses his first contribution to the SAT. It is his distinction between LA and IA opposing Austin's distinction between LA and IA.

According to his view, he finds those two acts inseparable. He believes that illocutionary force is part of the meaning. (ibid : 424). Searle hypothesizes that speaking a language means performing speech acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises and so on and it is a rule-governed form of behaviour. He concentrates on the fact that the reason for studying speech acts is that "all linguistic communication involves linguistic acts"(ibid.), and he stresses that the unit of linguistic communication is not the symbol, word or sentence (Ibid:226).

According to Yule (1996: 48), speech acts consist of three related acts: the first one called locutionary act, which is the basic act of utterance, or producing a meaningful linguistic expression. As in the example

9. I've just made some coffee

The second act called the illocutionary act, which is performed via the communicative force of an utterance. One might utter (20) to make statements, an offer, an explanation, or for some other communicative purposes. This is also generally known as the illocutionary force of the utterance. The third dimension is the perlocutionary act, we do not, of course, simply create an utterance with a function without intending it to have an effect, and this is the perlocutionary act. Depending on the circumstances, you will utter (20) on the assumption that the hearer will recognize the effect you intended for example, to account for a wonderful smell, or to get the hearer to drink some coffee. This is also generally known as the perlocutionary effect (Ibid: 49). Coulthard (1977: 17) defines the three acts as locutionary act, is the act of saying something in the full sense of 'say', for example:

10. He said to me 'Shoot her' meaning by 'shoot' shoot and referring by 'her' to her.

Illocutionary act is an act performed in saying something, the act identified by the explicit performative, for example:

11. He urged (or advised, ordered, etc.) me to shoot her.

Perlocutionary act, the act performed by or as a result of saying. For example:

12 . He persuaded me to shoot her.

Stubbs (1983: 149) believes that speech acts are defined by the speech act philosophers according to psychological and social functions outside the on-going discourse. They include, for example, the expression of psychological states (e.g. thanking, apologizing), and social acts such as influencing other people's behaviour (e.g. warning, ordering) or making contracts (e.g. promising, naming). Leech (1974: 343) states that Austin's theory has led him away from the question of 'what do sentences mean? Towards the question 'what sort of act we perform when we utter a sentence? He (1974: 347) refers to the development of the so-called 'performative analyses of sentences, as a recent trend relating to speech acts in generative semantics.

Van Dijk (1977: 195) considers a speech act as an accomplishment of specific social act and he suggests that the speaker should make up his mind and decide priorly the specific speech act, and then decide a precise semantic content of the utterance; the last process then is to make a syntactical, morphological, phonological and phonetic form of the utterance. Pratt (1977: 81) says that in order to perform a speech act correctly it is not enough to utter a sentence that has a grammatical

correctness. "Speech acts, like all behaviour, are correctly or felicitously performed only if certain conditions obtain. Palmer (1981:164) discusses the use of modal verbs shall and may/can which are used to make promises and give permission to serve as implicit performatives: As in the example

13. I shall come tomorrow

14. You shall have it tomorrow

2.5.3 Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

As Clark and Carlson (1982:35) point out Speech acts cannot be fully understood without considering the hearers as well as the speakers. Speech acts are directed at real people, whose abilities to recognize put limits on what speakers can do with their utterances. There are direct speech acts as well as indirect ones. Misapplication of the indirectness principle can lead to communication disruption or even social corruption. For example, let us look at the utterance: You are tired. Go to bed (Bennet, 1976: 67). The utterance is only a polite way to suggest that the speaker himself is sleepy and wants to go to bed. An unsuspecting interlocutor, not used to such politeness, is likely to say: I am not tired, are you? The polite person, being polite, is obliged by reciprocity to say: I am not tired if you are not. This only means that in order for an indirect speech act to be effective, the listener has to be able to understand what the speaker means. Misapplication of the indirectness principle may promote corruption by people who over-anticipate the unexpressed needs of their superiors. But that is not the concern of the present research paper. What we are concerned with is the linguistic form and pragmatic function of both direct and indirect speech acts used by the interlocutors (Batch and Harnish, 1979:3).

Searle (1975:61) introduces a distinction between direct and indirect speech acts. In indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, together with general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer. Indirect speech act is a 'case' in which one IA is performed indirectly by way of performing another. As in the example

15 . Can you speak a little louder? (Brown & Yule, 1983:232)

In (26) it is both a question about the hearer's ability and a request for action as well. In fact one utterance may perform several simultaneous acts. Consider the following utterance of a husband to his wife: as in the example

16. Hey, Michele, you've passed the exam

He may be 'doing' several things at once. He may be simultaneously 'asserting', 'congratulating', 'apologizing' (for his doubts) etc. (ibid: 233) A direct speech act is one where there is no attempt to save the face of the addressee/s. It is a bland, plain, ordinary way of saying things. An indirect speech act is a kind of circumlocution, an attempt to save the face of the addressee. The indirect complaint, for example, is a type of negative evaluation. A negative evaluation is a speech act that evaluates some person or situation through an utterance that carries a negative semantic load. An indirect complaint is defined as the expression of dissatisfaction to an addressee about oneself or someone/something that is not present. It differs from a direct complaint in that the person concerned is neither held responsible for nor capable of remedying the situation (Kasper, 2009: 157).

Yule (1996: 53) distinguishes between direct and indirect speech act, in that wherever there is a direct relationship between a structure (declarative, interrogative, imperative) and a function (statement, question, command/ request), there is a direct speech act. Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, there is an indirect speech act. So, a declarative used to make a statement is a direct speech act, but a declarative used to make a request is an indirect speech act, for example:

17. It is cold outside

It is a declarative sentence, when it is use to make a statement like:

18 .I hereby tell you about the weather

It is functioning as a direct speech act. But when it is used to make a command/ request, like:

19. I hereby request of you that you close the door

It is functioning as an indirect speech act (Ibid).

Patil (1994: 233) believes that "a person can be unpleasant to the addressee by being deliberately indirect or misleading in form Directness and indirectness are not black and white terms. A particular direct speech may become indirect if uttered in a different context or environment. However, direct speeches are plainly informative and often used to express orders and harmful or dry unfriendly talk. It is used by superiors but in the case of danger like fire, for instance, direct speech is used even by inferiors without causing any harm.

2.5.4 Characterizations of Speech Acts

2.5.4.1 Pragmatic Characterizations of Speech Acts

Generally, the pragmatic aspect of language is a function of the language form of manipulation in communication. According to Allerton (1979: 280), the pragmatic idea of the forces of fulfillment and duty is to interpret the meaning of a sentence in its entirety. Linguists need to take into account not only lexical components and grammatical structures, but also how the elements and structures express the content (i.e. Localization). Pragmatic analysis also does not jeopardize abstract essays in grammar, explaining the contextual nature of facts (Downes, 1977: 83). Crystal (1995: 120) adds that pragmatic research often includes "the factors that determine our choice of language and the influence of our choice on others in social interaction." (Thomas, 1983: 92). According to Leech (1974: 350), linguistic analysis the following devices should be considered:

1. The utterance itself.
2. The speaker of the utterance.
3. The listener (addressee) of the utterance.
4. The time and place of the utterance itself.

Pragmatic of sentences are often expressed in grammatical structures of sentences. You can apply the same to the macro file expression through the entire discourse. Since different pronouns can be used in team relations, syntactic structures are important and typical vocabulary units are expected to be selected (Van Dijk, 1981: 245).

2.5.4.2 Syntactic Characterizations of Speech Acts

Verbs can be actively used in the following syntax.

1. The subject of the sentence must be in the first pronoun “I” or “we” (Lyons, 1977: 749). Consider the following examples:

1- I do – (i.e., take this woman to be my lawful wedded wife) – as uttered in the course of the marriage ceremony

2- I apologize – (uttered when treading on one's toe or similar situations).

3- I leave my fortune to my sons – (as it is stated in a will).

4- People say, well, do you ever hear any other voices other than, like, a few people? Of course I do (uttered by W. Bush).

5- We can be confident that our coalition will succeed (uttered by W. Bush). The reader can notice that all the previous examples have the subjects in the first person pronouns which are represented by (I) and (We).

Traugott (1972: 48) indicates that performance discourse is a first-person verb and can be used passively, in this case it is the second, third or non-personal topic. Consider the following example:

20. Passengers are hereby warned to cross the track by the bridge only.

21. Notice is hereby given that trespasses will be prosecuted.

2. Punishment must be simple time (state, name, etc.) of the Present, and not the continuity of the present or the past (Lyons, 1977: 749). The current use of the verb in relation to the verb is “temporary existence, which occurs when the verb mentions“ actions that begin and end during speech ”(Quirk et al., 1985: 180).

3. No capital or additions. However, Leech (1975: 105-06) shows that performatives can be used with capital or subsidiary letters. For example, "Maybe?", "Leave me." "Could you congratulate me if I succeed?" The sentence remains in force. This is because there is no conflict between the speaker's power and the listener. Congratulations (Congratulations, sorry) Class behavior, including verbs like: But can I open the door? This is not a leader. The speaker's power is opposite to the recipient (May I? Let me).

4. The verb should not be included in the embedded sentence and should not be included in the main sentence. According to Leech (1996: 60), the executive hypothesis states that "the elements associated with speakers, speech actors and the statements of listeners are in the best sentences of the in-depth structure."

5. The sentence should not be in the negative form.

I do not promise to go, the verb ' promise ' is ruled out as not being performative verb, because it doesn't designate the speech act of 'promise ' (Huang, 1975:24).

6. It is optional to have an indirect object expression referring to the addressee.

22. I give my book to my son.

23. I promise him to give the book.

In these sentences, the indirect objects are (my son) and (him) in the second sentence (Lyons, 1977: 749).

7. The word "hereby" is inserted sometimes to emphasize the intended meaning or force of the utterance; it is optional with all performative

verbs. The word 'here by' is a useful criterion to indicate that the utterance is performative, while non- performative verbs do not accept the "hereby" insertion.

24. I hereby order you to go

25. I hereby write my lesson (Ibid: 751)

2.5.4.3 Semantic Characterizations of Speech Acts

Semantic Speech Semantic speech is the study of formal meaning. Because it is encoded in the language of the text regardless of the authors and readers defined in a particular context. On the other hand, pragmatics is associated with the meaning of language in a discourse. When used in appropriate situations to achieve a specific goal. Should not be considered as an alternative to the semantic meaning, as it comes from the interaction of semantics and context (Thomas, 1983: 19). Lyons (1981: 141) clarifies that it is the defining property of Ps. that they have a definite truth –value (truth conditional semantics) i.e., they are either true or false. Elgin (1979:29-30) confirms that a complete grammar must have a semantic component .The task of the semantic component of grammar is to "match the sequences of language with their proper meanings ". Speakers have the ability to interpret the meaning based on their knowledge of the world, of languages and of what a speech act is intended to present; a complete grammar must be able to explain this meaning –interpreting process.

2.5.5 Felicity Conditions

In order for a performative utterance to ‘work’, there are certain conditions that have to be met, In [J. L. Austin](#)'s formulation of [speech act](#) theory, a [performative utterance](#) is neither true nor false, but can

instead be deemed "felicitous" or "infelicitous" according to a set of conditions whose interpretation differs depending on whether the utterance in question is a declaration ("**I sentence you to death**"), a request ("**I ask that you stop doing that**") or a warning ("**I warn you not to jump off the roof**") (Hudson, 1996 :76). Austin believes that instead of truth values, performatives have felicity conditions. If we stand against any of these conditions the performative utterance is then infelicitous. He distinguishes three main conditions:

1. There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, that procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances, and further,
2. The particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked.
3. The procedure must be executed by all participants both correctly and completely. (Allan,1986: 182).

Searle (1969: 68) sets out a significant contribution to the SAT concerning the Felicity Conditions .For Searle, felicity conditions form a group of necessary conditions for the performance of a certain act. If these conditions are all present, the act will be performed successfully. He classifies the FCs into four types:

1. Propositional Content Conditions:

These conditions express the proposition of the sentence in question. They count as an expression of the psychological state.

2. Preparatory Conditions:

They refer to the intention and knowledge of the speaker and the hearer. They tell us what the speaker implies in the performance of the act. In the performance of any illocutionary act, the speaker implies that the preparatory conditions of the act are satisfied.

3. Sincerity Conditions:

They tell us what the speaker believes, intends, and desires in the performance of the act. One cannot greet insincerely, but one can state or promise insincerely.

2.5.6 Classification of Speech Acts

2. 5.6.1 Austin's Classification of Speech Acts

Austin (1962: 163) distinguishes five classes of utterance classified according to their illocutionary force:

- 1- **Verdictives:** They "consist in the delivering of a finding, official or unofficial, upon evidence or reasons as to value or fact, so far as these are distinguishable." (ibid.:152). They are typified by the giving of a verdict by a jury, arbitrator, or umpire.

Example: rank, grade, call, define, analyse.

- 2- **Exercitives:** "the giving of a decision in favour of or against a certain course of action, or advocacy of it. It is a decision that something is to be so, as distinct from a judgment that it is so."(ibid.:154) It is exercising of powers, rights or influences.

Example: order, request, beg, dare.

3- **Commissives**: They "commit the speaker to a certain course of action." (ibid.:156)

Example: promise, guarantee, refuse, decline.

4- **Behabitives**: They include "the notion of reaction to other people's behaviour and fortunes and of attitudes and expressions of attitudes to someone else's past conduct or imminent conduct." (ibid.:159)

Example: thank, congratulate, criticize.

5- **Expositives**: They involve the "expounding of views, the conducting of arguments, and the clarifying of usages and of references." (Ibid.:160)

Example: state, contend, insist, deny, remind, guess.

2.5.6 .2 Searle's Classification of Speech Acts

Searle (1975: 355) recognizes five kinds of speech acts:

1- **Assertives** have a truth value, show words-to-world fit, and express speaker's belief in proposition.. e.g., statements.

2- **Directives** are attempts to get hearer to do something; therefore they show world-to-words fit, and express speaker's wish or desire that hearer do e.g., orders

3- **Commissives** commit Speaker to some future course of action, so they show world-to-words fit, and Speaker expresses the intention that Speaker do A.(p. 356) e.g., promises

4- **Expressives** express Speaker's attitude to a certain state of affairs specified in the propositional content (e.g., I apologize for stepping on your toe). There is no direction of fit; a variety of different

psychological states; and propositional content must be related to S or H e.g., congratulations and Complaints, Complaints includes ethical provisions reflecting the speaker's consent as well as rejection of the behavior mentioned in the judgment.

5- **Declarations** bring about correspondence between the propositional content and the world; thus direction of fit is both words-to-world and world-to-words. Searle recognizes no psychological state for declarations. (ibid.) e.g., an excommunication.

2.5.7 Speech Act of Expressive

The expressive speech act occurs when the speaker shows his or her feelings and physiological state to the listener. They can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy or sorrow. (Searle ,1976:65) Norrick (1978: 279) specifies that expressive speech acts express psychological conditions, and thus not beliefs or intentions, which arise to give states of affairs. Some expressive speech acts have also been discussed by Taavitsainen and Jucker (2010), who concentrate on the use of politeness and on thanking, and who define expressives as expressing the state of mind, the attitudes, and the feelings of speakers (Taavitsainen and Jucker 2010: 159)

The expressive speech act is the expression of the emotional idea itself. Expressives are produced when the speaker thanks, apologizes or .welcomes. In using an expressive, the speaker makes words fit the world

- I am so thankful.
- I'm so sorry.
- Please, welcome in our new members.

- My congratulations!
- It's awful!

In case of Expressives the speaker shows apologizing, appreciation, congratulation, likes or dislikes sadness or happiness, thankfulness and so on (Searle, 1976:77).

Four different events of speaker-hearer interaction lead to the use of expressive speech acts. First, this is a hearer being offended by something, which calls for the expressive speech act of apologizing. Second, a hearer achieving something positive, which leads to the speech act of congratulating. Third, a hearer doing a favour to the speaker which leads to the act of thanking and finally a hearer approaching the speaker which leads to the expressive act of greeting (Clark 1995: 193).

2.5.8 Speech Act of Complaint

Speech acts have been a central concept in pragmatic studies. When people perform speech acts, they use words to do something, such as making an apology, a request or refusal. All the speech acts are important in social communication. Speech acts theorists' have indicated a relationship between their theoretical analysis and language users' communicative practice by their attempts to group the speech acts. For example, Searle (1976) claimed that thanking, apologizing, and complaining represent expressive speech acts. Leech (1983) classified the speech acts functionally: thanking and apologizing are convivial, while complaining, requesting, and correcting are competitive acts.

Using Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969, 1979) Speech Act Theory and their classifications, many researchers have explored the actual forms and functions of different speech acts in different languages. As for

complaint, Trosborg (1994:87) defines it as “an illocutionary act in which the speaker (the complainer) expresses his/her disapproval and negative feeling towards the state of affairs described in the proposition and for which he/she holds the hearer (the complaine) responsible, either directly or indirectly (Trosborg, 1994: 320).complaint belongs to the category of expressive speech acts, expressing the speaker’s approval as well as disapproval of the behavior which the complaine has already done or failed to do. Moreover, when a complaint is issued, a directive act may be implied or added (Ibid: 324) .Complaint is an expression of a psychological state of being dissatisfied or unhappy about something. According to Tanck (2002:3), the speech act of complaint occurs when a speaker reacts with displeasure or annoyance to an action that has affected him/her in an unfavorable manner.

Trosborg (1994:75) suggests that this involves an attempt to make the complaine repair the damage he/she caused, and/or an attempt to prevent a repetition of the deplorable act. So when the speaker complains, rather than just expressing his/her moral censure or blame, he/she is tending to request the hearer to perform a remedial act to compensate for the loss of the speaker. Therefore, the speech act complaint involves both expressive function and directive function. In the speech act of complaining, the speaker (S) “expresses displeasure or annoyance” (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993:108), and “disappointment or grievance” (Clyne, 1994: 49), in response to an action that is seen by the speaker as unfavorable. It is “an expression of dissatisfaction addressed by an individual A to an individual B concerning behaviors that A feels on the part of B is unsatisfactory (Lakoff ,1973:596). Clearly, complaining is an intrinsically face-threatening act (FTA). It threatens the hearer’s positive face because of the speaker’s damage to his/her self-image, or the speaker’s accusation

and anger on the hearer's previous wrongdoing; in addition, it also threatens the hearer's negative face because the complaint has an implicature of requesting some compensation from the hearer. The conflictive nature of complaining might result in a breach of the social goal of maintaining comity and harmony between speaker and hearer (Leech, 1983:67).

Olshtain and Weinbach (1987: 108) offered a new and clear definition of complaining "In the speech act of complaining, the speaker (S) expresses displeasure or annoyance-censure-as a reaction to a past or ongoing action, the consequences of which are perceived by S as affecting her unfavorably. This complaint is usually addressed to the hearer (H) whom the S holds, at least partially, responsible for the offensive action" .

2.5.9 Classifications of Complaints

In order to reveal the strategies of responding to customer complaints, it is necessary to find out the characteristics and categories of complaints first. According to Boxer (1989:67), two categories of complaint can be distinguished in terms of their patterns and functions: direct complaints and indirect complaints. In the first category, i.e., direct complaints, the addressee is held responsible for the perceived offence and is expected to acknowledge or change the undesirable state of affairs. Direct complaints display the situations that hearers express their displeasure or annoyance immediately and face to face when they are perceived by the speaker as affecting him unfavorably. A direct complaint involves an explicit or implicit accusation and at least one explicit or implicit directive (Clyne, 1994: 54). By stating or implying that the addressee is responsible for a perceived offence, direct complaints threaten the addressee's positive

face, i.e. the need to be approved of and liked. Moreover, by stating or implying that the addressee should undertake some action to change the undesirable state of affairs, the complaint impinges on the addressee's negative face, or their need to be unimpeded and autonomous (Daly, Holmes, Newton & Stubbe, 2003:66).

An indirect complaint is defined as a long or repeated expression of discontent not necessarily intended to change or improve the unsatisfactory situation (Clyne, 1994: 59). It differs from a direct complaint in that the addressee is neither held responsible nor capable of remedying the perceived offense. Data from a large study on indirect complaint among native speakers showed that indirect complaints are frequently employed as positive strategies for the purpose of establishing points of commonality (Boxer, 1993:91). They function to provide emotional release, or to off-load negative effect, rather than provoke actions to redress the offense. In other words, indirect complaints are not prototypical FTAs; rather, they are typical ways of establishing rapport with others. In business communication, customers are likely to complain directly in order to express their dissatisfaction and redress the offense.

Both direct and indirect complaints have the potential of leading to lengthy interactions between speaker and addressee; however, it is usually in the indirect complaint or griping that one finds conversational material upon which shared beliefs and attitudes may be expressed (Tatsuki, 2000: 65). As such, the indirect complaint becomes a solidarity-building device since it freely invokes the listener to engage in a series of commiserative responses to demonstrate attention and concern, or to maintain intimacy and stable social relationships (Moon 2010:1).Accordingly, making a complaint expression in English is mostly operated indirectly. Native speakers

usually use indirect complaints as a positive strategy for establishing points of commonality; they frequently employ indirect complaints in an attempt to establish rapport or solidarity between themselves and their interlocutors to be more polite and have less effect on the interlocutor or the hearer (ibid: 4).

2.5.10 Felicity Conditions of Complaint

In the light of these categories, Olshtain and Weinbach (1987:108) discuss the preconditions that are necessary for the speech act of complaining to take place. These factors present well the speech events that indicate what makes the participants talk, what they are talking about, and what the purpose of complaining is. They are as follows:

(1) Hearer (H) performs a socially unacceptable act (SUA) that is contrary to a social code of behavioral norms shared by Speaker (S) and H.

(2) S perceives the SUA as having unfavorable consequences for herself, and/or for the general public.

(3) The verbal expression of S relates post facto directly or indirectly to the SUA, thus having the illocutionary force of censure.

(4) S perceives the SUA as: (a) freeing S (at least partially) from the implicit understanding of a social commiserating relationship with H; S therefore chooses to express her frustration or annoyance; and (b) giving S the legitimate right to ask for repair in order to undo the SUA, either for her benefit or for the public benefit. It is the latter perception that leads to instrumental complaint aimed at “changing things” that do not meet with our standards or expectations. The main goal of such instrumental

complaint is to ensure that H performs some action of repair as a result of the complaint (Olshtain and Weinbach, 1987:108).

2.6 Previous Studies

An increasing number of researches have been conducted in the field of speech act of complaint. Here are some relevant previous studies:

1. Ndenguino Mpira Hermano (2009) **“Pragmatic Aspects of Making and Responding to Complaints in an Intercultural University Context”**

The study examines the pragmatic aspects of making and responding to complaints in an intercultural university context. A sample of international students and South African administrative staff in two Stellenbosch University residences are selected to investigate the nature and the effects of making and interpreting complaints in intercultural interactions. During these interactions, it is shown that the international students are often frustrated by the way they complain about a variety of issues. As a speech act, the complaint effectiveness depends on the way it is reflected and realized and also on the social situation in which it is performed. In this respect, the influence of cultural disparity on the way complaints are made and responded are investigated in this research to highlight the above-mentioned intercultural interactions.

The objective of the study is to analyze the intercultural contexts which involve the making and understanding of complaints that may cause misunderstandings. Through a discourse completion task, the complaints data were collected which accomplished by 24 international students belonging to six cultural groups, via. American, Chinese, Dutch, Gabonese, German and Libyan

The major outcomes of the analysis show that the six cultural groups differed in the way they made their complaints. Moreover, these disparities affect the manner in which some complaints were understood by the staff members. Moreover, It was also found that the staff members' replies to the complaints were influenced by the judgments of social acceptability of the international students' utterances. These findings lead to three main conclusions:

- (i) the way in which complaints are expressed and understood is affected by factors that relate to cultural differences;
- (ii) Such differences in culture may lead to misunderstandings; and
- (iii) Conscious efforts to enhance greater awareness of cultural differences will lead to a better understanding of the way in which people who belong to different cultures make and respond to complaints.

2. Maneenun Rhurakvit in (2011), "**Complaints in Thai and English: an interlanguage pragmatic study**". In his study, the researcher tries to carry out the complaint speech act in one's mother tongue which might not need a great amount of effort. However, it is considered as a problematic area when it comes to the case of EFL learners. The study tries to explore the features of the interlanguage complaints of Thai learners of English who are in various contexts of studying. The **Discourse Completion Task** questionnaires are the main data of the research, which is taken from four groups of informants. These groups are:

- (1) native Thai speakers
- (2) native English speakers,
- (3) Thai learners of English in Thailand and,
- (4) Thai learners of English in the UK.

Three main aspects are used for the analysis as the findings reveals. These are: the complaint lengths and patterns, the complaint strategies, and the complaint internal modifications. The obtained data show that the learners of English in Thailand tend to have the same complaint patterns compared to those of native Thai speakers. In addition to that, the patterns of complaint used by the learners of English in the UK tend to be close to those of native English speakers. However, it appears that downgraders are not used properly neither the learners of English in Thailand, nor in the UK. Compared to those of native English speakers, the insufficient use of internal modifications, such as downgraders results in the learners'weighty complaints. That is to say, from the native speaker's point of view, the learners'complaints might be less appropriate. It is concluded that studying abroad context is one of the effective factors in language learners'improvement, though the divergence of learners'complaints still exists in a variety of aspects. The conclusionsrecommend certain implications to language educators, particularly in Thailand, in that textbooks and pedagogical models provided for learners should be supplied with real-language in use and also other requirements regarding the sociopragmatic aspects of the target language so as enhance the learner's pragmatic ability.

3. Natascha Sorensen (2012), **“Management Response to Online Complaints”**

In many contemporary business practices and strategies, customer-centered philosophies are a prioritization Managers who have realized its importance to achieve customer satisfaction and the quality of higher perceived service. The concept of understanding for the customer through complaints, mainly the tool of a feedback management, has to be taken seriously. Accordingly, the main objective of the study is to understand

what makes customers write a complaint in online forums such as **TripAdvisor**, and how managers replies to this.

The theoretical background covers in more detail the following topics: customer satisfaction, service failure and recovery, emotions, quality standards, complaint handling, and an introduction to TripAdvisor. The main source being TripAdvisor, and the qualitative approach to the research question was used, applying content analysis to the reviews of the negative hotel, along with a manager's responses retrieved from TripAdvisor.com. The results of this study show that tangible factors are the element which customers complain about the most, accounting for 68%. The empathy of staff is the second element most frequently complained about, totaling 60%. Most of the managerial responses include terms such as "I", "we", "us" to make the response personal. Secondly, thanking for the review and apologizing to the guest is used in 68% of the responses. The most popular approach is justification, applied by 52% of the managers. A guidance tool to management is provided by the obtained results, as to what element of service to develop and how to reply to a customer complaint adequately.

2.7 Political Texts and Language

Since the politician's speech is mainly concerned with persuading or making the others believe what you are saying, the Speech Acts play the most important role in this kind of speech. It presents and documents some of the significant illocutionary acts that convey the intentions of speakers in political speeches (Bell 1995: 44). Political discourse has been a major domain of language use that has attracted the interests of researchers for a long while. This is because political discourse is a complex human activity that deserves critical study particularly because

of its central place in the organization and management of society. Political language deals with the use of power to organize people's mind and opinion. It is an instrument used to control the society in general (Crystal, 2003: 378). Political speech can be seen as a means of establishing and maintaining social relationships, expressing feelings, and selling ideas, policies, and political projects in any society. In pragmatics one of the most important phenomenon is Speech Act Theory; Speech Acts, the propositions/locutions performed often depend on the speaker's intention and the context in which the propositions are uttered (Jones and Wareing, 1999:35).The structures of political discourse are seldom exclusive, but typical and effective discourse in political contexts, but certainly, they do have preferred structures and strategies that are functional in the adequate accomplishment of political actions in political contexts. Political discourse is not only about stating public propositions. It is about politics. It is about doing things with words. Words are used to affect the political body (Woods, 2006:56). Lexical items not only may be selected because of official criteria of decorum, but also because they effectively emphasize political attitudes and opinions, manipulate public opinion, manufacture political consent, or legitimate political power. Many studies of political discourse deal with the language of professional politicians and political institutions, some of which are discourse-analytical Political discourse is identified by its actors or authors, viz., politicians. Politicians in this sense are the group of people who are being paid for their (political) activities, and who are being elected or appointed as the central players in the politics (Chilton, 2004: 14).

Therefore, we should also include the various recipients in political communicative events, such as the public, the people, and citizens. All these groups and individuals, as well as their organizations and

institutions, may take part in the political process, and many of them are actively involved in political discourse (van Dijk, 1997: 13). The organization of public life around style-oriented service and consumer activities has also shaped conceptions of political representations. It may therefore not come as a surprise that politicians themselves have adopted a more personalized rhetoric of choice and life style values to communicate their political messages to citizens (Simpson & Andrea, 2010: 43). A political speech is not necessarily a success because of a correctness of truth; rather it may be a matter of presenting arguments (Beard, 2000: 18). A political speech serves as a text, as an output and as a process which may be spoken or written. Most politicians are unaware of the fact that there is a link between what is said, what is meant, and the action conveyed by what is said. In the study of political speeches, one major theory that has been affective and adequate for analysis is the speech act theory. The notion of politics is viewed differently. What is political is either the social utterances or practices of the human or the use of language by politicians (Mey, 2009:727).

The characteristics of political language vary for doing its purposes. Politicians' purposes, persuade voters influence the audience, or make us adopt general political or social attitudes. When politicians engage in language interactions with other participants, they use the other forms, either loosely or under the rule of arbitrator. The close association between politics and language is not new. In this respect, Aristotle saw that human beings are naturally political animals who acquire and use language to pursue political ends (Woods, 2006:51). Depending on the context of situation and the individual's personality, the whole pragmatic and» generally speaking, Linguistic framework of the text are shaped, which, in turn, create an atmosphere for the achieving of the goals behind

every speech: to move, win, motivate, persuade, or inspire the audience (Fox, 1999: 1).

It is a fact that some speakers are eloquent by nature, still, political speeches are deliberate compositions aiming at specific points for specific purposes and conveying specific messages, whether positive or negative, through which the speaker maintains solidarity as a result of persuasive or emotive use of language, etc. and the audience gets neither pleased nor annoyed, but satisfied (Johnson and Johnson (2002:2).

2.8 Features of Political Speech

Political discourse is generally characterized by many features. The language that politicians use is considered a weapon and an effective instrument to gain political support. One of the facets in which the language is geared into this direction is the use of rhetoric to create specific convictions in the audience. Political discourse delivered by politicians is affected by the personal development of the political career and what it reflects to elicit its social settings. The individual's educational experience, parental influence, social circles, political party, economical status...etc. are factors that have their tremendous impacts on the personal development. They will also be reflected in the political speeches of the politicians (Grice: 1987 :92).

In politics, politicians always use a technique that is called 'targeting strategy' in which they try to persuade their audience that they themselves and their ideas are originated from one source, e.g., they are of the people. For example, presidents of USA always introduce themselves as ordinary citizens in their electoral campaigns although they are men of wealth. Politicians always enumerate their deeds or achievements to persuade public opinion of their political track. (Zheng, 2000:1).Stubbs

(1998: 211) believes that there are many features of discourse that operate equally in spoken and written language, 'lexical and grammatical cohesion, Imps, and so on.

In public, speaking to people may be varied according to subject matter which is involved in such a spoken or written text in particular situations. According to Price (2000: 343), the most important features of political speeches is that the power behind it. The speaker tries to have control over his hearer by means of the authority assigned to him. Therefore, the speaker is required to hold the attention of his audience through effective persuasive language. Most of the acts utilized in a political text are indirect, which is due to some social as well as political considerations related to the speaker. This feature plays a role in establishing and maintaining a constant communication between him and his audience (even his enemies).

Researchers and political theorists have been interested in how metaphors are used as persuasive devices. Theorists in this area have tended to assume that metaphors are persuasive. They have focused on the necessity of communication in politics. These metaphors have assisted politicians in communicating more effectively by addressing latent symbolic themes residing in segments of public consciousness. Metaphors also fit with the new information- processing models of political knowledge in which metaphors collapse complicated issues into more simplified packets of information that can be easily understood by the public. Politicians can use language effectively in politics, and explicitly, politicians can use a regional or social dialect, which is often regarded a claim to specialized ethnic identity (Spolsky, 1998: 58).

The additional focus on political speech is on the way, language is manipulated together with certain effects. In other words, rhetoric is the art of using language effectively and persuasively to bring about political, social and religious purposes (Brandt, 1970: 3). However, the relationship between rhetoric and political speech is noticed in the use of some powerful rhetorical techniques manipulated by political speakers and writers. Politics has traditionally been dominated in which formal or conventional language is required, and historically, as well as ritualistic and ceremonial aspects have been reserved. As Wilson (2001: 408) points out, in most cases it is the context, or a reflected form of words which carries the political message. With these in mind, we should note that a PD constructed for public consumption, the selection of words tends to be strategic or tactical (Fairclough, 2000: 17).

The manipulation of language at the level of words or phrases generally needs to be achieved at all. True, the deliberate selection of emotionally charged vocabulary to label people or processes involved in politically sensitive issues is still evident in the press, particularly when political opinions are sharply divided, as in the case of a shift in immigration policy or an unpopular war. Political interviewing is a highly regarded journalistic art. Pragmatic analyses, which focus on the way we produce and understand language in the context of a speech situation, reveal, for example, interviewers construct their questions carefully to place politicians in particular positions. Politicians obligate to use an evasive strategy, providing vague responses or contriving not to give straight answers. Claims and counter claims follow one after another in a quick succession, and argument will typically develop what has or has not been said or meant (Chilton, 2003: 24).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Chapter three deals with complaint as seen through Anna Trosborg (1994) and Olshtain and Weinbach (1987) models. Moreover, this chapter provides information about the data, research type and the model used for analyzing the data.

3.2 The Data

The research data consists of nine political speeches, three speeches for each of American Presidents George W. Bush Jr., Barack Obama and Donald Trump, whose main focus is terrorism.

3.3 Research Type

This research employed descriptive qualitative approach. According to Bodgan and Biklen (1982: 348), a qualitative approach is a research bringing about the descriptive data in the written and oral form data from the subjects of the research being investigated. It is concerned with providing the description of the phenomena which occur naturally without any intervention of an experiment treatment. Krathwohl in Wiersma (1995: 12) states that qualitative research is a research which describes phenomena in words instead of numbers or measures. Thus, the data and analysis in this research were in the descriptive forms. And the collected data are in the form of words instead of frequency of data (Moleong, 2001: 6). Finally, the analysis is conducted with the aid of statistical tables and percentages of the various strategies and acts of complaints that exist in the selected political speeches.

Models of Complaint 3.4

Trosborg's Model 3.4.1

The speech act complaint belongs to the category of expressive functions. This category includes ethical provisions reflecting the speaker's consent as well as rejection of the behavior mentioned in the judgment, but here we will almost always be concerned about the latter function, particularly with regard to the moral control or blame involved in the communication act of complaint (Trosborg ,1994:311). Complaints are statements, but this feature does not in any way distinguish complaints from other indicative sentences. We cannot refer to certain particular modal verbs as indicators of abusive power. Instead, the direct complaints scale is formulated according to the semantic scale that expresses the severity of the offense , The criteria used for establishing the scale of directness are Prepositional content (complainable) , Complainer and Accused (complainee) (ibid:314).

The Directive Acts of Complaint 3.4.1.1

The three main functions of the directive acts of complaint in Trosborg's view (1994: 320) are

a. Request for Repair

Request for repair is the first directive act of the complaint. In the majority of cases, the main aim of passing a moral judgment is made by complaint. In order to stop the complainee from doing the wrong action, the complainer demonstrates a complaint described in the complainable. It is considered as an incentive for the complainee to remedy the complainable. Consider the following examples given by (Ibid):

—Situation: Passenger to fellow passenger smoking in a nonsmoking compartment in a train. This is a non-smoker.

b. Threat

Threat is the second directive act of the complaint. According to this case, by issuing a particular threat, a complainer may select to attack the complainees face openly. With an immediate result, she or he often states an ultimatum. To express the threat, swear words are usually used by the speaker (Trosborg's, 1994:311) .The following is the example of this type:

—Situation: A cassette was stolen from a shop

Now, give me back what you have stolen, or I shall have to call the police

The above example shows that the complainees is threatened by the complainer, when the complainer says he will phone the police if the cassette is not given back to him.

c. Request for Forbearance

Request for forbearance is the third directive act of the complaint. In this case, a complainer asks the complainees not to commit his or her mistake anymore, when performing this directive acts (Ibid: 315) .Consider the following example

—Well, I'd like to find out about this because I'm hoping it won't happen again.

The criteria used for establishing the scale of directness are (P) Propositional content (complainable),(C) Complainer and(A) Accused (complainees) (Ibid: 322).

3.4.1.2 Complaints Categories

Trosborg (1994: 315) states four main categories. These categories are no explicit reproach, expression of annoyance or disapproval, accusation, and blame. Later, she derives subcategories (strategies) derived from those four main categories, strategy 1 being the most indirect, strategy 8 the most direct. These categories and the strategies are outlined below.

a. No explicit Reproach

Hinting strategies may be employed by the complainer to get rid of a struggle. In this case, the proposition does not comprise the complainable. Assertions are typical, though the content is different from the propositional content of the complainable which are different from each other. The complainer indicates that he/ she informs about an insult and makes the complainees indirectly responsible, in expressing the assertion in the existence of the complainees. The complainees are unaware of the insult whether indicated or not, as the complainer indirectly clarifies that something is unsatisfactory. This strategy is regarded as a weak complaint strategy, yet it might be manipulated with success to make for more effective and influential strategies (Ibid, 316) For example:
Str. 1. Hints

—Don't see much of you these days, do I?

b. Expression of Annoyance or Disapproval

Regarding a particular state of affairs he/she seems unfavorable for him/her, annoyance, dislike, disapproval, etc. which can be reflected by the complainer. The complainer takes the responsibility of the complainees but keeps away from pointing out him/her as the sinful person, by overtly affirming deplorable states in the complainees existence. The

consequences producing from an insult, for which the complainee is covertly responsible for, may be reflected by the utterance (Trosborg, 1994:316).

Str .2. Annoyance

—You know I don't like dust, I'm allergic to dust, didn't you know it?

Str. 3. Consequences

—I have already spar, spa, I've already spent ten minutes oh, quarter of an hour I think it was, cleaning up the bathroom itself. (Ibid: 317).

c. Accusations

The agent of a complainable is set up by accusations. Trosborg mentions two levels of directness. The complainer can ask the hearer questions about the context or demonstrate that he/she has to a certain extent linked with the offence. Thus, he tries to make the hearer a possible agent of the complainable (indirect accusation). On the other hand, the complainee could be directly accused by the complainer of making the offence(direct accusation). Consider the following accusations:

Str. 4. Indirect accusation

—Look at the mess; haven't you done any cleaning up for the last week?

Str. 5. Direct accusation

—You don't even clean up after you when you've been there, you used to do it, what's up with you now.

d. Blaming

The accused is guilty of the offence as it is presupposed by the act of blame. There are three levels that comprise the explicitness with which the complainer formulates his/her moral condemnation of the accused. In most cases, a value judgment on the complainees is passed by the complainer. It may look as a modified expression of blame, or otherwise, it may be expressed as condemnation which is explicit either of the complainees' action, or of the complainees as a person.

Str. 6. Modified blame

The disapproval of an action, which is modified, is conveyed by the complainer for which the accused is responsible for another approach not taken by the accused Trosborg (199:318). Consider the following example:

—It's boring to stay here, and I hate living in a mess, any way you ought to clean up after you.

Str. 7. Explicit condemnation of the accused's action or behaviour

An action for which the accused is held responsible (in direct terms) is bad, as the complainer clearly demonstrates that. For example:

—Ah, surely, I know but I think it's irritating, really irritating the way I have to clean up every time after you, especially now today I found dirty clothes of yours in my cupboard, I don't find that fair.

Str. 8. Explicit condemnation of the accused as a person

What is implicit at all other levels is explicitly stated by the complainer, namely, that he/ she finds the accused a non responsible social member (Ibid:19). For example

—Mette (swear-word), really, one can never (swear-word) trust you a damn.

3.4.2 Olshtain and Weinbach (1987) Model.

Olshtain and Weinbach (1987: 108) offered a new and clear definition of complaining "In the speech act of complaining, the speaker (S) expresses displeasure or annoyance-censure-as a reaction to a past or ongoing action, the consequences of which are perceived by S as affecting her unfavorably. This complaint is usually addressed to the hearer (H) whom the S holds, at least partially, responsible for the offensive action". Olshtain and Weinbach (1987: 199) state five main severities of the complaints , It is suggested that these five strategies are actually the five major strategies which identify the speech set of complaint in other words, when the preconditions for complaining occur, the speaker selects to reflect his/her feeling verbally, then any one of these five options exist for the realization of the complaining speech act.

1. Below the Level of Reproach

- Speaker selects to minimize hearer's FTA as in

—Never mind, nothing serious happened.

- Speaker keeps away explicit mention of offensive event as in

—Could we meet another time?

- Speaker tries to minimize cost and benefit for hearer even at maximizing cost for speaker as in

—Such things happen all the time.

2. Expression of Disapproval or Annoyance.

- Speaker selects to reflect disapproval or annoyance of the offensive event yet keeps away direct reference to hearer as in

—What terrible bureaucracy!

- An unknown third party is directed by the speaker's annoyance as in

—Such lack of consideration.

- Reference to the act of offensive is done in a vague and general manner as in

—Is this acceptable behavior?

3. Explicit Complaint

The speaker selects this strategy to accomplish an open face threatening act towards the hearer yet without incitement (Ibid). - There is explicit reference to hearer as in

—You're not fair.

- There is explicit reference to the Act as in

—You're inconsiderate.

- There is explicit reference to both hearer and Act as in

—One should not postpone this type of operation.

4. Accusation and Warning

The speaker performs an open face strategy, when choosing this threatening act, and even implies potential sanctions for the hearer

(Olshtain & Weinbach, 1987:201) - The hearer will be incriminated by the explicit reference to speaker's future act as in

—I'll speak to your supervisor.

5. Immediate Threat

In choosing this strategy, the speaker openly attacks the hearer's Face. Final and immediate results are frequently taken by this strategy (Ibid: 201).

- The reference to speaker's action implies explicit threat as in

—I'm not moving one inch unless you change my appointment.

- The time expressions which are relating to the point of speaking are manipulated as in

—Pay the money right now.

3.4.3 Proposed Model

The analysis of the selected political speeches focuses on the strategies and directive acts of complaint. The adopted model of analysis is eclectic consisting of the eight strategies proposed by Trosborg (1994). These are hints, annoyance, consequences, indirect accusation, direct accusation, modified blame, explicit blame (behaviour), and explicit blame (person) and one strategy from Olshtain and Weinbach (1987) which is warning. The analysis is also carried out in terms of directive acts identified by Trosborg (1994), namely: request for repair, threat, and request for forbearance

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA AND RESULTS ANALYSIS

Introduction 4.1

Chapter four presents the detailed analysis of the acts of complaint by adopting Anna Trosborg (1994) and the five point-complaint severity scales established by Olshtain and Weinbach (1987). It includes the sample of the study, i.e. the texts selected for the analysis. Moreover, it includes the results and discussions of analysis of the nine political speeches.

Data Analysis 4.2

Group (A) 4.2.1

Bush's First Speech 4.2.1.1

... The forces of extremism and terror are attempting to kill progress and peace by killing the innocent...

Bush in his speech uses the indirect complaint to express his accusation of terrorists as being responsible for the failure of the peace process because they are killing innocent people also he calls for changing the reality of the Middle East for the better for the citizens who have suffered and for long periods of living in terror. Bush uses request for repair to confirm that the purpose of the complaint is not only moral, but to try to redress the mistake made by the accused. Bush uses the indirect accusation strategy to accuse the terrorists of sabotaging the peace process in the Middle East.

Today, Palestinian authorities are encouraging, not opposing terrorism. This is unacceptable. .

Bush's statement reflects the indirect complaint to the Palestinian leaders of being contaminated with terrorism. He also calls on the Palestinian leadership to stand against terrorism as a condition for the support of the Americans for the establishment of a Palestinian state. Directive act of complaint used by bush is request for repair this clearly indicates that he is urging Palestinian leadership to change their behavior as a solution to the Palestinian cause, using direct accusation strategy to expresses his complaints.

...Every nation actually committed to peace will stop the flow of money, equipment and recruits to terrorist groups seeking the destruction of Israel — including Hamas Islamic Jihad, and Hezbollah. Every nation actually committed to peace must block the shipment of Iranian supplies to these groups, and oppose regimes that promote terror, like Iraq. And Syria must choose the right side in the war on terror by closing terrorist camps and expelling terrorist organizations...

These words are intended by Bush to indicate indirect complaints where Bush accuses many organizations such as Islamic Jihad, Hamas and Hezbollah, as well as accusing regimes like the Syrian regime and Iraq of trying to destroy Israel And calls on the United Nations committed to the peace process to stop supporting these regimes. Directive act of complaint is request for repair where Bush asks for help from countries around the world to boycott terrorism, Strategy of complaint is direct accusation.

Bush's Second Speech 4.2.1.2

...I am pleased also to stand with members of the diplomatic corps, including many representing nations that have been attacked by al Qaeda and its terrorist allies since September the 11th, 2001...

An indirect complaint where Bush holds al-Qaeda and its co-operative forces responsible for the Sept. 11 attacks, calling it the enemy of civilized nations. Request for repair is used by Bush as he asks world nations not to allow terrorist attacks to occur, he uses direct accusation to express complaints.

...Your presence here reminds us that we're engaged in a global war against an enemy that threatens all civilized nations...

These lines are utilized by Bush to indicate the indirect complaint where Bush hints to the world that there is a common enemy threatening civilized nations. Directive act of complaint is request for repair was used by Bush to try to motivate the world to end terrorism, Strategy of complaints is hints in which bush doesn't mention the offence.

...Al Qaeda and terrorists it has inspired have continued to attack across the world. They've killed the innocent in Europe and Africa and the Middle East, in Central Asia and the Far East, and beyond. Most recently, they attempted to strike again in the most ambitious plot since the attacks of September the 11th — a plan to blow up passenger planes headed for America over the Atlantic Ocean...

Bush's saying is an indirect complaint where he accuses al - Qaeda and terrorists of continuing terrorist attacks not only in America, but also in

many countries in Africa, Europe and the Middle East, as well as in the center of Asia, and most recently, when they tried to attack another plane for passengers. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance where Bush hopes to change the behavior of the accused in the future. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation is directed to al – Qaeda.

...The terrorists who attacked us on September the 11th, 2001, are men without conscience -- but they're not madmen. They kill in the name of a clear and focused ideology, a set of beliefs that are evil, but not insane...

This extract expresses indirect complaint where **Bush accuses the terrorists of evil and following evil ideologies which is beneficial to their interests.** Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance, he hopes that the accused will improve his behavior; Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation.

...These al Qaeda terrorists and those who share their ideology are violent Sunni extremists. They're driven by a radical and perverted vision of Islam that rejects tolerance, crushes all dissent, and justifies the murder of innocent men, women and children in the pursuit of political power...

This extract issues indirect complaint where **Bush accuses the terrorists of evil and following evil ideologies to achieve their goals and embrace a complex version of Islam that rejects tolerance and peaceful coexistence, all for political ends.** Directive act of complaint is request for repair where Bush seeking a solution to stop terrorism. Strategy of complaint is direct accusation, he directly accuses the

complainee (al Qaeda).

... About two months ago, the terrorist Zawahiri -- he's al Qaeda's second in command -- declared that al Qaeda intends to impose its rule in "every land that was a home for Islam, from [Spain] to Iraq. He went on to say, "The whole world is an open field for us"...

Bush uses indirect complaint where he accuses al - Qaeda leader al - Zawahiri of trying to extend the authority of al - Qaeda to the vast land of the world ,directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance , Bush hopes that the accused will improve his behavior, Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, Bush is directly accused the complainee (al-Qaeda leader al-zawahiri).

...Under the rule of the Taliban and al Qaeda, Afghanistan was a totalitarian nightmare -- a land where women were imprisoned in their homes, men were beaten for missing prayer meetings, girls could not go to school, and children were forbidden the smallest pleasures like flying kites. Religious police roamed the streets, beating and detaining civilians for perceived offenses. Women were publicly whipped. Summary executions were held in Kabul's soccer stadium in front of cheering mobs. And Afghanistan was turned into a launching pad for horrific attacks against America and other parts of the civilized world -- including many Muslim nations...

Bush words indicate the indirect complaint where Bush accuses al-Qaeda regime and the Taliban movement of depriving Afghan citizens,

whether men, women or children of their most basic rights, as well as intimidating them with horrific practices such as public executions on the streets . Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaint is direct accusation , Bush directly accuses the complaine (al-Qaeda and Taliban).

...They reject the possibility of peaceful coexistence with the free world. Again, hear the words of Osama bin Laden earlier this year: "Death is better than living on this Earth with the unbelievers among us." ...

These lines are intended by Bush to expresses indirect complaint where **Bush accuses Taliban leader Osama bin Laden of fighting the civilized world and preferring death to peaceful co-existence with the world.** Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is reforming the acts of terrorism and calling on them to cooperate with the world and remove them from isolation , Strategy of complaint is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complaine (Osama bin laden).

... al Qaeda and its allies intend to create numerous, decentralized operating bases across the world, from which they can plan new attacks, and advance their vision of a unified, totalitarian Islamic state that can confront and eventually destroy the free world...

Bush in his speech uses the indirect complaint where Bush accuses Al Qaeda and its collaborators of planting terrorist cells across the world

ready to destroy the free world .Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance ,he hopes that the accused will improve his behavior . Strategy of complaints is explicit blame (behavior), where Bush clearly indicates that al Qaeda and its allies hold responsible for the damage it caused .

...According to al Qaeda, their strategy to defeat America has two parts: First, they're waging a campaign of terror across the world. They're targeting our forces abroad, hoping that the American people will grow tired of casualties and give up the fight...

Bush's statement reflects indirect complaint where **Bush accuses the al-Qaeda system of following a strategy to defame American citizens and destroy the economy as well as attacking US forces outside the country to get tired.** Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is complaints is direct accusation , he directly accuses the complaine (al-Qaeda).

...They're targeting America's financial centers and economic infrastructure at home, hoping to terrorize us and cause our economy to collapse...

These lines are utilized by bush to indicate the indirect complaint where Bush holds al Qaeda responsible for the consequences of terrorist acts in America. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance ,Bush hopes that the accused will improve his behavior, Strategy of complaints is consequences , Bush expresses the consequences resulting from the act caused by the complaine(al-Qaeda).

...These terrorists hope to drive America and our coalition out of Afghanistan, so they can restore the safe haven they lost when coalition forces drove them out five years ago...

These words are intended by Bush to indicate indirect complaint where **Bush accuses al-Qaeda of trying to recover Afghanistan after the coalition forces expelled them.** Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complaine (al-Qaeda).

...The world did not heed Lenin's words, and paid a terrible price...

Bush's statement reflects the indirect complaint Where Bush holds the world responsible for neglecting Lenin's danger. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance ,he hopes that the accused will improve his behavior, Strategy of complaints is consequences , Bush express the consequences resulting from the act caused by the complaine(the world).

...The Soviet Empire he established killed tens of millions, and brought the world to the brink of thermonuclear war...

Bush's saying is an indirect complaint where he accuses The Soviet Empire established by Lenin as it was responsible for killing millions of people. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance ,he hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future , Strategy of complaints is direct accusation , he directly accuses the complaine (The Soviet Empire).

...The world ignored Hitler's words, and paid a terrible price...

Bush's statement reflects the indirect complaint where Bush holds the world responsible for neglecting Hitler's danger. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance, he hopes that the accused will improve his behavior, Strategy of complaints is consequences, Bush expresses the consequences resulting from the act caused by the complainees (the world).

... His Nazi regime killed millions in the gas chambers, and set the world aflame in war, before it was finally defeated at a terrible cost in lives...

This extract issues indirect complaint where **Bush accuses Hitler and his Nazi regime of killing millions of innocent people and making the world pay dearly for their actions.** Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance, he hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future, Strategies of complaints is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complainees (Hitler and his Nazi regime).

...al Qaeda remains dangerous and determined. Bin Laden and Zawahiri remain in hiding in remote regions of this world...

Bush's statement reflects the indirect complaint where Bush explains to the world how dangerous al Qaeda is. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaint is warning, Bush warns the world of the danger of al Qaeda.

...Al Qaeda continues to adapt in the face of our global campaign against them. Increasingly, al Qaeda is taking advantage of the

Internet to disseminate propaganda, and to conduct "virtual recruitment" and "virtual training" of new terrorists...

Bush uses indirect complaint where Bush accuses al – Qaeda of exploiting the Internet to spread propaganda, to "recruit" and "virtualizes" new terrorists. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused .Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (behavior), where Bush clearly indicates that Al Qaeda hold responsible for the damage it caused .

...Al Qaeda's leaders no longer need to meet face-to-face with their operatives. They can find new suicide bombers, and facilitate new terrorist attacks, without ever laying eyes on those they're training, financing, or sending to strike us...

These lines are intended by Bush to express indirect complaint where **Bush accuses al-Qaeda leaders of recruiting and transplanting new cells even though they are hiding using means to facilitate their actions, such as Internet communications.** Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (behavior), where Bush clearly indicates that Al Qaeda hold responsible for the damage it caused .

...The Shia extremists want to deny them this right. This Shia strain of Islamic radicalism is just as dangerous, and just as hostile to America, and just as determined to establish its brand of hegemony

across the broader Middle East. And the Shia extremists have achieved something that al Qaeda has so far failed to do: In 1979, they took control of a major power, the nation of Iran, subjugating its proud people to a regime of tyranny, and using that nation's resources to fund the spread of terror and pursue their radical agenda...

These lines are utilized by Bush to indicate the indirect complaint where **Bush accuses Shia extremists of controlling Iran and turning them into a center to achieve their agenda.** Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation .

...Like al Qaeda and the Sunni extremists, the Iranian regime has clear aims: They want to drive America out of the region, to destroy Israel, and to dominate the broader Middle East...

Bush's statement reflects indirect complaint where **Bush accuses the Iranian regime of trying to distance the US role in the region, as well as trying to destroy Israel and control the Middle East.** Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is complaints is direct accusation. He directly accuses the complaine (the Iranian regime).

... They are funding and arming terrorist groups like Hezbollah,

which allow them to attack Israel and America by proxy.

Hezbollah, the source of the current instability in Lebanon, has killed more Americans than any terrorist organization except al Qaeda...

Bush's statement reflects indirect complaint where Bush Accuses Iran of finding and arming terrorist groups such as Hezbollah, which allow them to attack Israel and the US by proxy also Hezbollah is responsible for instability in Lebanon and killing Americans. Directive act of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is complaints is direct accusation. He directly accuses the complaine (the Iranian regime).

...Unlike al Qaeda, they've not yet attacked the American homeland. Yet they're directly responsible for the murder of hundreds of Americans abroad. It was Hezbollah that was behind the 1983 bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut that killed 241 Americans...

Bush in his speech uses the indirect complaint where **Bush accuses the Iranian regime of trying to distance the US role in the region, as well as trying to destroy Israel and control the Middle East by funding groups such as Hezbollah that was responsible for killing many Americans.** Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, He is directly accused the complaine (Hezbollah).

•

... Saudi Hezbollah was behind the 1996 bombing of Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia that killed 19 Americans, an attack conducted by terrorists who we believe were working with Iranian officials...

Bush's statement reflects indirect complaint where Bush accuses the Saudi Hezbollah that it was behind the bombing of Khobar that killed Americans. Bush uses the request for repair to confirm that the purpose of the complaint is not only moral, but to try to redress the mistake made by the accused, Bush uses the direct accusation strategy to accuse directly the complaine (Saudi Hezbollah).

...Listen to the words of Hezbollah's leader, the terrorist Nasrallah, who has declared his hatred of America. He says, "Let the entire world hear me. Our hostility to the Great Satan [America] is absolute... Regardless of how the world has changed after 11 September, Death to America will remain our reverberating and powerful slogan: Death to America." ...

An indirect complaint were **Bush in his speech accuses Hezbollah leader Nasrallah of inciting the destruction of America.** Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused .Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complaine (Nasrallah).

...The Iranian regime and its terrorist proxies have demonstrated

their willingness to kill Americans -- and now the Iranian regime is pursuing nuclear weapons...

An indirect complaint where **Bush accuses the Iranian regime of planning to kill Americans and possess weapons of mass destruction.**

Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is reforming the acts of terrorism, Strategy of complaints is direct accusation ,he directly accuses the complaine (the Iranian regime and its terrorist proxies).

...The Shia and Sunni extremists represent different faces of the same threat...

An indirect complaint where **Bush accuses both Sunni and Shia extremists of being two sides of threat, even though their sources differ because they both offer to the world a dark version of Islam.**

Directive act of complaint is request for repair **where Bush seeks to stop the wrong act of the accused,** Strategy of complaint is direct accusation, he directly accusees the complaine (Shia and Sunni extremists)

...They would use those resources to fuel their radical agenda, and pursue and purchase weapons of mass murder. And armed with nuclear weapons, they would blackmail the free world, and spread their ideologies of hate, and raise a mortal threat to the American people ...

An indirect complaint where Bush accuses both Sunni and Shia extremists of using their country's resources to pursue their terrorist agenda. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation, he indirectly accuses the complaine.

4.2.1.3 Bush's Third Speech

...Nineteen men attacked us with a barbarity unequaled in our history. They murdered people of all colors, creeds, and nationalities -- and made war upon the entire free world...

An indirect complaint where Bush accuses a group of men of killing American citizens of all races in a brutal way. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance ,he hope that the accused will improve his behavior, Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation , Bush indirectly accuses the complaine.

...They murdered people of all colors, creeds, and nationalities -- and made war upon the entire free world...

Indirect complaint where Bush in his speech accuses unknown assailants of killing people of different races and nationalities and inciting war against the free world. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance , Bush hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future , Strategy of complaint is indirect accusation , Bush indirectly accuses the complaine.

...We have learned that they are evil and kill without mercy -- but not without purpose...

Bush's statement reflects the indirect complaint where Bush holds a group of unknown assailants of killing people brutally .Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance , Bush hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future , Strategy of complaints is annoyance, where Bush describes how bad the situation is yet he does not directly hold the complaineer responsible for the problem.

...We have learned that they form a global network of extremists who are driven by a perverted vision of Islam -- a totalitarian ideology that hates freedom, rejects tolerance, and despises all dissent...

An indirect complaint where Bush accuses the enemy of being a ruthless murderer and they have a perverse vision of Islam - hate freedom, tolerance and despise all opposition. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance , Bush hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future , Strategy of complaint is annoyance, Where Bush describes how bad the situation is yet he does not directly hold the complaineer responsible for the problem.

...And we have learned that their goal is to build a radical Islamic empire where women are prisoners in their homes, men are beaten for missing prayer meetings, and terrorists have a safe haven to plan and launch attacks on America and other civilized nations ...

These lines are intended by Bush to expresses indirect complaint where Bush accuses the enemy of being a ruthless murderer and seeks to build an Islamic radical empire in which people are punished and deprived of their most basic rights. Directive act of complaint is request

for forbearance , Bush hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future . Strategy of complaint is annoyance, Where Bush describes how bad the situation is yet he does not directly hold the complaine responsible for the problem.

...We saw what a handful of our enemies can do with box-cutters and plane tickets...

These lines are intended by Bush to expresses indirect complaint where Bush explains to the world how dangerous his enemies are. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance , Bush hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future , Strategies of complaint is hints where Bush implies that his enemies are guilty, indirectly responsible for the offence.

... We hear their threats to launch even more terrible attacks on our people...

Bush's statement reflects the indirect complaint where Bush explains how dangerous are enemies' threats. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance , Bush hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future , Strategy of complaints is annoyance, where Bush describes how bad the situation is yet he does not directly hold the complaine responsible for the problem.

... We know that if they were able to get their hands on weapons of mass destruction, they would use them against us. We face an enemy determined to bring death and suffering into our homes...

Bush uses indirect complaint where he accuses the enemy of using weapons of mass destruction against American citizens if they own them. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates

that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation , he is indirectly accused the complaine .

...No matter how long it takes, America will find you, and we will bring you to justice...

Bush's statement reflects the indirect complaint where Bush threatens the enemy to arrest him and bring him to justice sooner or later.

Directive acts of complaints is threat, where Bush Instead of issuing a (polite) request, he choose to attack the complaine's face openly by issuing a threat. Strategy of complaints is warning , Bush warns his enemies that they will receive their punishment .

...Al Qaeda and other extremists from across the world have come to Iraq to stop the rise of a free society in the heart of the Middle East. They have joined the remnants of Saddam's regime and other armed groups to foment sectarian violence and drive us out...

These words are intended by bush to indicate indirect complaints where Bush accuses al-Qaeda and other extremist forces of joining the remnants of Saddam's regime to stop a free society in Iraq and cause sectarian strife. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, he is directly accused the complaine (al-Qaeda and other extremist forces)

...Al Qaeda and those inspired by its hateful ideology have carried out terrorist attacks in more than two dozen nations. And just last

month, they were foiled in a plot to blow up passenger planes headed for the United States...

Bush in his speech uses the indirect complaint where Bush accuses Al Qaeda and its allies of attacking many countries, not just America and the last attempt to blow up a passenger plane. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is complaints is direct accusation, he is directly accused the complaine (Al Qaeda and those inspired by its hateful ideology)

...The terrorists fear freedom as much as they do our firepower. They are thrown into panic at the sight of an old man pulling the election lever, girls enrolling in schools, or families worshipping God in their own traditions...

These lines are utilized by Bush to indicate the indirect complaint where Bush accuses the enemy of fear of freedom because if they give people freedom they will not choose them so they are blocking people this right Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Bush's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaint is complaints is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complaine (The terrorists).

Group (B) 4.2.2

Obama's First Speech 4.2.2.1

...The United Nations Security Council voted overwhelmingly to sanction Iran for its continued failure to live up to its obligations...

Obama's statement reflects indirect complaint where Obama accuses

the Iranian system to abandon its obligations. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance , Obama hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future, Strategy of complaint is direct accusation, He is directly accused the complaine (Iran)

...For years, the Iranian government has failed to live up to its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It has violated its commitments to the International Atomic Energy Agency. It has ignored U.N. Security Council resolutions...

Obama's statement reflects the indirect complaint where Obama accuse the Iranian regime to violate its obligations to the Global Cooperation. directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance , Obama hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future, Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complaine (Iran)

...We recognize Iran's rights. But with those rights come responsibilities...

An indirect complaint Where Obama hints that the Iranian regime is not responsible. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance , Obama hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future, Strategy of complaints is hints where Obama implies that Iranian regime is guilty.

...The Iranian government has failed to meet those responsibilities...

These lines are utilized by Obama to indicate the indirect complaint where Obama Accuses Iran of failing to shoulder its responsibilities. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance , Obama hope that

the accused will improve his behavior in future ,Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complainee(Iran)

...Iran concealed a nuclear enrichment facility in Qom that raised serious questions about the nature of its program. Iran further violated its own obligations under U.N. Security Council resolutions to suspend uranium enrichment...

An indirect complaint where Obama accuses Iran of failing to shoulder its responsibilities toward its nuclear program and has built dubious energy sources. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaint is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complainee (Iran)

...The Iranian people participated with remarkable enthusiasm, but will instead be remembered for how the Iranian government brutally suppressed dissent and murdered the innocent, including a young woman left to die in the street...

These lines are present indirect complaint where Obama accuses the Iranian government of repressing its people and killing innocent people .Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaint is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complainee (Iran)

...Whether it is threatening the nuclear non-proliferation regime, or the human rights of its own citizens, or the stability of its own neighbors by supporting terrorism, the Iranian government

continues to demonstrate that its own unjust actions are a threat to justice everywhere...

An indirect complaint where Obama threatens Iran's government with the consequences of its nonsense bolts. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is explicit blame (behavior), where Obama clearly indicates that the Iranian government hold responsible for the damage it caused .

...Today's sanctions are yet another signal that if the Iranian government continues to undermine the NPT and the peace that it protects, then Iran will find itself more isolated, less prosperous and less secure...

Obama's words are indirect complaint where Obama threatens Iran's government that it will be more insulating if they follow up their sales to peace. Directive act of complaint is threat, where Obama Instead of issuing a (polite) request, he choose to attack the complaine's face openly by issuing a threat. Strategy of complaint is warning, where Obama's warning implies sanctions for Iran.

Obama's Second Speech 4.2.2.2

...Small groups of killers have the capacity to do great harm...

Obama's speech reflects the indirect complaint where Obama accuses terrorist groups of hurting America. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance , Obama hopes that the accused will improve his

behavior in future, Strategy of complaint is warning, where Obama warns from small groups danger.

...ISIL is not "Islamic." No religion condones the killing of innocents...

Obama in these lines expresses indirect complaint where Obama accuses ISIL that it doesn't belong to any religion. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaint is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complaine (ISIL)

...The vast majority of ISIL's victims have been Muslim...

These lines utilized by Obama to indicate the indirect complaint where Obama accuses ISIL that their first victims are Muslims. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaint is direct accusation, He is directly accused the complaine (ISIL)

...And ISIL is certainly not a state. It was formerly al Qaeda's affiliate in Iraq, and has taken advantage of sectarian strife and Syria's civil war to gain territory on both sides of the Iraq-Syrian border...

Obama in these lines expresses indirect complaint where Obama accuses ISIL of being remnants of al - Qaeda and it does not belong to Islam. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance, Obama hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future, Strategy of complaint is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complaine (ISIL)

...ISIL is a terrorist organization, pure and simple. And it has no vision other than the slaughter of all who stand in its way...

Obama's statement reflects the indirect complaint where Obama accuse ISIL as an expression of a terrorist organization that has no vision but murder. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance , Obama hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future, Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complaine (ISIL).

...In a region that has known so much bloodshed, these terrorists are unique in their brutality. They execute captured prisoners. They kill children. They enslave, rape, and force women into marriage. They threatened a religious minority with genocide. And in acts of barbarism, they took the lives of two American journalists -- Jim Foley and Steven Sotloff...

Obama's speech reflects the indirect complaint ,where he accuses ISIL of carrying out many horrific acts against men, women and children as well as prisoners. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance, Obama hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaints is explicit blame (behavior), where Obama clearly indicates **that ISIL responsible for these actions**

...In the fight against ISIL, we cannot rely on an Assad regime that terrorizes its own people -- a regime that will never regain the legitimacy it has lost...

These lines utilized by Obama to indicate the indirect complaint where Obama accuses the Assad regime of terrorizing the Syrian people and it will never regain the legitimacy it lost. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is explicit blame (behavior), where Obama clearly indicates that the Assad regime is **responsible for these actions**.

Obama's Third Speech 4.3.2.3

...On Wednesday, 14 Americans were killed as they came together to celebrate the holidays...

Obama in these lines, expresses indirect complaint where Obama **confirms the killing of a number of American citizens**. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance, Obama hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaint is annoyance where Obama explains how bad the situation is for Americans.

...I want to talk with you about this tragedy, the broader threat of terrorism, and how we can keep our country safe...

Obama's speech reflects the indirect complaint where Obama **explains the incident, which he described as tragedy**. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance, Obama hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future, Strategy of complaint is annoyance where Obama explains **how bad the situation is for Americans**.

...The victims were brutally murdered and injured by one of their coworkers and his wife...

Obama's words express the indirect complaint ,where Obama accuses a man and his wife of killing a number of American citizens.

Directive act of complaints is request for forbearance , Obama hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future, Strategy of complaint is indirect accusation, where Obama **accuses** a man and his wife indirectly.

...But it is clear that the two of them had gone down the dark path of radicalization, embracing a perverted interpretation of Islam that calls for war against America and the West. They had stockpiled assault weapons, ammunition, and pipe bombs. So this was an act of terrorism, designed to kill innocent people...

Obama in his speech uses the indirect complaint ,where Obama accuses the killers of embracing the false interpretation of Islam, which calls for war against America and the West. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is explicit blame (behavior), where Obama clearly indicates that the killers responsible for the tragedy.

...Our nation has been at war with terrorists since al Qaeda killed nearly 3,000 Americans on 9/11...

These lines are utilized by Obama to indicate the indirect complaint, where Obama accuses al Qaeda of being responsible for 9/11 attacks. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, he directly accused the complaine (al Qaeda)

...Terrorists turned to less complicated acts of violence like the mass shootings that are all too common in our society. It is this type of attack that we saw at Fort Hood in 2009; in Chattanooga earlier this year; and now in San Bernardino. And as groups like ISIL grew stronger amidst the chaos of war in Iraq and then Syria, and as the Internet erases the distance between countries, we see growing efforts by terrorists to poison the minds of people like the Boston Marathon bombers and the San Bernardino killer...

Obama's speech reflects the indirect complaint, where Obama accuses terrorists of being behind indiscriminate firing in US cities and how the Internet has helped to bridge distances between countries, helping to speed up poisoning the minds of the individuals who carried out the attacks. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complaine.

...We will destroy ISIL and any other organization that tries to harm us ...

These lines utilized by Obama to indicate the indirect complaint, where Obama threatens to destroy ISIL if it tries to hurt America. Directive act of complaint is threat, where Obama instead of issuing a (polite) request, he choose to attack the complainees face openly by issuing a threat. Strategy of complaint is warning , Obama warns his enemies that they will receive their punishment .

...A group that threatens us all...

Obama uses indirect complaint where he accuses ISIL as an enemy threatening all nations. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaint is hints, where Obama implies that the complainees indirectly responsible.

...ISIL fighters were part of the insurgency that we faced in Iraq...

An Indirect complaint where Obama accuses ISIL that they are part of the dilemma faced by US forces in the Iraqi situation. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, he directly accuses the complainees.

... But they also know that if we occupy foreign lands, they can maintain insurgencies for years, killing thousands of our troops, draining our resources, and using our presence to draw new recruits...

Obama in his speech uses the indirect complaint where he expresses how terrorist can exploit their presence in foreign lands. Directive act of

complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategies of complaints is explicit blame (behavior), where Obama clearly indicates that the terrorist responsible for these actions.

...ISIL does not speak for Islam...

Obama's speech reflects the indirect complaint where Obama accuses ISIL that it does not represent Islam. Directive act of complaint is request for forbearance , Obama hopes that the accused will improve his behavior in future, Strategy of complaints is direct accusation, where Obama accuses ISIL directly

...They are thugs and killers, part of a cult of death, and they account for a tiny fraction of more than a billion Muslims around the world -- including millions of patriotic Muslim Americans who reject their hateful ideology. Moreover, the vast majority of terrorist victims around the world are Muslim...

Obama's speech reflects the indirect complaint were Obama accuses ISIL that they are a group of assassinations do not touch the origin of Islam and their creed based hatred and rejected by millions of Muslims. Directive act of complaint is request for repair this clearly indicates that Obama's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is explicit blame (behavior), where Obama clearly indicates that the terrorist responsible for these actions.

Group (C) 4.2.3

Trump's First Speech 4.2.3.1

...Now, a different threat challenges our world: Radical Islamic Terrorism...

An indirect complaint, where Trump warns from the danger of radical Islam. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is warning, Where Trump warns from the danger of radical Islam.

...This summer, there has been an ISIS attack launched outside the war zones of the Middle East every 84 hours. Here, in America, we have seen one brutal attack after another...

An Indirect complaint, where Trump holds ISIS the responsible of the attacks in many places at the world especially in America. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses ISIS directly.

...In January of 2015, a French satirical newspaper, Charlie Hebdo, was attacked for publishing cartoons of the prophet Mohammed...

An indirect complaint, where Trump expresses his annoyance from the attacks in France. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance, Trump hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaints is annoyance, Trump use annoyance to express that the situation is considered bad for him/her, yet they do not directly hold the complainees responsible for the problem.

...Twelve were killed, including two police officers, and 11 were wounded. Two days later, four were murdered in a Jewish Deli...

Trump in these lines expresses Indirect complaint, where he accuses a supporter of the terrorist attack on the headquarters of the French newspaper and caused many casualties. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance, Trump hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation, Trump indirectly accuses the complaine.

...In November of 2015, terrorists went on a shooting rampage in Paris that slaughtered 130 people, and wounded another 368...

An indirect complaint where Trump holds the terrorists responsibility of killing people in Paris. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance, Trump hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation, Trump indirectly accuses the complaine.

...France is suffering gravely and the tourism industry is being massively affected in a most negative way...

An indirect complaint where Trump expresses his annoyance from tourism actions. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance, Trump hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaints is annoyance where Trump explains how bad the situation is for France.

... In March of this year, terrorists detonated a bomb in the Brussels airport, killing 32 and injuring 340...

Trump's statement reflects the indirect complaint, where he accuses terrorists of indiscriminately firing at citizens in Paris also the terrorists

blew up a bomb in the Brussels airport and killing many people. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance , Trump hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation ,Trump indirectly accuses the complaine.

...This July, in the South of France, an Islamic terrorist turned his truck into an instrument of mass murder, plowing down and killing 85 men, women and children – and wounding another 308...

Trump uses indirect complaint where he accuses Islamic terrorism of being behind the attack in southern France and caused many casualties Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation ,Trump indirectly accuses the complaine.

...A few weeks ago, in Germany, a refugee armed with an axe wounded five people in a gruesome train attack

These lines utilized by trump to indicate the indirect complaint where he accuses a refugee of being responsible for the attack in Germany. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategies of complaints is indirect accusation, Trump indirectly accuses the complaine.

...Overseas, ISIS has carried out one unthinkable atrocity after another...

An indirect complaint ,where Trump holds ISIS the responsibility for many attacks. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this

clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses ISIS directly

... Children slaughtered, girls sold into slavery, men and women burned alive. Crucifixions, beheadings and drownings. Ethnic minorities targeted for mass execution. Holy sites desecrated. Christians driven from their homes and hunted for extermination

Trump's statement reflects the indirect complaint ,where he accuses ISIS of advocating many violent practices of killing and torturing men, women and children as well as destroying holy sites and describing their actions as evil .Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses ISIS directly

...The rise of ISIS is the direct result of policy decisions made by President Obama and Secretary Clinton

These words are intended by trump to indicate indirect complaints, Trump accuses both former US President Obama and his assistant, Clinton, of being responsible for the emergence of an ISIS .Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (person) where Trump explicitly stated that Obama and his assistant Clinton are non responsible social members.

...At the same time, ISIS is trying to infiltrate refugee flows into

Europe and the United States.

Trump in these lines expresses indirect complaint, where he is accused of being responsible for the flow of refugees to Europe and the United States. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses ISIS directly.

...Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism.

Trump uses Indirect complaint, where he accuses the Iranian regime of being responsible for supporting terrorism. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses Iran directly.

... The Nuclear deal puts Iran, the number one state sponsor of Radical Islamic Terrorism.

Trump uses Indirect complaint, where he accuses the Iranian regime of being responsible for supporting radical Islamic terrorism. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses Iran directly.

...In short, the Obama-Clinton foreign policy has unleashed ISIS, destabilized the Middle East, and put the nation of Iran – which chants ‘Death to America’ – in a dominant position of regional power and, in fact, aspiring to be a dominant world power.

Trump in his speech uses the indirect complaint, where he accuses Obama of being responsible for the emergence of an oppressor and devastation of the Middle East and enabling Iran to support terrorism. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is Consequences where Trump expresses the consequences resulting from the Obama-Clinton foreign policy.

...It all began in 2009 with what has become known as President Obama's global 'Apology Tour.

Trump in his speech uses the indirect complaint, where he accuses Obama of being responsible for the emergence of an oppressor and devastation of the Middle East and enabling Iran to support terrorism. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (person) where Trump explicitly stated that Obama is non responsible social members.

...The failure to establish a new Status of Forces Agreement in Iraq, and the election-driven timetable for withdrawal, surrendered our gains in that country and led directly to the rise of ISIS With one episode of bad judgment after another, Hillary Clinton's policies launched ISIS onto the world.

Trump uses indirect complaint, where he accuses Obama that his foreign policy was responsible for sabotaging the situation in Libya Clinton also responsible for wasting US money on war and the emergence of ISIS. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this

clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is Consequences where Trump expresses the consequences resulting from the bad judgment made by Hillary Clinton.

... Yet, as she threw the Middle East into violent turmoil, things turned out well for her. The Clintons made almost \$60 million in gross income while she was Secretary of State.

Trump's speech reflects the indirect complaint ,where he blames Clinton because of her non responsible actions.Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance Where Trump hopes to change the behavior of the accused in the future. Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (person) where Trump explicitly stated that Clinton is non responsible social members.

...Incident after incident proves again and again: Hillary Clinton lacks the judgment, the temperament and the moral character to lead this nation.

Trump in his speech uses the indirect complaint ,where he accuses Hillary Clinton that she is not suitable for the leadership.Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (person) where Trump explicitly stated that Clinton is not responsible social members.

...Importantly, she also lacks the mental and physical stamina to take on ISIS, and all the many adversaries we face – not only in terrorism , but in trade and every other challenge we must confront to turn this country around

Trump's speech reflects the indirect complaint, where he accuses Clinton that she is responsible for wasting US money on war and the emergence of ISIS as well as many mistakes about American trade. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (person) where Trump explicitly stated that Clinton is non responsible social members.

...Al Qaeda in Iraq had been decimated, and Obama and Clinton gave it new life and allowed it to spread across the world.

Trump in these lines expresses Indirect complaint, where he accuses Obama's administration as he reiterated the al-Qaeda, with the appearance of ISIS in Iraq .Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused .Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (person) where Trump explicitly stated that Clinton and Obama as non responsible social members.

...We also know that ISIS recruits refugees after their entrance into the country as we have seen with the Somali refugee population in Minnesota

An indirect complaint where Trump is accused ISIS of recruiting refugees after entering the United States .Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses ISIS directly.

Trump's Second Speech 4.2.3.2

... America has suffered repeated barbaric attacks from the atrocities of September 11 to the devastation of the Boston bombings to the horrible killings in San Bernardino and Orlando.

An indirect complaint, where Trump accuses terrorism as responsible for many terrorist attacks in many American cities such as Boston, San Bernardino and Orlando. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance Where trump hopes to change the behavior of the accused in the future Strategy of complaints is annoyance, Trump use annoyance to express that the situation is considered bad for him/her, yet they do not directly hold the complainees responsible for the problem.

... The nations of Europe have also endured unspeakable horror. So too have the nations of Africa and South America. India, Russia, China, and Australia have all been victims.

An indirect complaint, where Trump accuses terrorism as responsible for many terrorist attacks in America and other countries as well as responsible for destruction in the countries of the Islamic and the Middle East .Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance Where trump hopes to change the behavior of the accused in the future Strategy of complaints is annoyance, Trump use annoyance to express that the situation is considered bad for him/her, yet they do not directly hold the complainees responsible for the problem.

...Terrorists do not worship God; they worship death.

Trump's statement reflects the indirect complaint, where he accuses the

terrorists of worshipping death. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation, Trump indirectly accuses the complaine.

...They do nothing to inspire but kill

An indirect complaint where Trump accuses terrorism of being nothing but murder. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation, Trump indirectly accuses the complaine.

...It is a regime that is responsible for so much instability in that region. I am speaking, of course, of Iran.

Trump in these lines expresses indirect compliant where he accuses the Iranian regime of being responsible for instability in the region because it supports sectarian conflicts. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses Iran directly.

...From Lebanon to Iraq to Yemen, Iran funds arms and trains terrorists, militias, and other extremist groups that spread destruction and chaos across the region.

An indirect complaint ,where Trump accuses Iran as provides weapons and helps terrorists, militias and other extremist groups spread destruction and chaos throughout the region. Directive acts of complaints is request

for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses Iran directly.

... Iran has fueled the fires of sectarian conflict and terror.

An Indirect complaint, where Trump accuses the Iranian regime funded and helped sectarian strife in the region. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses Iran directly.

...It is a government that speaks openly of mass murder, vowing the destruction of Israel, death to America, and ruin for many leaders and nations in this very room.

Trump's statement reflects the indirect complaint ,where he accuses Iranian regime of calling for public hostility to both America and Israel. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused .Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses Iran directly.

...Among Iran's most tragic and destabilizing interventions, you've seen it in Syria. Bolstered by Iran, Assad has committed unspeakable crimes, and the United States has taken firm action in response to the use of banned chemical weapons by the Assad regime.

An indirect complaint ,where Trump accuses the Iranian regime to commit crimes in Syria because they helped Assad to kill his people.Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly

indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused

Trump's Third Speech 4.2.3.3

... Rogue regimes represented in this body not only support terrorists but threaten other nations and their own people with the most destructive weapons known to humanity

Trump's speech reflects the indirect complaint, where he accuses rogue regimes of threatening the world with possession of dangerous weapons. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is indirect accusation ,Trump indirectly accuses the complaine.

...International criminal networks traffic drugs, weapons, people; force dislocation and mass migration; threaten our borders; and new forms of aggression exploit technology to menace our citizens.

An indirect complaint ,where trump accuses global crime organizations of threatening US citizens and threatening borders by smuggling people and drugs weapons. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused .Strategy of complaints is warning, Where Trump warns from The danger of International criminal networks.

...No one has shown more contempt for other nations and for the wellbeing of their own people than the depraved regime in North Korea. It is responsible for the starvation deaths of millions of North Koreans, and for the imprisonment, torture, killing, and oppression of countless more.

An indirect complaint ,where Trump accuses the North Korean regime of being responsible for torturing, imprisoning and killing his own people Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. .Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses North Korean regime directly.

...North Korea's reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles threatens the entire world with unthinkable loss of human life.

An indirect complaint, where Trump accuses the Korean regime of threatening human life because of possession of nuclear weapons Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is warning, Where Trump warns the entire world from the danger of Korean regime.

Rather than use its resources to improve Iranian lives, its oil profits go to fund Hezbollah and other terrorists that kill innocent Muslims and attack their peaceful Arab and Israeli neighbors.

Trump in these lines expresses Indirect compliant ,where he is accuses the Iranian regime of using its own resources and oil to support terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah, which threatens security countries such as Israel . Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused . Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (behavior), where Trump clearly indicates that the Iranian government hold responsible for the damage it caused .

...This wealth, which rightly belongs to Iran's people, also goes to shore up Bashar al-Assad's dictatorship, fuel Yemen's civil war, and undermine peace throughout the entire Middle East

Trump uses indirect complaint, where he accuses the Iranian regime of backing the dictatorship of Bashar al-Assad, inciting civil war in Yemen and sabotaging peace in the Middle East. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is Explicit blame (behavior), where Obama clearly indicates that the Iranian government hold responsible for the damage it caused.

...The actions of the criminal regime of Bashar al-Assad, including the use of chemical weapons against his own citizens — even innocent children — shock the conscience of every decent person.

Trump in his speech uses the indirect complaint, where he accuses Bashar Assad of using chemical weapons against his people. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is direct accusation where Trump accuses Bashar al-Assad regime directly.

...No society can be safe if banned chemical weapons are allowed to spread.

Trump uses indirect complaint, where he warns that there will be no safe society if the spread of chemical weapons present. Directive acts of

complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused .Strategy of complaints is warning, Where Trump warns from The danger of chemical weapons.

...The socialist dictatorship of Nicolas Maduro has inflicted terrible pain and suffering on the good people of that country.

An indirect complaint, where Trump accuses Nicolas Maduro of causing pain and suffering to his people. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance , Trump hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaints is explicit blame (behavior), where Trump clearly indicates that Nicolas Maduro is responsible for these actions.

...This corrupt regime destroyed a prosperous nation by imposing a failed ideology that has produced poverty and misery everywhere it has been tried.

Trump in these lines expresses Indirect compliant ,where he accuses Maduro by following a failed ideology that led its people to poverty and suffering.Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance , Trump hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaints is explicit blame (behavior), where Trump clearly indicates that Nicolas Maduro is responsible for these actions.

... Maduro has defied his own people, stealing power from their elected representatives to preserve his disastrous rule The Venezuelan people are starving and their country is collapsing .Their democratic institutions are being destroyed.

Trump's statement reflects the indirect complaint ,where he accuses Maduro that he is leading his people towards a catastrophic fate. Directive acts of complaints is request for forbearance , Trump hope that the accused will improve his behavior in future. Strategy of complaints is Consequences where Trump expresses the consequences resulting from the actions made by Maduro .

...This situation is completely unacceptable and we cannot stand by and watch.

Trump's words express the indirect complaint ,where he accuses Nicolas Maduro of Venezuela of causing pain and suffering to his people, as well as destroying his country because of the acts of his dictatorial regime. Directive acts of complaints is request for repair this clearly indicates that Trump 's purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments is also to repair the damage caused. Strategy of complaints is annoyance, Trump use annoyance to express that the situation is considered bad for him/her, yet they do not directly hold the complainees responsible for the problem.

4.3 Results and Discussions

4.3.1 Complaint's Strategies and Directive Acts in Group (A)

After analyzing the data in George Bush's three selected speeches, it turns out that it contains (43) utterances in total, The most frequent used directive act is *Request for repair* with a rate of occurrence (26) of (43) utterances (60.4%). The second directive act is occupied by *Request for forbearance* with the occurrences (16) of (43) utterances, amounting to (37.2%). The least used directive act is *Threat* with a frequency (1) of (43) utterances (2.3%).

Table No. (1): Distribution of complaint's directive Acts in Group (A)

%	Total	Speech 3	Speech 2	Speech 1	Directive Acts
60.4%	26	4	19	3	Request to repair
37.2%	16	7	9	0	Request for forbearance
2.3%	1	1	0	0	Threat
100					43

In terms of strategies, the most frequently used strategy is direct accusation occupying (22) from (43) utterances (51.16%). The second strategy is Indirect accusation with a rate of (7) from (43) utterances (16.27%). The third strategy is occupied by Annoyance with a rate of occurrence (4) of (43) (9.30%). The fourth frequent strategies are Consequences and Explicit blame (behavior) obtains (3) of (43) utterances for each (6.97%). The least frequent strategies are hints and warning obtains (2) of (43) utterances for each (4.6%).

Table No. (2): Distribution of complaint's Strategies in Group (A)

Strategies	Speech 1	Speech 2	Speech 3	Total	%
Hints	0	1	1	2	4.6%
Annoyance	0	0	4	4	9.30%
Consequences	0	3	0	3	% 6.97
Indirect accusation	1	3	3	7	16.27%

Direct accusation	2	17	3	22	51.16%
Modified blame	0	0	0	0	0
Explicit blame (behavior)	0	3	0	3	6.97%
Explicit blame (person)	0	0	0	0	0
Warning	0	1	1	2	4.6%
43					100

Complaint's Strategies and Directive Acts in Group (B) 4.3.2

The analysis of the data reveals that request for repair is the most frequently used directive act in these speeches with a rate of occurrence (13) of (27) utterances (48.1%). Request for forbearance comes in the second place after request for repair occupying (12) out of (27) utterances (44.4%). The least used directive act is threat with a frequency (2) of (27) utterances (7.4%).

Table No. (3): Distribution of Complaint's Directive Acts in Group (B)

%	Total	Speech 3	Speech 2	Speech 1	Directive Acts
48.1%	13	7	3	3	Request to repair
44.4%	12	4	4	4	Request for forbearance
7.4%	2	1	0	1	Threat
100					27

In terms of strategies, the most frequently used strategy is direct accusation occupying (13) of (27) utterances (48.1%). The second strategy is Explicit blame (behavior) occupying (6) out of (27)

utterances (22.2%). The Third strategy is warning with a rate of occurrence (3) out of (27) utterances(11.1%). The fourth strategy Occupy by both Annoyance and hints with a rate of occurrence (2) out of (27) utterances (7.4%). The least frequent strategy is occupied by Indirect accusation with a rate of occurrence(1) out of (27) utterances(3.7%).

Table No. (4): Distribution of Complaint’s Strategies in Group (B)

Strategies	Speech 1	Speech 2	Speech 3	Total	%
Hints	1	0	1	2	7.4%
Annoyance	0	0	2	2	7.4%
Consequences	0	0	0	0	0
Indirect accusation	0	0	1	1	3.7%
Direct accusation	5	4	4	13	48.1%
Modified blame	0	0	0	0	0
Explicit blame (behavior)	1	2	3	6	22.2%
Explicit blame (person)	0	0	0	0	0
Warning	1	1	1	3	11.1%
				27	100

Complaint’s Strategies and Directive Acts in Group (C) 4.3.3

After analyzing the data in **Donald Trump's** three selected speeches, it turns out that it contains (44) utterances in total, The most frequent

used directive act is *Request for repair* with a rate of occurrence (33) of (44) utterances (75%). The second directive act is occupied by *Request for forbearance* with the occurrences (11) of (44) utterances, amounting to (25%). The least used directive act is *Threat* with a zero frequency.

Table No. (5): Distribution of Complaint’s Directive Acts in Group (C)

%	Total	Speech 3	Speech 2	Speech 1	Directive Acts
75%	33	9	7	17	Request to repair
25%	11	3	2	6	Request for forbearance
0	0	0	0	0	Threat
100	44				

In terms of strategies, the most frequently used strategy is direct accusation occupying (14) of (44) utterances (31.8%). The second strategy is Indirect accusation occupying (8) out of (44) utterances (18.18%). The Third strategy is Explicit blame (person) with a rate of occurrence (6) out of (44) utterances (13.6%). The fourth strategy occupied by Annoyance with a rate of occurrence(5) out of (44) utterances(11.36%). The fifth strategy occupied by both Explicit blame (behavior) and warning with a rate of occurrence (4) out of (44) utterances (9.09%). The least frequent strategy is occupied by Consequences with a rate of occurrence(3) out of (44) utterances(6.8%).

Table No. (6): Distribution of Complaint’s Strategies in Group (C)

strategies	Speech 1	Speech 2	Speech 3	Total	%
Hints	0	0	0	0	0
Annoyance	2	2	1	5	11.36%

1	63.1%	72	1	75%	33	1	48.1%	13	1	60.4%	26	Request to repair
2	34.2%	39	2	25%	11	2	44.4%	12	2	37.2%	16	Request for forbearance
3	2.6%	3	3	0	0	3	7.4%	2	3	2.3%	1	Threat

Strategies in All Groups 4.4.2

Direct accusation is identified as the most frequent used strategy in all nine selected speeches with a rate of occurrence (49) of (114) utterances in total (42.9%). The second rank is occupied by indirect accusation with the occurrences (16) of (114) utterances (14%). The strategy used in the third rank is Explicit blame (behavior) with the occurrences (13) of (114) utterances (11.4%). The strategy that came in the fourth place is Annoyance with the occurrences (11) of (114) utterances (9.6%). The fifth strategy in rank is warning with the occurrences (9) of (114) utterances (7.8%). The sixth rank is occupied by both Consequences and Explicit blame (person) with the occurrences (6) of (114) utterances (5.2%). The last rank is occupied by Hints with the occurrences (4) of (114) utterances (3.5%). See table No. (9) below

Table No. (8): Distribution of Complaint's Strategies in All Groups

all Groups			Group(C)			Group(B)			Group(A)			Strategies
Rank	%	.freq	Rank	%	freq	Rank	%	freq	Rank	%	freq	
7	3.5%	4	0	0	0	4	7.4%	2	6	4.6%	2	Hints

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is dedicated to cover the results obtained from the data analyzed in the previous chapter. It further includes conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further consideration.

5.2 Conclusions

The examination of complaint in the research data of the present study :has yielded the following conclusions

1. Concerning the directive acts identified in the analyzed data, Request for repair is the highest percentage in all nine speeches with a rate of occurrence (72) of (114) utterances (63.1%). This clearly indicates that the sole purpose of complaint is not to pass moral judgments in most cases, but it functions as an incentive for the complainees to repair the damage he/she has caused or an attempt to stop repetition of the deplorable act.
2. While request for forbearance came second in all nine speeches with the occurrences (39) of (114) utterances (34.2%).the complainer requested the

complainee to a void performing the condemn action in the future. However, this type of request is regarded as a negative reinforce due to the subsequent repetition of such behavior by the complainee.

3. The least used directive act is Threat with frequency (3) of (114) utterances (2.6%).

4. With regard to the strategies used in the chosen data, the study has concluded the following:

a) Direct accusation has the highest percentage compared to other strategies found in the data, identified in (49) of (114) utterances (42.9%) of the total use of complaint strategies in the data under investigation.

b) Indirect accusation has the second rank identified in (16) utterances (14%) percent of the total use of complaint in the data of the study.

c) Explicit blame (behavior) rank third with the occurrences (13)utterances (11.4%)of the total use of complaint's strategies in the analyzed data.

d) Annoyance came in the fourth place identified in (11) utterances (9.6%).

e) The fifth strategy in rank is warning with the occurrences (9) utterances (7.8%).

f) Consequences and Explicit blame (person) both came in the sixth rank with the occurrences (6) utterances (5.2%).

g) The last rank is occupied by Hints with the occurrences (4) utterances (3.5%)

h) Modified blame is zero used in the analyzed data.

5.3 Recommendations

On the basis of the conclusions arrived at, the following recommendations are put forward:

1- The present research provides the general guidelines of the accurate use of the speech act of complaint to those interested in the fields of linguistics, literature, and stylistics as readers, writers, and critics.

2- Teachers of EFL learners should pay more attention to the speech act of complaint as they are found in different texts such as books, newspapers, classroom interactions, etc. In reality, complaint is always employed in both spoken and written language; teaching the speech act of complaint as a separate topic is highly recommended.

3- Because of the growing importance of English language in most academic majors , it would be of great benefit to all those who are interested in studying language and students to be informed with the various strategies of the speech act of complaint.

4- The present thesis provides the general guidelines of the accurate use of the speech act of complaint to those interested in the fields of linguistics, literature, and stylistics as readers, writers, and critics.

5- Understanding the language use and tracing the linguistic choices in the contexts, as it is believed, will make students interact efficiently and succeed in taking accurate decisions. It is, therefore, the teacher's task to point out systematically the speech act of complaint and its strategies. Additionally, the task of the teacher is to focus on the nature of the speech act of complaint and to refer students to their everyday use so as to make a background for them to be attentive in using them in the future.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

The following studies are suggested to be taken in the consideration in order to follow up the present study

1. Study speech acts to explore the other types of speech acts Proposed by both Austin(1962) and Searle(1979) as well as investigate other types of expressives such as greeting, thanking, apologizing, complaints, congratulating, in the same texts of political discourse selected in this research paper.
2. Investigation of speech acts of complaining in a whole set of other political texts or other kind of literary texts such as novels
3. The acts of complaining can be also investigated in a group of Arabic political speeches and other English speeches as part of a comparative study.
4. Complaints of patients of the ill treatment of the medical staff can be conducted.

A pragma linguistic study can be done on complaints by using another .5 modal in analyzing complaints in political speeches such as Brown and .Levinson (1987) modal

Bibliography

- Akmajian ,A, Demers , R. , Farmer, A. and Harnish , R .(1990).
Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication.
.Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Allan, K.(1986) **Linguistic Meaning** :Vol.2. New York: Routledge and
.kegan Paul,INC
- Argyle, M. ed. (1973). **Social Encounters: Readings in Social
.Interaction.** Harmonds worth, Middex: Penguin Publishing
- Austin, J. (1962). **How to do things with words.** Oxford: Oxford
University Press
- Bach, K. (2002). “**Semantic, Pragmatic**”. In J. Keim Campbell, M.
O'Rourke, and D. Shier, (Eds.) *Meaning and Truth* (pp. 284-292). New
York: Seven Bridges Press
- Bach, Kent and Robert M. Harnish. (1979) **Linguistic Communication
.and Speech Acts.** Cambridge MA: MIT Press
- Bates, E. (1996). **Language and Context. The Acquisition of
Pragmatics.** London: Longman, Academic Press
- Ballmer, Thomas T. and Waltraud Brennenstuhl. (1981) **Speech Act
Classification: A study in the Lexical Analysis of English Speech
Activity Verbs.** Berlin: Springer-Verlag

Bell, D .V .J. (1995) "**Negotiation in the Workplace: The View from a Political Linguist**", in Firth, A. (Ed.) *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace*, Vol.28 (PP. 40-86).Oxford: Pergamon Benvensite

.Beard, A. (2000). **The language of politics**. . London: Routledge

Black, E. (2006). **Pragmatics and Stylistics**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Blum-Kulka, S.(1987) "**Indirectness and Politeness in Requests: Same or Different?**" *Journal of Pragmatics* pp.145-160.

Boxer, D. (1993). **Complaints as Positive Strategies: What the Learner Needs to Know**. Florida: TESOL

Brown, P.& Gilman, A.(1989) "**Politeness Theory and Shakespear's Four major Tragedies**" *Language in society*. Vol:18 No. 2,pp.159-210

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). **Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

[Carston, Robyn](#) (2002) **Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of .Explicit Communication**. Oxford: Blackwell

Chapman, S. (2009). **Key Ideas in Linguistics and the Philosophy of .Language**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Chilton, P. (2004). **Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice**. London, New York: Routledge

Chilton,P. and C.Schäffner ,(1979). **Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse**.USA: John Benjamins Publishing

Clarck, H.H. and T.B. Carlson (1982) "**Speech Acts and Hearer's Beliefs**" N.V. Smith, ed., *Mutual Knowledge* New York: Academic .Press

Clyne, M. (1994). **Intercultural communication at work: Cultural values in discourse**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Cohen, A. (1996). "**Speech acts**". In S.L. McKay and N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* (pp.383-420).
.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Crystal, D. (1995). **The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.UK: (2008) _____
.Blackwell Publishing

Cruse, A. (2000). **Meaning in Learning: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Culpeper, J. (1996). **Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness**. *Journal of Pragmatics*. . London: Routledge

Cummings, L. (2010). **The Pragmatics Encyclopedia**. New York: Routledge

Daly, N., Holmes, J., Newton, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). **Expletives as solidarity signals in FTAs on the factory floor**. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 945–964

Downes, W.(1977)"The Imperative and Pragmatics "*Journal of Linguistics*, Vol.13.NO.1

Fairclough, N. (1989). **Language and Power**. New York: Longman Group

Gazdar, G. (1979). **Pragmatics , Implicature , Presupposition , and Logical Form**. New York: Academic Press

Grice. P. (1987). '**Logic and Conversation: Syntax and Semantics**'.
.New York: Academic Press

Horton, J. and Andrea T. Baumeister (1996) " **Literature, Philosophy and Political Theory** " In Horton , J and Andrea T. Baumeister (eds) **Literature and the Political Theory**. London: Routledge

Hudson, R. A. (1980). **Sociolinguistics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Holmes, J. (1986). “**Compliments and compliment responses in New Zealand English**”. **Anthropological Linguistics**, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 485-508

Hickey, L. (1988). **Pragmasylistic connections — but in Miguel Delibes**. Salford: University of Salford

Ifantidou, E. (2013). “**Pragmatic competence and explicit instruction**”. **Journal of Pragmatics**, Vol. 59, pp. 93-116

Johnson, D.W. and R.T. Johnson (2002) " **Civil Political Discourse in a Democracy : The Contribution of Psychology** " . Available at: [http://www.co-operation.org / pages/contro-pol.html](http://www.co-operation.org/pages/contro-pol.html)

/Jones, S. (2004). **Pragmatics**. March 2005. <[http://www.litnotes.co.uk](http://www.litnotes.co.uk/pragmatics.html) <.pragmatics.html

Jung, J. (2002). “**Issues in Acquisitional Pragmatics**”. Working Papers in TESOL&Applied Linguistics, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 1-13

. Kasper, G. (1990) "**Linguistic Politeness**. London: Continuum

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). **Interlanguage Pragmatics: An Introduction**. New York: Oxford University Press

Kramsch, C.(1993) "Proficiency Plus: The Next Step". Retrieved in 2003 from: web.mit.edu/esit/www/esit-resume.doc

Lakoff, R. (1973). **The logic of politeness: Or, minding your p.s and q.s. Papers from the Chicago Linguistic Society** . Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society

- Leech, G. (1983). **Principles of Pragmatics**. Harlow: Longman
- Levinson, S. (1983). **Pragmatics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lyons, J. (1981). **Language and Linguistics : An Introduction**. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press
- Mey, J. (2009). **Pragmatics: An introduction**. Malden: Blackwell Publishing
- Matthews .P .H(1997)**The concise Dictionary of linguistics**. Oxford: .Oxford University Press
- Moon, K.(2001).**Speech Act Study: Differences Between Native And Nonnative Speaker's strategies**. The American University. www.cas.american.edu/cas/tesol/pdf/.../WP2002-Moon-Speech-Act.pdf
- Morris, C. W. (1938). “**Foundations of Theory of Signs**”. In O. Neurath, R. Carnap, and C. Morris (Eds.) *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science* (pp.77138). Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Murphy, B., & Neu, J. (1996) **My grade's too low: The speech act set of complaining**. In S. M. Gass, & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: challenges to communication in a second language*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter
- Olshtain, E. and Weinbach, L. (1987). “**Complaints: A Study of Speech Act Behavior Among Native and Nonnative Speakers of Hebrew**” .New York: OUP
- .Palmer, F.P. (1981) **Semantics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- .Patil, Z.N.(1994) **Style in Indian English Fiction Delhi**: Prestige
- .Price, S. (1998). **Media Studies**. London: Longman

Sadock, J. (1978). "**On Testing for Conversational Implicature**". In Cole, J. P. & J. R. Morgan (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics of Speech Acts*. Vol. IX. New York: Academic Press, pp.281-98

Searle, J.F. (1969). **Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language**. London: Cambridge University Press

Stubbs, M. (1983). **Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Schiffrin, Deborah. (1994) **Approaches to Discourse**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Schauer, G. A. (2009). **Interlanguage Pragmatic Development: The Study Abroad Context**. London: Continuum

Stelmann, M., Jr. (1982) "**Speech Act Theory and Writing**" Nystrand, ed., **What Writers Know :The Language, Process, and Structure of Written Discourse**. London Academic Press

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000) " Rapport Management : A Framework for Analysis" In Spencer-Oatey (ed) **Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk Across Cultures**. London and New York: Continuum. pp.11-46

Spolsky, B. (1998) **Sociolinguistics** . Oxford: Oxford University Press

Tanck, S. (2002). "**Speech Act Sets of Refusal and Complaint: A comparison of Native and Non-Native English Speakers' Production**". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: OUP

Thomas, J. (1995) . **Meaning in Interaction : An Introduction to Pragmatics** . London : Longman

Trosborg, A. (1995). **Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Compliments, and Apologies**. Berlin: Mouton

[Turbull, W. \(2003\)](#). **Language in Action Psychological Models of Conversation**. Psychology Press

van Dijk, T.A. (1981) **Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse**. The Hague: Mouton Publishers. (Janua Linguarum. Series Maior; 101)

Verschueren, J. (1999a). **Language and Ideology**. Vol.1. Antwerp: International Pragmatics Associations. January 2004. <<http://www.publib.sk/elpub/ff/ferencik/10.pdf>

Watts, R. (1992) **Politeness**. Cambridge: CUP

Wolfram Bublitz .(2011). **Foundations of Pragmatics**. Berlin: De Gruyter

.Yule, G. (1998). **Pragmatics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Zheng , T (2000) "**Characteristics of Australian Political Language Rhetoric: Tactics of Gaining Public Support and Shirking Responsibility**". Available at :<http://www.immi.se/intercultural>

A p p e n d i c e s

Group (A)

George Bush's speeches

1. Rose Garden Speech on Israel_Palestine Two-State Solution
(Delivered 24 June 2002, Washington, D.C.)
2. War on Terror Address to Military Officers Association of America.
(Delivered 5 September 2006, Capital Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C)
3. Address to the Nation on the Five-Year Anniversary of 9/11(delivered 11 September 2006).

Group (B)

Barack Obama's

speeches

1. Address to the Nation on the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant
(Delivered 10 September 2014)
2. Address on UN Security Council Sanctions Against Iran
(delivered 9 June 2010))
3. Address to the Nation on Foreign and Domestic Counter-Terrorism
Strategies (Delivered 6 December 2015, Oval Office, the White House)

Group (C)

Donald Trump's speeches

1. Donald Trump's speech on fighting terrorism (delivered 15 August 2016)
2. President Trump's full speech from Saudi Arabia on global terrorism
(May 21, 2017)
3. Remarks by President Trump to the 72nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly (September 19, 2017 New York)

Group (A)

The first speech

George W. Bush

Rose Garden Speech on IsraelPalestine TwoState Solution, .Delivered 24 June 2002, Washington, D.C



For too long, the citizens of the Middle East have lived in the midst of death and fear. The hatred of a few holds the hopes of many hostage. The forces of extremism and terror are attempting to kill progress and

peace by killing the innocent. And this casts a dark shadow over an entire region. For the sake of all

.humanity, things must change in the Middle East

It is untenable for Israeli citizens to live in terror. It is untenable for Palestinians to live in squalor and

occupation. And the current situation offers no prospect that life will improve. Israeli citizens will continue to

be victimized by terrorists, and so Israel will continue to defend herself

In the situation the Palestinian people will grow more and more miserable

. My vision is two states, living side

by side in peace and security. There is simply no way to achieve that peace until all parties fight terror. Yet,

at this critical moment, if all parties will break with the past and set out o

n a new path, we can overcome the darkness with the light of hope. Peace requires a new and different Palestinian leadership, so that a Palestinian state can be born

I call on the Palestinian people to elect new leaders, leaders not compromised by terror. I call upon them to build a practicing democracy, based on tolerance and liberty. If the Palestinian people actively pursue these goals, America and the world will actively support their efforts. If the Palestinian people meet these goals, they will be able to reach agreement with Israel and Egypt and Jordan on security and other arrangements for independence. And when the Palestinian people have new leaders, new institutions and new security arrangements with their neighbors, the United States of America will support the creation of a Palestinian state whose borders and certain aspects of its sovereignty will be provisional until resolved as part of a final settlement in the Middle East

In the work ahead, we all have responsibilities. The Palestinian people are gifted and capable, and I am confident they can achieve a new birth for their nation. A Palestinian state will never be created by terror it will be built through reform. And reform must be more than cosmetic change, or veiled attempt to preserve the status quo. True reform will require entirely new political and economic institutions, based on democracy, market economics and action against terrorism. Today, the elected Palestinian legislature has no authority, and power is concentrated in the hands of an

unaccountable few. A Palestinian state can only serve its citizens with a new constitution which separates the powers of government. The Palestinian parliament should have the full authority of a legislative body.

Local officials and government ministers need authority of their own and the independence to govern effectively.

The United States, along with the European Union and Arab states, will work with Palestinian leaders to

create a new constitutional framework, and a working democracy for the Palestinian people. And the United

States, along with others in the international community will help the Palestinians organize and monitor fair, multi-

party local elections by the end of the year, with national elections to follow. Today, the Palestinian people live in economic stagnation, made worse by official corruption. A Palestinian state will require a vibrant economy, where honest enterprise is encouraged by honest government. The

United States, the international donor community and the World Bank stand ready to work with Palestinians

on a major project of economic reform and development. The United States, the EU, the World Bank, the

International Monetary Fund are willing to oversee reforms in Palestinian finances, encouraging transparency and independent auditing.

And the United States, along with our partners in the developed world, will increase our humanitarian

assistance to relieve Palestinian suffering. Today, the Palestinian people lack effective courts of law and

have no means to defend and vindicate their rights. A Palestinian state will require a system of reliable

justice to punish those who prey on the innocent. The United States and members of the international community stand ready to work with Palestinian leaders to establish finance establish finance and monitor a truly independent judiciary. Today, Palestinian authorities are encouraging, not opposing, terrorism. This is unacceptable. And the United States will not support the establishment of a Palestinian state until its leaders engage in a sustained fight against the terrorists and dismantle their infrastructure. This will require an externally supervised effort to rebuild and reform the Palestinian security services. The security system must have clear lines of authority and accountability and a unified chain of command. America is pursuing this reform along with key regional states. The world is prepared to help, yet ultimately these steps toward statehood depend on the Palestinian people and their leaders. If they energetically take the path of reform, the rewards can come quickly. If Palestinians embrace democracy, confront corruption and firmly reject terror, they can count on American support for the creation of a provisional state of Palestine. With a dedicated effort, this state could rise rapidly, as it comes to terms with Israel, Egypt and Jordan on practical issues, such as security. The final borders, the capital and other aspects of this state's sovereignty will be negotiated between the parties, as part of a final settlement. Arab states have offered their help in this process, and their help is needed. I've said in the past that nations are either with us or against us in the war on terror. To be counted on the side of peace, nations must act. Every leader actually committed to peace

will end incitement to violence in official media, and publicly denounce homicide bombings. Every nation actually committed to peace will stop the flow of money, equipment and recruits to terrorist groups seeking the destruction of Israel including Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and Hezbollah. Every nation actually committed to peace must block the shipment of Iranian supplies to these groups, and oppose regimes that promote terror, like Iraq. And Syria must choose the right side in the war on terror by closing terrorist camps and expelling terrorist organizations. Leaders who want to be included in the peace process must show by their deeds an undivided support for peace. And as we move toward a peaceful solution, Arab states will be expected to build closer ties of diplomacy and commerce with Israel, leading to full normalization of relations between Israel and the entire Arab world. Israel also has a large stake in the success of a democratic Palestine. Permanent occupation threatens Israel's identity and democracy. A stable, peaceful Palestinian state is necessary to achieve the security that Israel longs for. So I challenge Israel to take concrete steps to support the emergence of a viable, credible Palestinian state.

As we make progress towards security, Israel forces need to withdraw fully to positions they held prior to September 28, 2000. And consistent with the recommendations of the Mitchell Committee, Israeli settlement activity in the occupied territories must stop.

The Palestinian economy must be allowed to develop. As violence subsid

es, freedom of movement should be restored, permitting innocent Palestinians to resume work and normal life. Palestinian legislators and officials, humanitarian and international workers, must be allowed to go about the business of building a better future. And Israel should release frozen Palestinian revenues into honest, accountable hands.

I've asked Secretary Powell to work intensively with Middle Eastern and international leaders to realize the vision of a Palestinian state, focusing them on a comprehensive plan to support Palestinian reform and institutionbuilding.

Ultimately, Israelis and Palestinians must address the core issues that divide them if there is to be a real peace, resolving all claims and ending the conflict between them. This means that the Israeli occupation that began in 1967 will be ended through a settlement negotiated between the parties, based on U.N.

Resolutions 242 and 338, with Israeli withdrawal to secure and recognize borders.

We must also resolve questions concerning Jerusalem, the plight and future of Palestinian refugees, and a final peace between Israel and Lebanon, and Israel and a Syria that supports peace and fights terror.

All who are familiar with the history of the Middle East realize that there may be setbacks in this process.

Trained and determined killers, as we have seen, want to stop it. Yet the Egyptian and Jordanian peace

treaties with Israel remind us that with determined and responsible leadership progress can come quickly.

As new Palestinian institutions and new leaders emerge, demonstrating real performance on security and reform, I expect Israel to respond and work toward a final status agreement. With intensive effort by all, this agreement could be reached within three years from now. And I and my country will actively lead toward that goal.

I can understand the deep anger and anguish of the Israeli people. You've lived too long with fear and funerals, having to avoid markets and public transportation, and forced to put armed guards in kindergarten classrooms. The Palestinian Authority has rejected your offer at hand, and trafficked with terrorists. You have a right to a normal life; you have a right to security; and I deeply believe that you need a reformed, responsible Palestinian partner to achieve that security.

I can understand the deep anger and despair of the Palestinian people. For decades you've been treated as pawns in the Middle East conflict. Your interests have been held hostage to a comprehensive peace agreement that never seems to come, as your lives get worse year by year. You deserve democracy and the rule of law. You deserve an open society and a thriving economy. You deserve a life of hope for your children. An end to occupation and a peaceful democratic Palestinian state may seem distant, but America

and our partners throughout the world stand ready to help, help you make them possible as soon as possible.

If liberty can blossom in the rocky soil of the West Bank and Gaza, it will inspire millions of men and women around the globe who are equally weary of poverty and oppression, equally entitled to the benefits of democratic government.

I have a hope for the people of Muslim countries. Your commitments to morality, and learning, and tolerance led to great historical achievements. And those values are alive in the Islamic world today. You have a rich culture, and you share the aspirations of men and women in every culture. Prosperity and freedom and dignity are not just American hopes, or Western hopes. They are universal, human hopes. And even in the violence and turmoil of the Middle East, America believes those hopes have the power to transform lives and nations.

This moment is both an opportunity and a test for all parties in the Middle East: an opportunity to lay the foundations for future peace; a test to show who is serious about peace and who is not. The choice here is stark and simple. The Bible says, "I have set before you life and death; therefore, choose life." The time has arrived for everyone in this conflict to choose peace, and hope, and life.

Thank you very much .

The second speech
George W. Bush
War on Terror Address to
Military Officers
Association of America
delivered 5 September 2006, Capital Hilton Hotel,
.Washington, D.C



Thank you all very much. Thank you all. Please be seated. General Hendrix, thank you for the invitation to be here. Thanks for the kind introduction. I'm honored to stand with the men and women of the Military Officers Association of America. I appreciate the Board of Directors who are here, and the leaders who have given me this platform from which to speak. I'm proud to be here with active members of the United States military. Thank you for your service. I'm proud to be your Commander-in-Chief.

I am pleased also to stand with members of the diplomatic corps, including many representing nations that have been attacked by al Qaeda and its terrorist allies since September the 11th, 2001. Your presence here reminds us that we're engaged in a global war against an enemy that threatens all civilized nations. And today the civilized world stands

together to defend our freedom; we stand together to defeat the terrorists; and were working to secure the peace for generations to come. I appreciate my Attorney General joining us today, Al Gonzales. Thank you for being here. The Secretary of Homeland Security, Michael Chertoff, is with us. Three members of the United States Senate -- I might say, three important members of the United States Senate -- Senate President Pro Tem Ted Stevens of Alaska. Thank you for joining us, Senator Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Thad Cochran of Mississippi. The Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, John Warner of Virginia. I thank Norb Ryan, as well, for his leadership. I do appreciate all the folks that are at Walter Reed who have joined us today. I'm going to tell the parents of our troops, we provide great health care to those who wear the uniform. I'm proud of those folks at Bethesda and Walter Reed -- are providing you the best possible care to help you recover from your injuries. Thank you for your courage. Thank you for joining us here today. May God bless you in your recovery.

Next week, America will mark the fifth anniversary of September the 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks. As this day approaches, it brings with it a flood of painful memories. We remember the horror of watching planes fly into the World Trade Center, and seeing the towers collapse before our eyes. We remember the sight of the Pentagon, broken and in flames. We remember the rescue workers who rushed into burning buildings to save lives, knowing they might never emerge again. We remember the brave passengers who charged the cockpit of their hijacked plane, and stopped the terrorists from reaching their target and killing more innocent civilians. We remember the cold brutality of the enemy who inflicted this harm on our country -- an enemy whose leader, Osama bin Laden,

declared the massacre of nearly 3,000 people that day -- I quote -- "an unparalleled and magnificent feat of valor, unmatched by any in humankind before them." In five years since our nation was attacked, al Qaeda and terrorists it has inspired have continued to attack across the world. They've killed the innocent in Europe and Africa and the Middle East, in Central Asia and the Far East, and beyond. Most recently, they attempted to strike again in the most ambitious plot since the attacks of September the 11th -- a plan to blow up passenger planes headed for America over the Atlantic Ocean. Five years after our nation was attacked, the terrorist danger remains. We're a nation at war - and America and her allies are fighting this war with relentless determination across the world. Together with our coalition partners, we've removed terrorist sanctuaries, disrupted their finances, killed and captured key operatives, broken up terrorist cells in America and other nations, and stopped new attacks before they're carried out. We're on the offense against the terrorists on every battlefield -- and we'll accept nothing less than complete victory.

In the five years since our nation was attacked, we've also learned a great deal about the enemy we face in this war. We've learned about them through videos and audio recordings, and letters and statements they've posted on websites. We've learned about them from captured enemy documents that the terrorists have never meant for us to see. Together, these documents and statements have given us clear insight into the mind of our enemies -- their ideology, their ambitions, and their strategy to defeat us. We know what the terrorists intend to do because they've told us -- and we need to take their words seriously. So today I'm going to describe -- in the terrorists' own words, what they believe... what they hope to accomplish, and how they intend to accomplish it. I'll discuss

how the enemy has adapted in the wake of our sustained offensive against them, and the threat posed by different strains of violent Islamic radicalism. I'll explain the strategy we're pursuing to protect America, by defeating the terrorists on the battlefield, and defeating their hateful ideology in the battle of ideas.

The terrorists who attacked us on September the 11th, 2001, are men without conscience -- but they're not madmen. They kill in the name of a clear and focused ideology, a set of beliefs that are evil, but not insane. These al Qaeda terrorists and those who share their ideology are violent Sunni extremists. They're driven by a radical and perverted vision of Islam that rejects tolerance, crushes all dissent, and justifies the murder of innocent men, women and children in the pursuit of political power. They hope to establish a violent political utopia across the Middle East, which they call a "Caliphate" -- where all would be ruled according to their hateful ideology. Osama bin Laden has called the 9/11 attacks -- in his words -- "a great step towards the unity of Muslims and establishing the Righteous... [Caliphate]."

This caliphate would be a totalitarian Islamic empire encompassing all current and former Muslim lands, stretching from Europe to North Africa, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia. We know this because al Qaeda has told us. About two months ago, the terrorist Zawahiri -- he's al Qaeda's second in command -- declared that al Qaeda intends to impose its rule in "every land that was a home for Islam, from [Spain] to Iraq. He went on to say, "The whole world is an open field for us ." We know what this radical empire would look like in practice, because we saw how the radicals imposed their ideology on the people of Afghanistan. Under the rule of the Taliban and al Qaeda, Afghanistan was a totalitarian nightmare -- a land where women were imprisoned in their homes, men were beaten

for missing prayer meetings, girls could not go to school, and children were forbidden the smallest pleasures like flying kites. Religious police roamed the streets, beating and detaining civilians for perceived offenses. Women were publicly whipped. Summary executions were held in Kabul's soccer stadium in front of cheering mobs. And Afghanistan was turned into a launching pad for horrific attacks against America and other parts of the civilized world -- including many Muslim nations. The goal of these Sunni extremists is to remake the entire Muslim world in their radical image. In pursuit of their imperial aims, these extremists say there can be no compromise or dialogue with those they call "infidels" -- a category that includes America, the world's free nations, Jews, and all Muslims who reject their extreme vision of Islam. They reject the possibility of peaceful coexistence with the free world. Again, hear the words of Osama bin Laden earlier this year: "Death is better than living on this Earth with the unbelievers among us."

These radicals have declared their uncompromising hostility to freedom. It is foolish to think that you can negotiate with them. We see the uncompromising nature of the enemy in many captured terrorist documents. Here are just two examples: After the liberation of Afghanistan, coalition forces searching through a terrorist safe house in that country found a copy of the al Qaeda charter. This charter states that "there will be continuing enmity until everyone believes in Allah. We will not meet [the enemy] halfway. There will be no room for dialogue with them." Another document was found in 2000 by British police during an anti-terrorist raid in London -- a grisly al Qaeda manual that includes chapters with titles such as "Guidelines for Beating and Killing Hostages." This manual declares that their vision of Islam "does not...make a truce with unbelief, but rather confronts it." The

confrontation...calls for...the dialogue of bullets, the ideals of assassination, bombing, and destruction, and the diplomacy of the cannon and machine gun." Still other captured documents show al Qaeda's strategy for infiltrating Muslim nations, establishing terrorist enclaves, overthrowing governments, and building their totalitarian empire. We see this strategy laid out in a captured al Qaeda document found during a recent raid in Iraq, which describes their plans to infiltrate and take over Iraq's western Anbar Province.

The document lays out an elaborate al Qaeda governing structure for the region that includes an Education Department, a Social Services Department, a Justice Department, and an "Execution Unit" responsible for "Sorting out, Arrest, Murder, and Destruction." According to their public statements, countries that have -- they have targeted stretch from the Middle East to Africa, to Southeast Asia. Through this strategy, al Qaeda and its allies intend to create numerous, decentralized operating bases across the world, from which they can plan new attacks, and advance their vision of a unified, totalitarian Islamic state that can confront and eventually destroy the free world. These violent extremists know that to realize this vision, they must first drive out the main obstacle that stands in their way -- the United States of America. According to al Qaeda, their strategy to defeat America has two parts: First, they're waging a campaign of terror across the world. They're targeting our forces abroad, hoping that the American people will grow tired of casualties and give up the fight. And they're targeting America's financial centers and economic infrastructure at home, hoping to terrorize us and cause our economy to collapse. Bin Laden calls this his "bleed-until-bankruptcy plan." And he cited the attacks of 9/11 as evidence that such a plan can succeed. With the 9/11 attacks, Osama bin Laden says,

"al Qaeda spent 500,000 dollars on the event, while America... lost -- according to the lowest estimate -- 500 billion dollars...meaning that every dollar of al Qaeda defeated a million dollars" of America. Bin Laden concludes from this experience that "America is definitely a great power, with... unbelievable military strength and a vibrant economy, but all of these have been built on a very weak and hollow foundation." He went on to say, "Therefore, it is very easy to target the flimsy base and concentrate on their weak points, and even if we're able to target one-tenth of these weak points, we will be able [to] crush and destroy them."

Secondly, along with this campaign of terror, the enemy has a propaganda strategy. Osama bin Laden laid out this strategy in a letter to the Taliban leader, Mullah Omar, that coalition forces uncovered in Afghanistan in 2002. In it, bin Laden says that al Qaeda intends to "[launch]," in his words, "a media campaign... to create a wedge between the American people and their government." This media campaign, bin Laden says, will send the American people a number of messages, including "that their government [will] bring them more losses, in finances and casualties". And he goes on to say that "they are being sacrificed...to serve...the big investors, especially the Jews." Bin Laden says that by delivering these messages, al Qaeda "aims at creating pressure from the American people on the American government to stop their campaign against Afghanistan." Bin Laden and his allies are absolutely convinced they can succeed in forcing America to retreat and causing our economic collapse. They believe our nation is weak and decadent, and lacking in patience and resolve. And they're wrong. Osama bin Laden has written that the "defeat of... American forces in Beirut" in 1983 is proof America does not have the stomach to stay in the fight. He's declared that "in Somalia...the United States [pulled] out, trailing

disappointment, defeat, and failure behind it." And last year, the terrorist Zawahiri declared that Americans "know better than others that there is no hope in victory. The Vietnam specter is closing every outlet."

These terrorists hope to drive America and our coalition out of Afghanistan, so they can restore the safe haven they lost when coalition forces drove them out five years ago. But they've made clear that the most important front in their struggle against America is Iraq -- the nation bin Laden has declared the "capital of the Caliphate." Hear the words of bin Laden: "I now address...the whole...Islamic nation: Listen and understand...The most...serious issue today for the whole world is this Third World War...[that] is raging in [Iraq]." He calls it "a war of destiny between infidelity and Islam." He says, "The whole world is watching this war," and that it will end in "victory and glory or misery and humiliation." For al Qaeda, Iraq is not a distraction from their war on America -- it is the central battlefield where the outcome of this struggle will be decided. Here is what al Qaeda says they will do if they succeed in driving us out of Iraq: The terrorist Zawahiri has said that al Qaeda will proceed with "several incremental goals. The first stage: Expel the Americans from Iraq. The second stage: Establish an Islamic authority or amirate, then develop it and support it until it achieves the level of Caliphate... The third stage: Extend the jihad wave to the secular countries neighboring Iraq. And the fourth stage: ...the clash with Israel".

These evil men know that a fundamental threat to their aspirations is a democratic Iraq that can govern itself, sustain itself, and defend itself. They know that given a choice, the Iraqi people will never choose to live in the totalitarian state the extremists hope to establish. And that is why we must not, and we will not, give the enemy victory in Iraq by deserting the Iraqi people. Last year, the terrorist Zarqawi declared in a message

posted on the Internet that democracy "is the essence of infidelity and deviation from the right path." The Iraqi people disagree. Last December, nearly 12 million Iraqis from every ethnic and religious community turned out to vote in their country's third free election in less than a year. Iraq now has a unity government that represents Iraq's diverse population -- and al Qaeda's top commander in Iraq breathed his last breath.

Despite these strategic setbacks, the enemy will continue to fight freedom's advance in Iraq, because they understand the stakes in this war. Again, hear the words of bin Laden, in a message to the American people earlier this year. He says: "The war is for you or for us to win. If we win it, it means your defeat and disgrace forever." Now, I know some of our country hear the terrorists' words, and hope that they will not, or cannot, do what they say. History teaches that underestimating the words of evil and ambitious men is a terrible mistake. In the early 1900s, an exiled lawyer in Europe published a pamphlet called "What Is To Be Done?" -- in which he laid out his plan to launch a communist revolution in Russia. The world did not heed Lenin's words, and paid a terrible price. The Soviet Empire he established killed tens of millions, and brought the world to the brink of thermonuclear war. In the 1920s, a failed Austrian painter published a book in which he explained his intention to build an Aryan super-state in Germany and take revenge on Europe and eradicate the Jews. The world ignored Hitler's words, and paid a terrible price. His Nazi regime killed millions in the gas chambers, and set the world aflame in war, before it was finally defeated at a terrible cost in lives.

Bin Laden and his terrorist allies have made their intentions as clear as Lenin and Hitler before them. The question is: Will we listen? Will we pay attention to what these evil men say? America and our coalition partners have made our choice. We're taking the words of the enemy

seriously. We're on the offensive, and we will not rest, we will not retreat, and we will not withdraw from the fight, until this threat to civilization has been removed.

Five years into this struggle, it's important to take stock of what's been accomplished -- and the difficult work that remains. Al Qaeda has been weakened by our sustained offensive against them, and today it is harder for al Qaeda's leaders to operate freely, to move money, or to communicate with their operatives and facilitators. Yet al Qaeda remains dangerous and determined. Bin Laden and Zawahiri remain in hiding in remote regions of this world. Al Qaeda continues to adapt in the face of our global campaign against them. Increasingly, al Qaeda is taking advantage of the Internet to disseminate propaganda, and to conduct "virtual recruitment" and "virtual training" of new terrorists. Al Qaeda's leaders no longer need to meet face-to-face with their operatives. They can find new suicide bombers, and facilitate new terrorist attacks, without ever laying eyes on those they're training, financing, or sending to strike us.

As al Qaeda changes, the broader terrorist movement is also changing, becoming more dispersed and self-directed. More and more, we're facing threats from locally established terrorist cells that are inspired by al Qaeda's ideology and goals, but do not necessarily have direct links to al Qaeda, such as training and funding. Some of these groups are made up of "homegrown" terrorists, militant extremists who were born and educated in Western nations, were indoctrinated by radical Islamists or attracted to their ideology, and joined the violent extremist cause. These locally established cells appear to be responsible for a number of attacks and plots, including those in Madrid, and Canada, and other countries across the world. As we continue to fight al Qaeda and these Sunni

extremists inspired by their radical ideology, we also face the threat posed by Shia extremists, who are learning from al Qaeda, increasing their assertiveness, and stepping up their threats. Like the vast majority of Sunnis, the vast majority of Shia across the world reject the vision of extremists -- and in Iraq, millions of Shia have defied terrorist threats to vote in free elections, and have shown their desire to live in freedom. The Shia extremists want to deny them this right. This Shia strain of Islamic radicalism is just as dangerous, and just as hostile to America, and just as determined to establish its brand of hegemony across the broader Middle East. And the Shia extremists have achieved something that al Qaeda has so far failed to do: In 1979, they took control of a major power, the nation of Iran, subjugating its proud people to a regime of tyranny, and using that nation's resources to fund the spread of terror and pursue their radical agenda.

Like al Qaeda and the Sunni extremists, the Iranian regime has clear aims: They want to drive America out of the region, to destroy Israel, and to dominate the broader Middle East. To achieve these aims, they are funding and arming terrorist groups like Hezbollah, which allow them to attack Israel and America by proxy. Hezbollah, the source of the current instability in Lebanon, has killed more Americans than any terrorist organization except al Qaeda. Unlike al Qaeda, they've not yet attacked the American homeland. Yet they're directly responsible for the murder of hundreds of Americans abroad. It was Hezbollah that was behind the 1983 bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut that killed 241 Americans. And Saudi Hezbollah was behind the 1996 bombing of Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia that killed 19 Americans, an attack conducted by terrorists who we believe were working with Iranian officials. Just as we must take the words of the Sunni extremists

seriously, we must take the words of the Shia extremists seriously. Listen to the words of Hezbollah's leader, the terrorist Nasrallah, who has declared his hatred of America. He says, "Let the entire world hear me. Our hostility to the Great Satan [America] is absolute... Regardless of how the world has changed after 11 September, Death to America will remain our reverberating and powerful slogan: Death to America."

Iran's leaders, who back Hezbollah, have also declared their absolute hostility to America. Last October, Iran's President declared in a speech that some people ask -- in his words -- "whether a world without the United States and Zionism can be achieved...I say that this...goal is achievable." Less than three months ago, Iran's President declared to America and other Western powers: "open your eyes and see the fate of pharaoh... if you do not abandon the path of falsehood...your doomed destiny will be annihilation." Less than two months ago, he warned: "The anger of Muslims may reach an explosion point soon. If such a day comes...[America and the West] should know that the waves of the blast will not remain within the boundaries of our region." He also delivered this message to the American people: "If you would like to have good relations with the Iranian nation in the future...bow down before the greatness of the Iranian nation and surrender. If you don't accept [to do this], the Iranian nation will...force you to surrender and bow down."

America will not bow down to tyrants.

The Iranian regime and its terrorist proxies have demonstrated their willingness to kill Americans -- and now the Iranian regime is pursuing nuclear weapons. The world is working together to prevent Iran's regime from acquiring the tools of mass murder. The international community has made a reasonable proposal to Iran's leaders, and given them the

opportunity to set their nation on a better course. So far, Iran's leaders have rejected this offer. Their choice is increasingly isolating the great Iranian nation from the international community, and denying the Iranian people an opportunity for greater economic prosperity. It's time for Iran's leader to make a different choice. And we've made our choice. We'll continue to work closely with our allies to find a diplomatic solution. The world's free nations will not allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapon.

The Shia and Sunni extremists represent different faces of the same threat. They draw inspiration from different sources, but both seek to impose a dark vision of violent Islamic radicalism across the Middle East. They oppose the advance of freedom, and they want to gain control of weapons of mass destruction. If they succeed in undermining fragile democracies, like Iraq, and drive the forces of freedom out of the region, they will have an open field to pursue their dangerous goals. Each strain of violent Islamic radicalism would be emboldened in their efforts to topple moderate governments and establish terrorist safe havens.

Imagine a world in which they were able to control governments, a world awash with oil and they would use oil resources to punish industrialized nations. And they would use those resources to fuel their radical agenda, and pursue and purchase weapons of mass murder. And armed with nuclear weapons, they would blackmail the free world, and spread their ideologies of hate, and raise a mortal threat to the American people. If we allow them to do this, if we retreat from Iraq, if we don't uphold our duty to support those who are desirous to live in liberty, 50 years from now history will look back on our time with unforgiving clarity, and demand to know why we did not act.

I'm not going to allow this to happen -- and no future American President can allow it either. America did not seek this global struggle, but we're answering history's call with confidence and a clear strategy. Today we're releasing a document called the "National Strategy for Combating Terrorism." This is an unclassified version of the strategy we've been pursuing since September the 11th, 2001. This strategy was first released in February 2003; it's been updated to take into account the changing nature of this enemy

This strategy document is posted on the White House website -- whitehouse.gov. And I urge all Americans to read it.

Our strategy for combating terrorism has five basic elements:

First, we're determined to prevent terrorist attacks before they occur. So we're taking the fight to the enemy. The best way to protect America is to stay on the offense. Since 9/11, our coalition has captured or killed al Qaeda managers and operatives, and scores of other terrorists across the world. The enemy is living under constant pressure, and we intend to keep it that way -- and this adds to our security. When terrorists spend their days working to avoid death or capture, it's harder for them to plan and execute new attacks.

We're also fighting the enemy here at home. We've given our law enforcement and intelligence professionals the tools they need to stop the terrorists in our midst. We passed the Patriot Act to break down the wall that prevented law enforcement and intelligence from sharing vital information. We created the Terrorist Surveillance Program to monitor the communications between al Qaeda commanders abroad and terrorist operatives within our borders. If al Qaeda is calling somebody in America, we need to know why, in order to stop attacks.

I want to thank these three Senators for working with us to give our law enforcement and intelligence officers the tools necessary to do their jobs. And over the last five years, federal, state, and local law enforcement have used those tools to break up terrorist cells, and to prosecute terrorist operatives and supporters in New York, and Oregon, and Virginia, and Texas, and New Jersey, and Illinois, Ohio, and other states. By taking the battle to the terrorists and their supporters on our own soil and across the world, we've stopped a number of al Qaeda plots.

Second, we're determined to deny weapons of mass destruction to outlaw regimes and terrorists who would use them without hesitation. Working with Great Britain and Pakistan and other nations, the United States shut down the world's most dangerous nuclear trading cartel, the AQ Khan network. This network had supplied Iran and Libya and North Korea with equipment and know-how that advanced their efforts to obtain nuclear weapons

And we launched the Proliferation Security Initiative, a coalition of more than 70 nations that is working together to stop shipments related to weapons of mass destruction on land, at sea, and in the air. The greatest threat this world faces is the danger of extremists and terrorists armed with weapons of mass destruction -- and this is a threat America cannot defeat on her own. We applaud the determined efforts of many nations around the world to stop the spread of these dangerous weapons. Together, we pledge we'll continue to work together to stop the world's most dangerous men from getting their hands on the world's most dangerous weapons.

Third, we're determined to deny terrorists the support of outlaw regimes. After September the 11th, I laid out a clear doctrine: America makes no

distinction between those who commit acts of terror, and those that harbor and support them, because they're equally guilty of murder. Thanks to our efforts, there are now three fewer state sponsors of terror in the world than there were on September the 11th, 2001. Afghanistan and Iraq have been transformed from terrorist states into allies in the war on terror. And the nation of Libya has renounced terrorism, and given up its weapons of mass destruction programs, and its nuclear materials and equipment. Over the past five years, we've acted to disrupt the flow of weapons and support from terrorist states to terrorist networks. And we have made clear that any government that chooses to be an ally of terror has also chosen to be an enemy of civilization.

Fourth, we're determined to deny terrorist networks control of any nation, or territory within a nation. So, along with our coalition and the Iraqi government, we'll stop the terrorists from taking control of Iraq, and establishing a new safe haven from which to attack America and the free world. And we're working with friends and allies to deny the terrorists the enclaves they seek to establish in ungoverned areas across the world. By helping governments reclaim full sovereign control over their territory, we make ourselves more secure.

Fifth, we're working to deny terrorists new recruits, by defeating their hateful ideology and spreading the hope of freedom -- by spreading the hope of freedom across the Middle East. For decades, American policy sought to achieve peace in the Middle East by pursuing stability at the expense of liberty. The lack of freedom in that region helped create conditions where anger and resentment grew, and radicalism thrived, and terrorists found willing recruits. And we saw the consequences on September the 11th, when the terrorists brought death and destruction to our country. The policy wasn't working.

The experience of September the 11th made clear, in the long run, the only way to secure our nation is to change the course of the Middle East. So America has committed its influence in the world to advancing freedom and liberty and democracy as the great alternatives to repression and radicalism. We're taking the side of democratic leaders and moderates and reformers across the Middle East. We strongly support the voices of tolerance and moderation in the Muslim world. We're standing with Afghanistan's elected government against al Qaeda and the Taliban remnants that are trying to restore tyranny in that country. We're standing with Lebanon's young democracy against the foreign forces that are seeking to undermine the country's sovereignty and independence. And we're standing with the leaders of Iraq's unity government as they work to defeat the enemies of freedom, and chart a more hopeful course for their people. This is why victory is so important in Iraq. By helping freedom succeed in Iraq, we will help America, and the Middle East, and the world become more secure.

During the last five years we've learned a lot about this enemy. We've learned that they're cunning and sophisticated. We've witnessed their ability to change their methods and their tactics with deadly speed -- even as their murderous obsessions remain unchanging. We've seen that it's the terrorists who have declared war on Muslims, slaughtering huge numbers of innocent Muslim men and women around the world. .

We know what the terrorists believe, we know what they have done, and we know what they intend to do. And now the world's free nations must summon the will to meet this great challenge. The road ahead is going to be difficult, and it will require more sacrifice. Yet we can have confidence in the outcome, because we've seen freedom conquer tyranny and terror before. In the 20th century, free nations confronted and

defeated Nazi Germany. During the Cold War, we confronted Soviet communism, and today Europe is whole, free and at peace.

And now, freedom is once again contending with the forces of darkness and tyranny. This time, the battle is unfolding in a new region -- the broader Middle East. This time, we're not waiting for our enemies to gather in strength. This time, we're confronting them before they gain the capacity to inflict unspeakable damage on the world, and we're confronting their hateful ideology before it fully takes root

We see a day when people across the Middle East have governments that honor their dignity, and unleash their creativity, and count their votes. We see a day when across this region citizens are allowed to express themselves freely, women have full rights, and children are educated and given the tools necessary to succeed in life. And we see a day when all the nations of the Middle East are allies in the cause of peace.

We fight for this day, because the security of our own citizens depends on it. This is the great ideological struggle of the 21st century -- and it is the calling of our generation. All civilized nations are bound together in this struggle between moderation and extremism. By coming together, we will roll back this grave threat to our way of life. We will help the people of the Middle East claim their freedom, and we will leave a safer and more hopeful world for our children and grandchildren.

God bless

The third speech

George W. Bush

Address to the Nation on the Five-Year Anniversary of 9/11 delivered 11 September 2006



Good evening. Five years ago, this date -- September the 11th -- was seared into America's memory.

Nineteen men attacked us with a barbarity unequalled in our history. They murdered people of all colors, creeds, and nationalities -- and made war upon the entire free world. Since that day, America and her allies have taken the offensive in a war unlike any we have fought before. Today, we are safer, but we are not yet safe. On this solemn night, I've asked for some of your time to discuss the nature of the threat still before us, what we are doing to protect our nation, and the building of a more hopeful Middle East that holds the key to peace for America and the world.

On 9/11, our nation saw the face of evil. Yet on that awful day, we also witnessed something distinctly American: ordinary citizens rising to the occasion, and responding with extraordinary acts of courage. We saw courage in office workers who were trapped on the high floors of burning skyscrapers -- and called home so that their last words to their families would be of comfort and love. We saw courage in passengers aboard Flight 93, who recited the 23rd Psalm -- and then charged the cockpit.

And we saw courage in the Pentagon staff who made it out of the flames and smoke -- and ran back in to answer cries for help. On this day, we remember the innocent who lost their lives -- and we pay tribute to those who gave their lives so that others might live.

For many of our citizens, the wounds of that morning are still fresh. I've met firefighters and police officers who choke up at the memory of fallen comrades. I've stood with families gathered on a grassy field in Pennsylvania, who take bittersweet pride in loved ones who refused to be victims -- and gave America our first victory in the war on terror. I've sat beside young mothers with children who are now five years old -- and still long for the daddies who will never cradle them in their arms. Out of this suffering, we resolve to honor every man and woman lost. And we seek their lasting memorial in a safer and more hopeful world.

Since the horror of 9/11, we've learned a great deal about the enemy. We have learned that they are evil and kill without mercy -- but not without purpose. We have learned that they form a global network of extremists who are driven by a perverted vision of Islam -- a totalitarian ideology that hates freedom, rejects tolerance, and despises all dissent. And we have learned that their goal is to build a radical Islamic empire where women are prisoners in their homes, men are beaten for missing prayer meetings, and terrorists have a safe haven to plan and launch attacks on America and other civilized nations. The war against this enemy is more than a military conflict. It is the decisive ideological struggle of the 21st century, and the calling of our generation.

Our nation is being tested in a way that we have not been since the start of the Cold War. We saw what a handful of our enemies can do with box-cutters and plane tickets. We hear their threats to launch even more

terrible attacks on our people. And we know that if they were able to get their hands on weapons of mass destruction, they would use them against us. We face an enemy determined to bring death and suffering into our homes. America did not ask for this war, and every American wishes it were over. So do I. But the war is not over -- and it will not be over until either we or the extremists emerge victorious. If we do not defeat these enemies now, we will leave our children to face a Middle East overrun by terrorist states and radical dictators armed with nuclear weapons. We are in a war that will set the course for this new century -- and determine the destiny of millions across the world.

For America, 9/11 was more than a tragedy -- it changed the way we look at the world. On September the 11th, we resolved that we would go on the offense against our enemies, and we would not distinguish between the terrorists and those who harbor or support them. So we helped drive the Taliban from power in Afghanistan. We put al Qaeda on the run, and killed or captured most of those who planned the 9/11 attacks, including the man believed to be the mastermind, Khalid Sheik Mohammed. He and other suspected terrorists have been questioned by the Central Intelligence Agency, and they provided valuable information that has helped stop attacks in America and across the world. Now these men have been transferred to Guantanamo Bay, so they can be held to account for their actions. Osama bin Laden and other terrorists are still in hiding. Our message to them is clear: No matter how long it takes, America will find you, and we will bring you to justice.

On September the 11th, we learned that America must confront threats before they reach our shores, whether those threats come from terrorist networks or terrorist states. I'm often asked why we're in Iraq when Saddam Hussein was not responsible for the 9/11 attacks. The answer is

that the regime of Saddam Hussein was a clear threat. My administration, the Congress, and the United Nations saw the threat -- and after 9/11, Saddam's regime posed a risk that the world could not afford to take. The world is safer because Saddam Hussein is no longer in power. And now the challenge is to help the Iraqi people build a democracy that fulfills the dreams of the nearly 12 million Iraqis who came out to vote in free elections last December.

Al Qaeda and other extremists from across the world have come to Iraq to stop the rise of a free society in the heart of the Middle East. They have joined the remnants of Saddam's regime and other armed groups to foment sectarian violence and drive us out. Our enemies in Iraq are tough and they are committed -- but so are Iraqi and coalition forces. We're adapting to stay ahead of the enemy, and we are carrying out a clear plan to ensure that a democratic Iraq succeeds.

We're training Iraqi troops so they can defend their nation. We're helping Iraq's unity government grow in strength and serve its people. We will not leave until this work is done. Whatever mistakes have been made in Iraq, the worst mistake would be to think that if we pulled out, the terrorists would leave us alone. They will not leave us alone. They will follow us. The safety of America depends on the outcome of the battle in the streets of Baghdad. Osama bin Laden calls this fight "the Third World War" -- and he says that victory for the terrorists in Iraq will mean America's "defeat and disgrace forever." If we yield Iraq to men like bin Laden, our enemies will be emboldened; they will gain a new safe haven; they will use Iraq's resources to fuel their extremist movement. We will not allow this to happen. America will stay in the fight. Iraq will be a free nation, and a strong ally in the war on terror.

We can be confident that our coalition will succeed because the Iraqi people have been steadfast in the face of unspeakable violence. And we can be confident in victory because of the skill and resolve of America's Armed Forces. Every one of our troops is a volunteer, and since the attacks of September the 11th, more than 1.6 million Americans have stepped forward to put on our nation's uniform. In Iraq, Afghanistan, and other fronts in the war on terror, the men and women of our military are making great sacrifices to keep us safe. Some have suffered terrible injuries -- and nearly 3,000 have given their lives. America cherishes their memory. We pray for their families. And we will never back down from the work they have begun.

We also honor those who toil day and night to keep our homeland safe, and we are giving them the tools they need to protect our people. We've created the Department of Homeland Security. We have torn down the wall that kept law enforcement and intelligence from sharing information. We've tightened security at our airports and seaports and borders, and we've created new programs to monitor enemy bank records and phone calls. Thanks to the hard work of our law enforcement and intelligence professionals, we have broken up terrorist cells in our midst and saved American lives.

Five years after 9/11, our enemies have not succeeded in launching another attack on our soil, but they've not been idle. Al Qaeda and those inspired by its hateful ideology have carried out terrorist attacks in more than two dozen nations. And just last month, they were foiled in a plot to blow up passenger planes headed for the United States. They remain determined to attack America and kill our citizens -- and we are determined to stop them. We'll continue to give the men and women who protect us every resource and legal authority they need to do their jobs.

In the first days after the 9/11 attacks I promised to use every element of national power to fight the terrorists, wherever we find them. One of the strongest weapons in our arsenal is the power of freedom. The terrorists fear freedom as much as they do our firepower. They are thrown into panic at the sight of an old man pulling the election lever, girls enrolling in schools, or families worshipping God in their own traditions. They know that given a choice, people will choose freedom over their extremist ideology. So their answer is to deny people this choice by raging against the forces of freedom and moderation. This struggle has been called a clash of civilizations.

In truth, it is a struggle for civilization. We are fighting to maintain the way of life enjoyed by free nations. And we're fighting for the possibility that good and decent people across the Middle East can raise up societies based on freedom and tolerance and personal dignity.

We are now in the early hours of this struggle between tyranny and freedom. Amid the violence, some question whether the people of the Middle East want their freedom, and whether the forces of moderation can prevail. For 60 years, these doubts guided our policies in the Middle East. And then, on a bright September morning, it became clear that the calm we saw in the Middle East was only a mirage. Years of pursuing stability to promote peace had left us with neither. So we changed our policies, and committed America's influence in the world to advancing freedom and democracy as the great alternatives to repression and radicalism.

With our help, the people of the Middle East are now stepping forward to claim their freedom. From Kabul to Baghdad to Beirut, there are brave men and women risking their lives each day for the same freedoms that

we enjoy. And they have one question for us: Do we have the confidence to do in the Middle East what our fathers and grandfathers accomplished in Europe and Asia? By standing with democratic leaders and reformers, by giving voice to the hopes of decent men and women, we're offering a path away from radicalism. And we are enlisting the most powerful force for peace and moderation in the Middle East: the desire of millions to be free.

Across the broader Middle East, the extremists are fighting to prevent such a future. Yet America has confronted evil before, and we have defeated it -- sometimes at the cost of thousands of good men in a single battle. When Franklin Roosevelt vowed to defeat two enemies across two oceans, he could not have foreseen D-Day and Iwo Jima -- but he would not have been surprised at the outcome. When Harry Truman promised American support for free peoples resisting Soviet aggression, he could not have foreseen the rise of the Berlin Wall -- but he would not have been surprised to see it brought down. Throughout our history, America has seen liberty challenged, and every time, we have seen liberty triumph with sacrifice and determination. At the start of this young century, America looks to the day when the people of the Middle East leave the desert of despotism for the fertile gardens of liberty, and resume their rightful place in a world of peace and prosperity. We look to the day when the nations of that region recognize their greatest resource is not the oil in the ground, but the talent and creativity of their people. We look to the day when moms and dads throughout the Middle East see a future of hope and opportunity for their children. And when that good day comes, the clouds of war will part, the appeal of radicalism will decline, and we will leave our children with a better and safer world.

On this solemn anniversary, we rededicate ourselves to this cause. Our nation has endured trials, and we face a difficult road ahead. Winning this war will require the determined efforts of a unified country, and we must put aside our differences and work together to meet the test that history has given us. We will defeat our enemies. We will protect our people. And we will lead the 21st century into a shining age of human liberty.

Earlier this year, I traveled to the United States Military Academy. I was there to deliver the commencement address to the first class to arrive at West Point after the attacks of September the 11th. That day I met a proud mom named RoseEllen Dowdell. She was there to watch her son, Patrick, accept his commission in the finest Army the world has ever known. A few weeks earlier, RoseEllen had watched her other son, James, graduate from the Fire Academy in New York City. On both these days, her thoughts turned to someone who was not there to share the moment: her husband, Kevin Dowdell. Kevin was one of the 343 firefighters who rushed to the burning towers of the World Trade Center on September the 11th -- and never came home. His sons lost their father that day, but not the passion for service he instilled in them. Here is what Rose Ellen says about her boys: "As a mother, I cross my fingers and pray all the time for their safety -- but as worried as I am, I'm also proud, and I know their dad would be, too."

Our nation is blessed to have young Americans like these -- and we will need them. Dangerous enemies have declared their intention to destroy our way of life. They're not the first to try, and their fate will be the same as those who tried before. Nine-Eleven showed us why. The attacks were meant to bring us to our knees, and they did, but not in the way the terrorists intended.

Americans united in prayer, came to the aid of neighbors in need, and resolved that our enemies would not have the last word. The spirit of our people is the source of America's strength. And we go forward with trust in that spirit, confidence in our purpose, and faith in a loving God who made us to be free.

Thank you, and May God bless you.

Group (B)

The First speech

Barack Obama

Address on UN Security Council Sanctions against Iran

Delivered 9 June 2010

Alright. Good afternoon, everybody. Today, the United Nations Security Council voted overwhelmingly to sanction Iran for its continued failure to live up to its obligations. This resolution will put in place the toughest sanctions ever faced by the Iranian government, and it sends an unmistakable message about the international community's commitment to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons.



For years, the Iranian government has failed to live up to its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It has violated its commitments to the International Atomic Energy Agency. It has ignored U.N. Security Council resolutions. And while Iran's leaders hide behind outlandish rhetoric, their actions have been deeply troubling. Indeed, when I took office just over 16 months ago, Iranian intransigence was well-established. Iran had gone from zero centrifuges spinning to several thousand, and the international community was divided about how to move forward.

Yet this day was not inevitable. We made clear from the beginning of my administration that the United States was prepared to pursue diplomatic solutions to address the concerns over Iranian nuclear programs. I

extended the offer of engagement on the basis of mutual interest and mutual respect.

And together with the United Kingdom, with Russia, China, and Germany, we sat down with our Iranian counterparts. We offered the opportunity of a better relationship between Iran and the international community -- one that reduced Iran's political isolation, and increased its economic integration with the rest of the world. In short, we offered the Iranian government the prospect of a better future for its people, if -- and only if -- it lives up to its international obligations.

So there is no double standard at play here. We've made it clear, time and again, that we respect Iran's right, like all countries, to access peaceful nuclear energy. That is a right embedded in the NPT -- a treaty that has to serve as the safeguard against a world in which more nations acquire the world's most deadly weapons, and international law is treated as an empty promise. That NPT treaty was signed by all the parties involved, and it is a treaty that the United States has sought to strengthen from the day I took office, including through our own commitments to reduce America's nuclear arsenal.

So let me repeat: We recognize Iran's rights. But with those rights come responsibilities. And time and again, the Iranian government has failed to meet those responsibilities. Iran concealed a nuclear enrichment facility in Qom that raised serious questions about the nature of its program. Iran further violated its own obligations under U.N. Security Council resolutions to suspend uranium enrichment. Instead, they're enriching up to 20 percent. It has failed to comply fully with IAEA's requirements. Indeed, Iran is the only NPT signatory in the world -- the only one -- that

cannot convince the IAEA that its nuclear program is intended for peaceful purposes.

That's why the international community was compelled to impose these serious consequences. These are the most comprehensive sanctions that the Iranian government has faced. They will impose restrictions on Iran's nuclear activities, its ballistic missile program, and, for the first time, its conventional military. They will put a new framework in place to stop Iranian smuggling, and crack down on Iranian banks and financial transactions. They target individuals, entities, and institutions -- including those associated with the Revolutionary Guard -- that have supported Iran's nuclear program and prospered from illicit activities at the expense of the Iranian people. And we will ensure that these sanctions are vigorously enforced, just as we continue to refine and enforce our own sanctions on Iran alongside our friends and our allies.

The strong resolution that was passed today benefited from strong international support. In voting for it, we were joined by nations from Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America -- including Russia and China. And these sanctions show the united view of the international community that a nuclear arms race in the Middle East is in nobody's interest, and that nations must be held accountable for challenging the global non-proliferation regime. The Iranian government must understand that true security will not come through the pursuit of nuclear weapons. True security will come through adherence to international law and the demonstration of its peaceful intent.

We know that the Iranian government will not change its behavior overnight, but today's vote demonstrates the growing costs that will come with Iranian intransigence. And I want to be clear: These sanctions do

not close the door on diplomacy. Iran continues to have the opportunity to take a different and better path. I would like nothing more than to reach the day when the Iranian government fulfills its international obligations -- a day when these sanctions are lifted, previous sanctions are lifted, and the Iranian people can finally fulfill the greatness of the Iranian nation.

Indeed, these sanctions are not directed at the Iranian people. As I said in Cairo, for decades the Iranian government has defined itself in opposition to my country. But faced with the opportunity to find a new way forward -- one that would benefit its own people -- the Iranian government has chosen instead to remain a prisoner of the past.

Saturday will mark one year from the day that an election captivated the attention of the world -- an event that should have been remembered for how the Iranian people participated with remarkable enthusiasm, but will instead be remembered for how the Iranian government brutally suppressed dissent and murdered the innocent, including a young woman left to die in the street.

Actions do have consequences, and today the Iranian government will face some of those consequences. Because whether it is threatening the nuclear non-proliferation regime, or the human rights of its own citizens, or the stability of its own neighbors by supporting terrorism, the Iranian government continues to demonstrate that its own unjust actions are a threat to justice everywhere.

I want and hope for the people of Iran that the government of Iran will make a different choice. It can make a different choice and pursue a course that will reaffirm the NPT as the basis of global non-proliferation and disarmament -- a course that will advance Iran's own security and

prosperity, and the peace of the wider world. Today's sanctions are yet another signal that if the Iranian government continues to undermine the NPT and the peace that it protects, then Iran will find itself more isolated, less prosperous and less secure.

Thank you

The Second speech

Barack Obama

Address to the Nation on the Islamic State of Iraq and the .Levant

Delivered 10 September 2014

My fellow Americans, tonight I want to speak to you about what the United States will do with our friends and allies to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group known as ISIL.



As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people. Over the last several years, we have consistently taken the fight to terrorists who threaten our country. We took out Osama bin Laden and much of al Qaeda's leadership in Afghanistan and Pakistan. We've targeted al Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen, and recently eliminated the top commander of its affiliate in Somalia. We've done so while bringing more than 140,000 American troops home from Iraq, and drawing down our forces in Afghanistan, where our combat mission will end later this year. Thanks to our military and counterterrorism professionals, America is safer.

Still, we continue to face a terrorist threat. We can't erase every trace of evil from the world, and small groups of killers have the capacity to do great harm. That was the case before 9/11, and that remains true today. And that's why we must remain vigilant as threats emerge. At this moment, the greatest threats come from the Middle East and North

Africa, where radical groups exploit grievances for their own gain. And one of those groups is ISIL -- which calls itself the "Islamic State."

Now let's make two things clear: ISIL is not "Islamic." No religion condones the killing of innocents. And the vast majority of ISIL's victims have been Muslim. And ISIL is certainly not a state. It was formerly al Qaeda's affiliate in Iraq, and has taken advantage of sectarian strife and Syria's civil war to gain territory on both sides of the Iraq-Syrian border. It is recognized by no government, nor by the people it subjugates. ISIL is a terrorist organization, pure and simple. And it has no vision other than the slaughter of all who stand in its way.

In a region that has known so much bloodshed, these terrorists are unique in their brutality. They execute captured prisoners. They kill children. They enslave, rape, and force women into marriage. They threatened a religious minority with genocide. And in acts of barbarism, they took the lives of two American journalists -- Jim Foley and Steven Sotloff.

So ISIL poses a threat to the people of Iraq and Syria, and the broader Middle East -- including American citizens, personnel and facilities. If left unchecked, these terrorists could pose a growing threat beyond that region, including to the United States. While we have not yet detected specific plotting against our homeland, ISIL leaders have threatened America and our allies. Our Intelligence Community believes that thousands of foreigners -- including Europeans and some Americans -- have joined them in Syria and Iraq. Trained and battlehardened, these fighters could try to return to their home countries and carry out deadly attacks.

I know many Americans are concerned about these threats. Tonight, I want you to know that the United States of America is meeting them with

strength and resolve. Last month, I ordered our military to take targeted action against ISIL to stop its advances. Since then, we've conducted more than 150 successful airstrikes in Iraq. These strikes have protected American personnel and facilities, killed ISIL fighters, destroyed weapons, and given space for Iraqi and Kurdish forces to reclaim key territory. These strikes have also helped save the lives of thousands of innocent men, women and children.

But this is not our fight alone. American power can make a decisive difference, but we cannot do for Iraqis what they must do for themselves, nor can we take the place of Arab partners in securing their region. And that's why I've insisted that additional U.S. action depended upon Iraqis forming an inclusive government, which they have now done in recent days. So tonight, with a new Iraqi government in place, and following consultations with allies abroad and Congress at home, I can announce that America will lead a broad coalition to roll back this terrorist threat.

Our objective is clear: We will degrade, and ultimately destroy, ISIL through a comprehensive and sustained counterterrorism strategy.

First, we will conduct a systematic campaign of airstrikes against these terrorists. Working with the Iraqi government, we will expand our efforts beyond protecting our own people and humanitarian missions, so that we're hitting ISIL targets as Iraqi forces go on offense. Moreover, I have made it clear that we will hunt down terrorists who threaten our country, wherever they are. That means I will not hesitate to take action against ISIL in Syria, as well as Iraq. This is a core principle of my presidency: If you threaten America, you will find no safe haven.

Second, we will increase our support to forces fighting these terrorists on the ground. In June, I deployed several hundred American

servicemembers to Iraq to assess how we can best support Iraqi security forces. Now that those teams have completed their work -- and Iraq has formed a government -- we will send an additional 475 servicemembers to Iraq. As I have said before, these American forces will not have a combat mission -- we will not get dragged into another ground war in Iraq. But they are needed to support Iraqi and Kurdish forces with training, intelligence and equipment. We'll also support Iraq's efforts to stand up National Guard Units to help Sunni communities secure their own freedom from ISIL's control.

Across the border, in Syria, we have ramped up our military assistance to the Syrian opposition. Tonight, I call on Congress again to give us additional authorities and resources to train and equip these fighters. In the fight against ISIL, we cannot rely on an Assad regime that terrorizes its own people -- a regime that will never regain the legitimacy it has lost. Instead, we must strengthen the opposition as the best counterweight to extremists like ISIL, while pursuing the political solution necessary to solve Syria's crisis once and for all.

Third, we will continue to draw on our substantial counterterrorism capabilities to prevent ISIL attacks. Working with our partners, we will redouble our efforts to cut off its funding; improve our intelligence; strengthen our defenses; counter its warped ideology; and stem the flow of foreign fighters into and out of the Middle East. And in two weeks, I will chair a meeting of the U.N. Security Council to further mobilize the international community around this effort.

Fourth, we will continue to provide humanitarian assistance to innocent civilians who have been displaced by this terrorist organization. This includes Sunni and Shia Muslims who are at grave risk, as well as tens of

thousands of Christians and other religious minorities. We cannot allow these communities to be driven from their ancient homelands.

So this is our strategy. And in each of these four parts of our strategy, America will be joined by a broad coalition of partners. Already, allies are flying planes with us over Iraq; sending arms and assistance to Iraqi security forces and the Syrian opposition; sharing intelligence; and providing billions of dollars in humanitarian aid. Secretary Kerry was in Iraq today meeting with the new government and supporting their efforts to promote unity. And in the coming days he will travel across the Middle East and Europe to enlist more partners in this fight, especially Arab nations who can help mobilize Sunni communities in Iraq and Syria, to drive these terrorists from their lands. This is American leadership at its best: We stand with people who fight for their own freedom, and we rally other nations on behalf of our common security and common humanity.

My Administration has also secured bipartisan support for this approach here at home. I have the authority to address the threat from ISIL, but I believe we are strongest as a nation when the President and Congress work together. So I welcome congressional support for this effort in order to show the world that Americans are united in confronting this danger

Now, it will take time to eradicate a cancer like ISIL. And any time we take military action, there are risks involved — especially to the servicemen and women who carry out these missions. But I want the American people to understand how this effort will be different from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. It will not involve American combat troops fighting on foreign soil. This counterterrorism campaign will be

waged through a steady, relentless effort to take out ISIL wherever they exist, using our air power and our support for partner forces on the ground.

This strategy of taking out terrorists who threaten us, while supporting partners on the front lines, is one that we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years. And it is consistent with the approach I outlined earlier this year: to use force against anyone who threatens America's core interests, but to mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges to international order.

My fellow Americans, we live in a time of great change. Tomorrow marks 13 years since our country was attacked. Next week marks six years since our economy suffered its worst setback since the Great Depression. Yet despite these shocks, through the pain we have felt and the grueling work required to bounce back, America is better positioned today to seize the future than any other nation on Earth.

Our technology companies and universities are unmatched. Our manufacturing and auto industries are thriving. Energy independence is closer than it's been in decades. For all the work that remains, our businesses are in the longest uninterrupted stretch of job creation in our history. Despite all the divisions and discord within our democracy, I see the grit and determination and common goodness of the American people every single day -- and that makes me more confident than ever about our country's future.

Abroad, American leadership is the one constant in an uncertain world. It is America that has the capacity and the will to mobilize the world against terrorists. It is America that has rallied the world against Russian aggression, and in support of the Ukrainian peoples' right to determine

their own destiny. It is America — our scientists, our doctors, our know-how — that can help contain and cure the outbreak of Ebola. It is America that helped remove and destroy Syria's declared chemical weapons so that they can't pose a threat to the Syrian people or the world again. And it is America that is helping Muslim communities around the world not just in the fight against terrorism, but in the fight for opportunity, and tolerance, and a more hopeful future.

America, our endless blessings bestow an enduring burden. But as Americans, we welcome our responsibility to lead. From Europe to Asia, from the far reaches of Africa to war-torn capitals of the Middle East, we stand for freedom, for justice, for dignity. These are values that have guided our nation since its founding.

Tonight, I ask for your support in carrying that leadership forward. I do so as a Commander-in-Chief who could not be prouder of our men and women in uniform — pilots who bravely fly in the face of danger above the Middle East, and servicemembers who support our partners on the ground.

When we helped prevent the massacre of civilians trapped on a distant mountain, here's what one of them said: "We owe our American friends our lives. Our children will always remember that there was someone who felt our struggle and made a long journey to protect innocent people."

That is the difference we make in the world. And our own safety, our own security, depends upon our willingness to do what it takes to defend this nation and uphold the values that we stand for — timeless ideals that will endure long after those who offer only hate and destruction have been vanquished from the Earth.

May God bless our troops, and may God bless the United States of America.

The Third speech

Barack Obama

Address to the Nation on Foreign and Domestic Counter-Terrorism Strategies

Delivered 6 December 2015, Oval Office, the White House

Good evening. On Wednesday, 14 Americans were killed as they came together to celebrate the holidays. They were taken from family and friends who loved them deeply. They were white and black; Latino and Asian;



immigrants and American-born; moms and dads; daughters and sons. Each of them served their fellow citizens and all of them were part of our American family.

Tonight, I want to talk with you about this tragedy, the broader threat of terrorism, and how we can keep our country safe.

The FBI is still gathering the facts about what happened in San Bernardino, but here is what we know. The victims were brutally murdered and injured by one of their coworkers and his wife. So far, we have no evidence that the killers were directed by a terrorist organization overseas, or that they were part of a broader conspiracy here at home. But it is clear that the two of them had gone down the dark path of radicalization, embracing a perverted interpretation of Islam that calls for war against America and the West. They had stockpiled assault weapons,

ammunition, and pipe bombs. So this was an act of terrorism, designed to kill innocent people.

Our nation has been at war with terrorists since al Qaeda killed nearly 3,000 Americans on 9/11. In the process, we've hardened our defenses -- from airports to financial centers, to other critical infrastructure. Intelligence and law enforcement agencies have disrupted countless plots here and overseas, and worked around the clock to keep us safe. Our military and counterterrorism professionals have relentlessly pursued terrorist networks overseas -- disrupting safe havens in several different countries, killing Osama bin Laden, and decimating al Qaeda's leadership.

Over the last few years, however, the terrorist threat has evolved into a new phase. As we've become better at preventing complex, multifaceted attacks like 9/11, terrorists turned to less complicated acts of violence like the mass shootings that are all too common in our society. It is this type of attack that we saw at Fort Hood in 2009; in Chattanooga earlier this year; and now in San Bernardino. And as groups like ISIL grew stronger amidst the chaos of war in Iraq and then Syria, and as the Internet erases the distance between countries, we see growing efforts by terrorists to poison the minds of people like the Boston Marathon bombers and the San Bernardino killers.

For seven years, I've confronted this evolving threat each morning in my intelligence briefing. And since the day I took this office, I've authorized U.S. forces to take out terrorists abroad precisely because I know how real the danger is. As Commander-in-Chief, I have no greater responsibility than the security of the American people. As a father to two young daughters who are the most precious part of my life, I know

that we see ourselves with friends and coworkers at a holiday party like the one in San Bernardino. I know we see our kids in the faces of the young people killed in Paris. And I know that after so much war, many Americans are asking whether we are confronted by a cancer that has no immediate cure.

Well, here's what I want you to know: The threat from terrorism is real, but we will overcome it. We will destroy ISIL and any other organization that tries to harm us. Our success won't depend on tough talk, or abandoning our values, or giving into fear. That's what groups like ISIL are hoping for. Instead, we will prevail by being strong and smart, resilient and relentless, and by drawing upon every aspect of American power.

Here's how. First, our military will continue to hunt down terrorist plotters in any country where it is necessary. In Iraq and Syria, airstrikes are taking out ISIL leaders, heavy weapons, oil tankers, infrastructure. And since the attacks in Paris, our closest allies -- including France, Germany, and the United Kingdom -- have ramped up their contributions to our military campaign, which will help us accelerate our effort to destroy ISIL.

Second, we will continue to provide training and equipment to tens of thousands of Iraqi and Syrian forces fighting ISIL on the ground so that we take away their safe havens. In both countries, we're deploying Special Operations Forces who can accelerate that offensive. We've stepped up this effort since the attacks in Paris, and we'll continue to invest more in approaches that are working on the ground.

Third, we're working with friends and allies to stop ISIL's operations -- to disrupt plots, cut off their financing, and prevent them from recruiting

more fighters. Since the attacks in Paris, we've surged intelligence-sharing with our European allies. We're working with Turkey to seal its border with Syria. And we are cooperating with Muslim-majority countries -- and with our Muslim communities here at home -- to counter the vicious ideology that ISIL promotes online.

Fourth, with American leadership, the international community has begun to establish a process -- and timeline -- to pursue ceasefires and a political resolution to the Syrian war. Doing so will allow the Syrian people and every country, including our allies, but also countries like Russia, to focus on the common goal of destroying ISIL -- a group that threatens us all.

This is our strategy to destroy ISIL. It is designed and supported by our military commanders and counterterrorism experts, together with 65 countries that have joined an American-led coalition. And we constantly examine our strategy to determine when additional steps are needed to get the job done. That's why I've ordered the Departments of State and Homeland Security to review the Visa Waiver Program under which the female terrorist in San Bernardino originally came to this country. And that's why I will urge high-tech and law enforcement leaders to make it harder for terrorists to use technology to escape from justice.

Now, here at home, we have to work together to address the challenge. There are several steps that Congress should take right away.

To begin with, Congress should act to make sure no one on a no-fly list is able to buy a gun. What could possibly be the argument for allowing a terrorist suspect to buy a semi-automatic weapon? This is a matter of national security.

We also need to make it harder for people to buy powerful assault weapons like the ones that were used in San Bernardino. I know there are some who reject any gun safety measures. But the fact is that our intelligence and law enforcement agencies -- no matter how effective they are -- cannot identify every would-be mass shooter, whether that individual is motivated by ISIL or some other hateful ideology. What we can do -- and must do -- is make it harder for them to kill.

Next, we should put in place stronger screening for those who come to America without a visa so that we can take a hard look at whether they've traveled to warzones. And we're working with members of both parties in Congress to do exactly that.

Finally, if Congress believes, as I do, that we are at war with ISIL, it should go ahead and vote to authorize the continued use of military force against these terrorists. For over a year, I have ordered our military to take thousands of airstrikes against ISIL targets. I think it's time for Congress to vote to demonstrate that the American people are united, and committed, to this fight. My fellow Americans, these are the steps that we can take together to defeat the terrorist threat. Let me now say a word about what we should not do.

We should not be drawn once more into a long and costly ground war in Iraq or Syria. That's what groups like ISIL want. They know they can't defeat us on the battlefield. ISIL fighters were part of the insurgency that we faced in Iraq. But they also know that if we occupy foreign lands, they can maintain insurgencies for years, killing thousands of our troops, draining our resources, and using our presence to draw new recruits.

The strategy that we are using now -- airstrikes, Special Forces, and working with local forces who are fighting to regain control of their own

country -- that is how we'll achieve a more sustainable victory. And it won't require us sending a new generation of Americans overseas to fight and die for another decade on foreign soil.

Here's what else we cannot do. We cannot turn against one another by letting this fight be defined as a war between America and Islam. That, too, is what groups like ISIL want. ISIL does not speak for Islam. They are thugs and killers, part of a cult of death, and they account for a tiny fraction of more than a billion Muslims around the world -- including millions of patriotic Muslim Americans who reject their hateful ideology. Moreover, the vast majority of terrorist victims around the world are Muslim. If we're to succeed in defeating terrorism we must enlist Muslim communities as some of our strongest allies, rather than push them away through suspicion and hate.

That does not mean denying the fact that an extremist ideology has spread within some Muslim communities. This is a real problem that Muslims must confront, without excuse. Muslim leaders here and around the globe have to continue working with us to decisively and unequivocally reject the hateful ideology that groups like ISIL and al Qaeda promote; to speak out against not just acts of violence, but also those interpretations of Islam that are incompatible with the values of religious tolerance, mutual respect, and human dignity.

But just as it is the responsibility of Muslims around the world to root out misguided ideas that lead to radicalization, it is the responsibility of all Americans -- of every faith -- to reject discrimination. It is our responsibility to reject religious tests on who we admit into this country. It's our responsibility to reject proposals that Muslim Americans should somehow be treated differently. Because when we travel down that road,

we lose. That kind of divisiveness, that betrayal of our values plays into the hands of groups like ISIL. Muslim Americans are our friends and our neighbors, our co-workers, our sports heroes -- and, yes, they are our men and women in uniform who are willing to die in defense of our country. We have to remember that. My fellow Americans, I am confident we will succeed in this mission because we are on the right side of history. We were founded upon a belief in human dignity -- that no matter who you are, or where you come from, or what you look like, or what religion you practice, you are equal in the eyes of God and equal in the eyes of the law.

Even in this political season, even as we properly debate what steps I and future Presidents must take to keep our country safe, let's make sure we never forget what makes us exceptional. Let's not forget that freedom is more powerful than fear; that we have always met challenges -- whether war or depression, natural disasters or terrorist attacks -- by coming together around our common ideals as one nation, as one people. So long as we stay true to that tradition, I have no doubt America will prevail.

Thank you. God bless you, and may God bless the United States of America.

Group (C)

The First Speech

Donald Trump

Donald Trump's remarks on terrorism.

On August 15

Today we begin a conversation about how to Make America Safe Again.

In the 20th Century, the United States defeated Fascism , Nazism , and Communism . Now, a different threat challenges our world: Radical Islamic Terrorism . This summer, there has been an ISIS



attack launched outside the war zones of the Middle East every 84 hours. Here, in America, we have seen one brutal attack after another.

13 were murdered, and 38 wounded, in the assault on Ft. Hood. The Boston Marathon Bombing wounded and maimed 264 people, and ultimately left five dead – including 2 police officers. In Chattanooga, Tennessee, five unarmed marines were shot and killed at a military recruiting center. Last December, 14 innocent Americans were gunned down at an office party in San Bernardino, another 22 were injured. In June, 49 Americans were executed at the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, and another 53 were injured. It was the worst mass shooting in our history, and the worst attack on the LGTBQ community in our history. In Europe, we have seen the same carnage and bloodshed inflicted upon our closest

allies. In January of 2015, a French satirical newspaper, Charlie Hebdo, was attacked for publishing cartoons of the prophet Mohammed. Twelve were killed, including two police officers, and 11 were wounded. Two days later, four were murdered in a Jewish Deli. In November of 2015, terrorists went on a shooting rampage in Paris that slaughtered 130 people, and wounded another 368. France is suffering gravely, and the tourism industry is being massively affected in a most negative way. In March of this year, terrorists detonated a bomb in the Brussels airport, killing 32 and injuring 340.

This July, in the South of France, an Islamic terrorist turned his truck into an instrument of mass murder, plowing down and killing 85 men, women and children – and wounding another 308. Among the dead were 2 Americans – a Texas father, and his 11-year-old son. A few weeks ago, in Germany, a refugee armed with an axe wounded five people in a gruesome train attack. Only days ago, an ISIS killer invaded a Christian church in Normandy France, forced an 85-year-old priest to his knees, and slit his throat before his congregation. Overseas, ISIS has carried out one unthinkable atrocity after another. Children slaughtered, girls sold into slavery, men and women burned alive. Crucifixions, beheadings and drownings. Ethnic minorities targeted for mass execution. Holy sites desecrated. Christians driven from their homes and hunted for extermination. ISIS rounding-up what it calls the “nation of the cross” in a campaign of genocide. We cannot let this evil continue. Nor can we let the hateful ideology of Radical Islam – its oppression of women, gays, children, and nonbelievers – be allowed to reside or spread within our own countries. We will defeat Radical Islamic Terrorism , just as we have defeated every threat we have faced in every age before. But we will not defeat it with closed eyes, or silenced voices. Anyone who cannot name

our enemy, is not fit to lead this country. Anyone who cannot condemn the hatred, oppression and violence of Radical Islam lacks the moral clarity to serve as our President. The rise of ISIS is the direct result of policy decisions made by President Obama and Secretary Clinton. Let's look back at the Middle East at the very beginning of 2009, before the Obama-Clinton Administration took over. Libya was stable. Syria was under control. Egypt was ruled by a secular President and an ally of the United States. Iraq was experiencing a reduction in violence. The group that would become what we now call ISIS was close to being extinguished. Iran was being choked off by economic sanctions.

Fast-forward to today. What have the decisions of Obama-Clinton produced? Libya is in ruins, our ambassador and three other brave Americans are dead, and ISIS has gained a new base of operations. Syria is in the midst of a disastrous civil war. ISIS controls large portions of territory. A refugee crisis now threatens Europe and the United States. In Egypt, terrorists have gained a foothold in the Sinai desert, near the Suez Canal, one of the most essential waterways in the world. Iraq is in chaos, and ISIS is on the loose. ISIS has spread across the Middle East, and into the West. In 2014, ISIS was operating in some 7 nations. Today they are fully operational in 18 countries with aspiring branches in 6 more, for a total of 24 – and many believe it is even more than that. The situation is likely worse than the public knows: a new Congressional report reveals that the Administration has downplayed the growth of ISIS, with 40% of analysts saying they had experienced efforts to manipulate their findings. At the same time, ISIS is trying to infiltrate refugee flows into Europe and the United States. Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, is now flush with \$150 billion in cash released by the United States – plus another \$400 million in ransom. Worst of all, the Nuclear deal puts Iran,

the number one state sponsor of Radical Islamic Terrorism , on a path to nuclear weapons.

In short, the Obama-Clinton foreign policy has unleashed ISIS, destabilized the Middle East, and put the nation of Iran – which chants ‘Death to America’ – in a dominant position of regional power and, in fact, aspiring to be a dominant world power. It all began in 2009 with what has become known as President Obama’s global ‘Apology Tour.’ In a series of speeches, President Obama described America as “arrogant,” “dismissive” “derisive” and a “colonial power.” He informed other countries that he would be speaking up about America’s “past errors.” He pledged that we would no longer be a “senior partner,” that “sought to dictate our terms.” He lectured CIA officers of the need to acknowledge their mistakes, and described Guantanamo Bay as a “rallying cry for our enemies.” Perhaps no speech was more misguided than President Obama’s speech to the Muslim World delivered in Cairo, Egypt, in 2009. In winning the Cold War, President Ronald Reagan repeatedly touted the superiority of freedom over communism , and called the USSR the Evil Empire. Yet, when President Obama delivered his address in Cairo, no such moral courage could be found. Instead of condemning the oppression of women and gays in many Muslim nations, and the systematic violations of human rights, or the financing of global terrorism , President Obama tried to draw an equivalency between our human rights record and theirs. His naïve words were followed by even more naïve actions. The failure to establish a new Status of Forces Agreement in Iraq, and the election-driven timetable for withdrawal, surrendered our gains in that country and led directly to the rise of ISIS.

The failures in Iraq were compounded by Hillary Clinton’s disaster in Libya. President Obama has since said he regards Libya as his worst

mistake. According to then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, the invasion of Libya was nearly a split decision, but Hillary Clinton's forceful advocacy for the intervention was the deciding factor. With one episode of bad judgment after another, Hillary Clinton's policies launched ISIS onto the world. Yet, as she threw the Middle East into violent turmoil, things turned out well for her. The Clintons made almost \$60 million in gross income while she was Secretary of State. Incident after incident proves again and again: Hillary Clinton lacks the judgement, the temperament and the moral character to lead this nation. Importantly, she also lacks the mental and physical stamina to take on ISIS, and all the many adversaries we face – not only in terrorism, but in trade and every other challenge we must confront to turn this country around. It is time for a new approach. Our current strategy of nation-building and regime change is a proven failure. We have created the vacuums that allow terrorists to grow and

thrive. I was an opponent of the Iraq war from the beginning – a major difference between me and my opponent. Though I was a private citizen, whose personal opinions on such matters was not sought, I nonetheless publicly expressed my private doubts about the invasion. Three months before the invasion I said, in an interview with Neil Cavuto, to whom I offer my best wishes for a speedy recovery, that “perhaps [we] shouldn't be doing it yet,” and that “the economy is a much bigger problem.” In August of 2004, very early in the conflict, I made a detailed statement to Esquire magazine. Here is the quote in full:

'Look at the war in Iraq and the mess that we're in. I would never have handled it that way. Does anybody really believe that Iraq is going to be a wonderful democracy where people are going to run down to the voting box and gently put in their ballot and the winner is happily going to step

up to lead the country? C'mon. Two minutes after we leave, there's going to be a revolution, and the meanest, toughest, smartest, most vicious guy will take over. And he'll have weapons of mass destruction, which Saddam didn't have. 'What was the purpose of this whole thing? Hundreds and hundreds of young people killed. And what about the people coming back with no arms and legs? Not to mention the other side. All those Iraqi kids who've been blown to pieces. And it turns out that all of the reasons for the war were blatantly wrong. All this for nothing.' So I have been clear for a long time that we should not have gone in. But I have been just as clear in saying what a catastrophic mistake Hillary Clinton and President Obama made with the reckless way in which they pulled out. After we had made those hard-fought sacrifices and gains, we should never have made such a sudden withdrawal – on a timetable advertised to our enemies. Al Qaeda in Iraq had been decimated, and Obama and Clinton gave it new life and allowed it to spread across the world. By that same token, President Obama and Hillary Clinton should never have attempted to build a Democracy in Libya, to push for immediate regime change in Syria or to support the overthrow of Mubarak in Egypt. One more point on this: I have long said that we should have kept the oil in Iraq – another area where my judgement has been proven correct. According to CNN, ISIS made as much \$500 million in oil sales in 2014 alone, fueling and funding its reign of terror. If we had controlled the oil, we could have prevented the rise of ISIS in Iraq – both by cutting off a major source of funding, and through the presence of U.S. forces necessary to safeguard the oil and other vital infrastructure. I was saying this constantly and to whoever would listen: keep the oil, keep the oil, keep the oil, I said – don't let someone else get it. If they had listened to me then, we would have had the economic benefits of the oil, which I wanted to use to help take care

of the wounded soldiers and families of those who died – and thousands of lives would have been saved.

This proposal, by its very nature, would have left soldiers in place to guard our assets. In the old days, when we won a war, to the victor belonged the spoils. Instead, all we got from Iraq – and our adventures in the Middle East – was death, destruction and tremendous financial loss. But it is time to put the mistakes of the past behind us, and chart a new course. If I become President, the era of nation-building will be ended. Our new approach, which must be shared by both parties in America, by our allies overseas, and by our friends in the Middle East, must be to halt the spread of Radical Islam . All actions should be oriented around this goal, and any country which shares this goal will be our ally. We cannot always choose our friends, but we can never fail to recognize our enemies. As President, I will call for an international conference focused on this goal. We will work side-by-side with our friends in the Middle East, including our greatest ally, Israel. We will partner with King Abdullah of Jordan, and President Sisi of Egypt, and all others who recognize this ideology of death that must be extinguished. We will also work closely with NATO on this new mission. I had previously said that NATO was obsolete because it failed to deal adequately with terrorism; since my comments they have changed their policy and now have a new division focused on terror threats. I also believe that we could find common ground with Russia in the fight against ISIS. They too have much at stake in the outcome in Syria, and have had their own battles with Islamic terrorism . My Administration will aggressively pursue joint and coalition military operations to crush and destroy ISIS, international cooperation to cutoff their funding, expanded intelligence sharing, and

cyberwarfare to disrupt and disable their propaganda and recruiting. We cannot allow the

internet to be used as a recruiting tool, and for other purposes, by our enemy – we must shut down their access to this form of communication, and we must do so immediately.

Unlike Hillary Clinton, who has risked so many lives with her careless handling of sensitive information, my Administration will not telegraph exact military plans to the enemy. I have often said that General MacArthur and General Patton would be in a state of shock if they were alive today to see the way President Obama and Hillary Clinton try to recklessly announce their every move before it happens – like they did in Iraq – so that the enemy can prepare and adapt. The fight will not be limited to ISIS. We will decimate Al Qaeda, and we will seek to starve funding for Iran-backed Hamas and Hezbollah. We can use existing UN Security Council resolutions to apply new sanctions. Military, cyber and financial warfare will all be essential in dismantling Islamic terrorism . But we must use ideological warfare as well Just as we won the Cold War, in part, by exposing the evils of communism and the virtues of free markets, so too must we take on the ideology of Radical Islam . While my opponent accepted millions of dollars in Foundation donations from countries where being gay is an offense punishable by prison or death, my Administration will speak out against the oppression of women, gays and people of different faith. Our Administration will be a friend to all moderate Muslim reformers in the Middle East, and will amplify their voices.

This includes speaking out against the horrible practice of honor killings, where women are murdered by their relatives for dressing, marrying or

acting in a way that violates fundamentalist teachings. Over 1,000 Pakistani girls are estimated to be the victims of honor killings by their relatives each year. Recently, a prominent Pakistani social media star was strangled to death by her brother on the charge of dishonoring the family. In his confession, the brother took pride in the murder and said: “Girls are born to stay home and follow traditions.” Shockingly, this is a practice that has reached our own shores. One such case involves an Iraqi immigrant who was sentenced to 34 years in jail for running over his own daughter claiming she had become “too Westernized.” To defeat Islamic terrorism, we must also speak out forcefully against a hateful ideology that provides the breeding ground for violence and terrorism to grow. A new immigration policy is needed as well. The common thread linking the major Islamic terrorist attacks that have recently occurred on our soil – 9/11, the Ft. Hood shooting, the Boston Bombing, the San Bernardino attack, the Orlando attack – is that they have involved immigrants or the children of immigrants. Clearly, new screening procedures are needed. A review by the U.S. Senate Immigration Subcommittee has identified 380 foreign-born individuals charged with terrorism or terrorism-related offenses between 9/11 and 2014, and many more since then. We also know that ISIS recruits refugees after their entrance into the country – as we have seen with the Somali refugee population in Minnesota.

Beyond terrorism, as we have seen in France, foreign populations have brought their anti-Semitic attitudes with them. Pew polling shows that in many of the countries from which we draw large numbers of immigrants, extreme views about religion – such as the death penalty for those who leave the faith – are commonplace. A Trump Administration will establish a clear principle that will govern all decisions pertaining to

immigration: we should only admit into this country those who share our values and respect our people.

In the Cold War, we had an ideological screening test. The time is overdue to develop a new screening test for the threats we face today. In addition to screening out all members or sympathizers of terrorist groups, we must also screen out any who have hostile attitudes towards our country or its principles – or who believe that Sharia law should supplant American law. Those who do not believe in our Constitution, or who support bigotry and hatred, will not be admitted for immigration into the country. Only those who we expect to flourish in our country – and to embrace a tolerant American society – should be issued visas. To put these new procedures in place, we will have to temporarily suspend immigration from some of the most dangerous and volatile regions of the world that have a history of exporting terrorism . As soon as I take office, I will ask the State Department and the Department of Homeland Security to identify a list of regions where adequate screening cannot take place. We will stop processing visas from those areas until such time as it is deemed safe to resume based on new circumstances or new procedures. The size of current immigration flows are simply too large to perform adequate screening.

We admit about 100,000 permanent immigrants from the Middle East every year. Beyond that, we admit hundreds of thousands of temporary workers and visitors from the same regions. If we don't control the numbers, we can't perform adequate screening. By contrast, my opponent wants to increase the flow of Syrian refugees by 550% percent. The United States Senate Subcommittee on Immigration estimates that Hillary Clinton's plan would mean roughly 620,000 refugees from all current refugee-sending nations in her first term , assuming no cuts to other

refugee programs. This would be additional to all other nonrefugee immigration. The Subcommittee estimates her plan would impose a lifetime cost of roughly \$400 billion when you include the costs of healthcare, welfare, housing, schooling, and all other entitlement benefits that are excluded from the State Department's placement figures. In short, Hillary Clinton wants to be America's Angela Merkel, and you know what a disaster this massive immigration has been to Germany and the people of Germany – crime has risen to levels that no one thought would they would ever see. We have enough problems in our country, we don't need another one. Finally, we will need to restore common sense to our security procedures Another common feature of the past attacks that have occurred on our soil is that warning signs were ignored. The 9/11 hijackers had fraud all over their visa applications. The Russians warned us about the Boston Bombers, here on political asylum , and the attackers were even twice interviewed by the FBI. The female San Bernardino shooter, here on a fiancé visa from Saudi Arabia, wrote of her support for Jihad online. A neighbor saw suspicious behavior but didn't warn authorities, because said they didn't want to be accused of racially profiling – now many are dead and gravely wounded.

The shooter in Orlando reportedly celebrated in his classroom after 9/11. . He too was interviewed by the FBI. His father, a native of Afghanistan, supported the oppressive Taliban regime, and expressed anti-American views – and by the way, was just seen sitting behind Hillary Clinton with a big smile on his face all the way through her speech. He obviously liked what she had to say. The Ft. Hood Shooter delivered a presentation to a room full of mental health experts before the attacks in which he threw out one red flag after another. He even proclaimed that “we love death more than you love life!” These warnings signs were ignored because

political correctness has replaced common sense in our society. That is why one of my first acts as President will be to establish a Commission on Radical Islam – which will include reformist voices in the Muslim community who will hopefully work with us. We want to build bridges and erase divisions. The goal of the commission will be to identify and explain to the American public the core convictions and beliefs of Radical Islam , to identify the warning signs of radicalization, and to expose the networks in our society that support radicalization. This commission will be used to develop new protocols for local police officers, federal investigators, and immigration screeners.

We will also keep open Guantanamo Bay, and place a renewed emphasis on human intelligence. Drone strikes will remain part of our strategy, but we will also seek to capture high-value targets to gain needed information to dismantle their organizations. Foreign combatants will be tried in military commissions. Finally, we will pursue aggressive criminal or immigration charges against anyone who lends material support to terrorism . Similar to the effort to take down the mafia, this will be the understood mission of every federal investigator and prosecutor in the country.

To accomplish a goal, you must state a mission: the support networks for Radical Islam in this country will be stripped out and removed one by one. Immigration officers will also have their powers restored: those who are guests in our country that are preaching hate will be asked to return home. To Make America Safe Again, We Must Work Together Again Our victory in the Cold War relied on a bipartisan and international consensus. That is what we must have to defeat Radical Islamic terrorism . But just like we couldn't defeat communism without acknowledging that communism exists – or explaining its evils – we can't

defeat Radical Islamic Terrorism unless we do the same. This also means we have to promote the exceptional virtues of our own way of life – and expecting that newcomers to our society do the same. Pride in our institutions, our history and our values should be taught by parents and teachers, and impressed upon all who join our society. Assimilation is not an act of hostility, but an expression of compassion. Our system of government, and our American culture, is the best in the world and will produce the best outcomes for all who adopt it. This approach will not only make us safer, but bring us closer together as a country. Renewing this spirit of Americanism will help heal the divisions in our country. It will do so by emphasizing what we have in common – not what pulls us apart. This is my pledge to the American people: as your President I will be your greatest champion. I will fight to ensure that every American is treated equally, protected equally, and honored equally. We will reject bigotry and oppression in all its forms, and seek a new future built on our common culture and values as one American people. Only this way, will we make America Great Again and Safe Again – For Everyone. Thank you.

The Second speech

Donald Trump

President Trump's full speech from Saudi Arabia on global terrorism.

May 21, 2017

Thank you. I would like to thank King Salman for his extraordinary words, and the magnificent Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for hosting today's summit. I am honored to be received by such gracious hosts. I



have always heard about the splendor of your country and the kindness of your citizens, but words do not do justice to the grandeur of this remarkable place and the incredible hospitality you have shown us from the moment we arrived.

You also hosted me in the treasured home of King Abdul Aziz, the founder of the kingdom who united your great people. Working alongside of another beloved leader, American President Franklin Roosevelt, King Abdul Aziz began the enduring partnership between our two countries. King Salman, your father would be very, very proud to see that you are continuing his legacy. And just as he opened the first chapter of our partnership, today we begin a new chapter that will bring lasting benefits to all of our citizens. Let me now also extend my deep and heartfelt gratitude to each and every one of the distinguished heads of state who made this journey here today. You greatly honor us with your presence and I send the warmest regards from my country to yours. Thank you. I

know that our time together will bring many blessings to both your people and to mine. I stand before you as a representative of the American people to deliver a message of friendship and hope and love. That is why I chose to make my first foreign visit a trip to the heart of the Muslim world, to the nation that serves as custodian of the two holiest sites in the Islamic faith. In my inaugural address to the American people, I pledged to strengthen America's oldest friendships and to build new partnerships in pursuit of peace. I also promised that America will not seek to impose our way of life on others, but to outstretch our hands in the spirit of cooperation and trust.

Our vision is one of peace, security, and prosperity in this region and all throughout the world. Our goal is a coalition of nations who share the aim of stamping out extremism and providing our children a hopeful future that does honor to god. And so this historic and unprecedented gathering of leaders, unique in the history of nations, is a symbol to the world of our shared resolved (sic), and our military that will protect the safety of our people and enhance

the security of and made record investments in our military that will protect the safety of our people and enhance the security of our wonderful friends and allies, many of whom are here -- closer bonds of friendship, security, culture and commerce. For Americans, this is a very exciting time. A new spirit of optimism is sweeping our country. In just a few months, we have created almost a million new jobs, added over \$3 trillion in new value, lifted the burdens on American industry, and made record investments in our military that will protect the safety of our people and enhance the security of our wonderful friends and allies, many of whom are here today. Now there is even more blessed news that I am pleased to share with you. My meetings with King Salman, the crown prince, and

the deputy crown prince, have been filled with great warmth, good will, and tremendous cooperation. Yesterday, we signed historic agreements with the kingdom that will invest almost \$400 billion in our two countries and create many hundreds of thousands of jobs in America and Saudi Arabia. This landmark agreement includes the announcement of a \$110 billion Saudi-funded defense purchase. And we will be sure to help our Saudi friends to get a good deal from our great American defense companies, the greatest anywhere in the world. This agreement will help the Saudi military to take a far greater role in security and operations having to do with security. We've also started discussions with many of the countries present today on strengthening partnerships and forming new ones to advance security and stability across the Middle East and far beyond. Later today, we will make history again with the opening of the new global center for combating extremist ideology located right here in the central part of the Islamic world. This ground-breaking new center represents a clear declaration that Muslim-majority countries must take the lead in combating radicalization, and I want to express our gratitude to King Salman for his strong demonstration and his absolutely incredible and powerful leadership. I have had the pleasure of welcoming several of the leaders present today to the White House, and I look forward to working with all of you. America is a sovereign nation and our first priority is always the safety and security of our citizens. We are not here to lecture. We are not here to tell other people how to live, what to do, who to be, or how to worship. Instead, we are here to offer partnership based on shared interests and values to pursue a better future. Here at this summit, we will discuss. But above all, we must be united in pursuing the one goal that transcends every other consideration. That goal is to meet history's great test, to conquer extremism and vanquish the forces terrorism brings with it every single time. Young Muslim boys and girls

should be able to grow up free from fear, safe from violence, and innocent of hatred. When young Muslim men and women should have the chance to build a new era of prosperity for themselves, it has to be done and we have to let them do it. With God's help, this summit will mark the beginning of the end for those who practice terror and spread its vile creed. At the same time, we pray this special gathering may someday be remembered as the beginning of peace in the Middle East and maybe even all over the world. But this future can only be achieved through

defeating terrorism and the ideology that drives it. Few nations have been spared the violent reach of terrorism. America has suffered repeated barbaric attacks from the atrocities of September 11 to the devastation of the Boston bombings to the horrible killings in San Bernardino and Orlando. The nations of Europe have also endured unspeakable horror. So too have the nations of Africa and South America. India, Russia, China, and Australia have all been victims. But in sheer numbers, the deadliest toll has been exacted on the innocent people of Arab, Muslim, and Middle Eastern nations. They have borne the brunt of the killings and the worst of destruction in this wave of fanatical violence. Some estimates hold that more than 95 percent of the victims of terrorism are themselves Muslim. We now face a humanitarian and security disaster in this region that is spreading across the planet. It is a tragedy of epic proportions. No description of the suffering and depravity can begin to capture its full measure. The (INAUDIBLE) of ISIS, if you look at what's happening, al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, and so many others must be counted not only in the number of dead; it also must be counted in generations of vanished dreams. The Middle East is rich with natural beauty, vibrant cultures, and massive amounts of historic treasures. It should increasingly become one of the great global centers of commerce and opportunity. This region

should not be a place from which refugees flee but to which newcomers flock. Saudi Arabia is home to the holiest sites in one of the world's great faiths. Each year millions of Muslims come from around the world to Saudi Arabia to take part in the Hajj. In addition to ancient wonders, this country is also home to modern ones, including soaring achievements in architecture. Egypt was a thriving center of learning and achievement thousands of years before other parts of the world. The wonders of Giza (ph), Luxor, and Alexandria are proud monuments to that ancient heritage. All over the world people dream of walking through the ruins of Petra in Jordan. Iraq was the cradle of civilization and is a land of natural beauty. And the United Arab Emirates has reached incredible heights with glass and steel, and turned earth and water into spectacular works of art. The entire region is at the center of the key shipping lanes of the Suez Canal, the Red Se, and the Straits (sic) of Hormuz. The potential of this region has never, ever been greater. Sixty-five percent of its population is under the age of 30. Like all young men and women, they seek great futures to build, great national projects to join, and a place for their families to call home. But this untapped potential, this tremendous cause of optimism, is held at bay by bloodshed and terror. There can be no coexistence with this violence. There can be no tolerating it, no accepting it, no excusing it, and no ignoring it. Every time a terrorist murders an innocent person and falsely invokes the name of God, it should be an insult to every person of faith. Terrorists do not worship God; they worship death. If we do not act against this organized terror, then we know what will happen and what will be the end result. Terrorism's devastation of life will continue to spread, peaceful societies will become engulfed by violence, and the futures of many generations will be sadly squandered. If we do not stand in uniform condemnation of this killing, then not only will we be judged by our people, not only will we be judged

by history, but we will be judged by God. This is not a battle between different faiths, different sects, or different civilizations. This is a battle between

barbaric criminals who seek to obliterate human life and decent people, all in the name of religion. People that want to protect life and want to protect their religion. This is a battle between good and evil. When we see the scenes of destruction in the wake of terror, we see no signs that those murdered were Jewish or Christian, Shia or Sunni. When we look upon the strains (sic) of innocent blood soaked into the ancient ground, we cannot see the faith or sect or tribe of the victims. We see only that they were children of God whose deaths are an insult to all that is holy. But we can only overcome this evil if the forces of good are united and strong, and if everyone in this room does their fair share and fulfills their part of the burden. Terrorism has spread all across the world, but the path to peace begins right here on this ancient soil in this sacred land. America is prepared to stand with you in pursuit of shared interests and common security, but the nations of the Middle East cannot wait for American power to crush this enemy for them. The nations of the Middle East will have to decide what kind of future they want for themselves, for their country, and frankly for their families, for their children. It's a choice between two futures, and it is a choice America cannot make for you. A better future is only possible if your nations drive out the terrorists and drive out the extremists. Drive them out. Drive them out of your places of worship. Drive them out of your communities. Drive them out of your holy land. And drive them out of this earth. For our part, America is committed to adjusting our strategies to meet evolving threats and new facts. We will discard those strategies that have not worked and will apply new approaches, informed by experience, talent, and judgment. We

are adopting a principled realism rooted in common values, shared interests, and common sense. Our friends will never question our support and our enemies will never doubt our determination. Our partnerships will advance security through stability, not through radical disruption. We will make decisions based on real world outcomes, not inflexible ideology. We will be guided by the lessons of experience, not the confines of rigid thinking. And wherever possible, we will seek gradual reforms, not sudden intervention. We must seek partners, not perfection. And to make allies of all who share our goals. Above all, America seeks peace, not war. Muslim nations must be willing to take on the burden if we are going to defeat terrorism and send its wicked ideology into oblivion. The first task in this joint effort is for your nations to deny all territory to the foot soldiers of evil. Every country in the region has an absolute duty to ensure that terrorists find no sanctuary on their soil. Many are already making significant contributions to regional security. Jordanian pilots are crucial partners against ISIS in Syria and Iraq. Saudi Arabia and a regional coalition have taken strong action against Houthi militants in Yemen. The Lebanese army is hunting ISIS operatives who try to infiltrate their territory. Emirati troops are supporting our Afghan partners and supporting them strongly. In Mosul, American troops are supporting Kurds, Sunnis and Shias fighting together for their homeland. Qatar, which hosts the U.S. Central Command, is a crucial strategic partner. Our longstanding partnership with Kuwait and Bahrain continue to enhance security in the region. Our courageous Afghan soldiers are making tremendous sacrifices in the fight against the Taliban and others in the fight for their country.

As we deny terrorist organizations control of territory and populations, we must also strip them of their access to funds. We must cut off the

financial channels that let ISIS sell oil, let extremists pay their fighters, and help terrorists smuggle their reinforcements. I am proud to announce that the nations here today will be signing an agreement to prevent the financing of terrorism called the Terrorist Financing Targeting Center, co-chaired by the United States and Saudi Arabia, and joined by every member of the Gulf Cooperation Council. It is another historic step in a day that will be long remembered. I also applaud the Gulf Cooperation Council for blocking funders from using their countries as a financial base for terror and for designating Hezbollah as a terrorist organization, which they certainly are, last year. Saudi Arabia also joined us this week in placing sanctions on one of the most senior leaders of Hezbollah. Of course, there is still much work to be done. That means honestly confronting the crisis of Islamic extremism and the Islamists and Islamic terror of all kinds. We must stop what they're doing to inspire, because they do nothing to inspire but kill. And we are having a very profound effect if you look at what's happened recently. And it means standing together against the murder of innocent Muslims, the oppression of women, the persecution of Jews, and the slaughter of Christians. Religious leaders must make this absolutely clear -barbarism will deliver you no glory. Piety to evil will bring you no dignity. If you choose the path of terror, your life will be empty, your life will be brief, and your soul will be fully condemned. And political leaders must speak out to affirm the same idea. Heroes don't kill innocents; they save them. Many nations here today have taken important steps to raise up that message. Saudi Arabia's vision for 2030 is an important and encouraging statement of tolerance, respect, empowering women, and economic development. The United Arab Emirates has also engaged in the battle for the hearts and souls, and with the United States launched a center to counter the online spread of hate. Bahrain too is working to undermine recruitment

and radicalism. I also applaud Jordan, Turkey and Lebanon for their role in hosting refugees. The surge of migrants and refugees living, and just living so poorly, that they're forced to leave the Middle East depletes the human capital needed to build stable societies and economies. Instead of depriving this region of so much human potential, Middle Eastern countries can give young people hope for a brighter future in their home nations and regions. That means promoting the aspirations and dreams of all citizens who seek a better life, including women, children, and the followers of all faiths. Numerous Arab and Islamic scholars have eloquently argued that protecting equality strengthens Arab and Muslim communities. For many centuries, the Middle East has been home to Christians, Muslims, and Jews living side by side. We must practice tolerance and respect for each other once again, and make this region a place where every man and woman, no matter their faith or ethnicity, can enjoy a life of dignity and hope. In that spirit, after concluding my visit in a fabulous place that we're at today, Riyadh, which I've gotten to know so well in so short a time, I will travel to Jerusalem and Bethlehem, and then to the Vatican, visiting many of the holiest places in the three Abrahamic faiths. If these three faiths can join together

in cooperation, then peace in this world is possible, including peace between Israelis and Palestinians. I will be meeting with both Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Palestinian President Abbas. Starving terrorists of their territory, of their funding, and the false allure of the craven ideology will be the basis for easily defeating them. But no discussion of stamping out this threat would be complete without mentioning the government that gives terrorists all three -- safe harbor, financial backing, and the social standing needed for recruitment. It is a regime that is responsible for so much instability in that region. I am

speaking, of course, of Iran. From Lebanon to Iraq to Yemen, Iran funds arms and trains terrorists, militias, and other extremist groups that spread destruction and chaos across the region. For decades, Iran has fueled the fires of sectarian conflict and terror. It is a government that speaks openly of mass murder, vowing the destruction of Israel, death to America, and ruin for many leaders and nations in this very room. Among Iran's most tragic and destabilizing interventions, you've seen it in Syria. Bolstered by Iran, Assad has committed unspeakable crimes, and the United States has taken firm action in response to the use of banned chemical weapons by the Assad regime, launching 59 missiles at the Syrian air base from where that murderous attack originated. Responsible nations must work together to end the humanitarian crisis in Syria, eradicate ISIS, and restore stability to the region and as quickly as possible. The Iranian regime's longest suffering victims are its own people. Iran has a rich history and culture, but the people of Iran have endured hardship and despair under their leader's reckless pursuit of conflict and terror. Until the Iranian regime is willing to be a partner for peace, all nations of conscience must work together to isolate it, deny it, funding for terrorism, cannot do it, and pray for the day when the Iranian people have the just and righteous government they so richly deserve. The decisions we make will affect countless lives. King Salman, I thank you for the creation of this great moment in history and for your massive investments in America and its industries and its jobs. I also thank you for investing in the future of this part of the world, the fertile region -- and it is so fertile -- has all of the ingredients for extraordinary success: A rich history and culture, a young and vibrant people, a thriving spirit of enterprise. You can only unlock this future if the citizens of the Middle East are freed from extremism, terror, and violence. We in this room are the leaders of our peoples. They look to us for answers and for action. And when we

look back at their faces, behind every pair of eyes is a soul that yearns for justice and yearns for peace. Today, billions of faces are now looking at us, waiting for us to act on the great question of our time. Will we be indifferent in the presence of evil? Will we protect our citizens from its violent ideology? Will we let its venom spread through our societies? Will we let it destroy the most holy sites on earth? If we do not confront this deadly terror, we know what the future will bring -- more suffering, more death, and more despair. But if we act, if we leave this magnificent room unified and determined to do what it takes to destroy the terror that threatens the world, then there is no limit to the great future our citizens will have. The birthplace of civilization is waiting to begin a new renaissance. Just imagine what tomorrow could bring,

glorious wonders of science, art, medicine, and commerce to inspire mankind. Great cities built on the ruins of shattered towns. New jobs and industries that will lift up millions and millions of people. Parents who no longer worry for their children, their families, and who no longer mourn for their loved ones. And the faithful who finally worship without fear. These are the blessings of prosperity and peace. These are the desires that burn with a righteous flame in every single human heart. And these are the just demands of our beloved people. I ask you to join me, to join together, to work together, and to fight together, because united we will not fail. We cannot fail. Nobody, absolutely nobody, can beat us. Thank you. God bless you, God bless your countries, and God bless the United States of America. Thank you very much. Thank you.

The ninth speech

Donald Trump

Remarks by President Trump to the 72nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly

September 19, 2017

Mr. Secretary General, Mr. President, world leaders, and distinguished delegates: Welcome to New York. It is a profound honor to stand here in my home city, as a representative of the American people, to address the people of the world.



As millions of our citizens continue to suffer the effects of the devastating hurricanes that have struck our country, I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to every leader in this room who has offered assistance and aid. The American people are strong and resilient, and they will emerge from these hardships more determined than ever before.

Fortunately, the United States has done very well since Election Day last November 8th. The stock market is at an all-time high — a record. Unemployment is at its lowest level in 16 years, and because of our regulatory and other reforms, we have more people working in the United States today than ever before. Companies are moving back, creating job growth the likes of which our country has not seen in a very long time. And it has just been announced that we will be spending almost \$700 billion on our military and defense.

Our military will soon be the strongest it has ever been. For more than 70 years, in times of war and peace, the leaders of nations, movements, and religions have stood before this assembly. Like them, I intend to address some of the very serious threats before us today but also the enormous potential waiting to be unleashed.

We live in a time of extraordinary opportunity. Breakthroughs in science, technology, and medicine are curing illnesses and solving problems that prior generations thought impossible to solve.

But each day also brings news of growing dangers that threaten everything we cherish and value. Terrorists and extremists have gathered strength and spread to every region of the planet. Rogue regimes represented in this body not only support terrorists but threaten other nations and their own people with the most destructive weapons known to humanity.

Authority and authoritarian powers seek to collapse the values, the systems, and alliances that prevented conflict and tilted the world toward freedom since World War II.

International criminal networks traffic drugs, weapons, people; force dislocation and mass migration; threaten our borders; and new forms of aggression exploit technology to menace our citizens.

ALL NEWS

REMARKS Remarks by President Trump to the 72nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly FOREIGN POLICY Issued on: September 19, 2017

To put it simply, we meet at a time of both of immense promise and great peril. It is entirely up to us whether we lift the world to new heights, or let it fall into a valley of disrepair.

We have it in our power, should we so choose, to lift millions from poverty, to help our citizens realize their dreams, and to ensure that new generations of children are raised free from violence, hatred, and fear.

This institution was founded in the aftermath of two world wars to help shape this better future. It was based on the vision that diverse nations could cooperate to protect their sovereignty, preserve their security, and promote their prosperity.

It was in the same period, exactly 70 years ago, that the United States developed the Marshall Plan to help restore Europe. Those three beautiful pillars — they're pillars of peace, sovereignty, security, and prosperity.

The Marshall Plan was built on the noble idea that the whole world is safer when nations are strong, independent, and free. As President Truman said in his message to Congress at that time, "Our support of European recovery is in full accord with our support of the United Nations. The success of the United Nations depends upon the independent strength of its members."

To overcome the perils of the present and to achieve the promise of the future, we must begin with the wisdom of the past. Our success depends on a coalition of strong and independent nations that embrace their sovereignty to promote security, prosperity, and peace for themselves and for the world.

We do not expect diverse countries to share the same cultures, traditions, or even systems of government. But we do expect all nations to uphold these two core sovereign duties: to respect the interests of their own people and the rights of every other sovereign nation. This is the beautiful vision of this institution, and this is foundation for cooperation and success.

Strong, sovereign nations let diverse countries with different values, different cultures, and different dreams not just coexist, but work side by side on the basis of mutual respect.

Strong, sovereign nations let their people take ownership of the future and control their own destiny. And strong, sovereign nations allow individuals to flourish in the fullness of the life intended by God.

In America, we do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example for everyone to watch. This week gives our country a special reason to take pride in that example. We are celebrating the 230th anniversary of our beloved Constitution — the oldest constitution still in use in the world today.

This timeless document has been the foundation of peace, prosperity, and freedom for the Americans and for countless millions around the globe whose own countries have found inspiration in its respect for human nature, human dignity, and the rule of law.

The greatest in the United States Constitution is its first three beautiful words. They are: “We the people.”

Generations of Americans have sacrificed to maintain the promise of those words, the promise of our country, and of our great history. In America, the people govern, the people rule, and the people are

sovereign. I was elected not to take power, but to give power to the American people, where it belongs.

In foreign affairs, we are renewing this founding principle of sovereignty. Our government's first duty is to its people, to our citizens — to serve their needs, to ensure their safety, to preserve their rights, and to defend their values.

As President of the United States, I will always put America first, just like you, as the leaders of your countries will always, and should always, put your countries first. (Applause.)

All responsible leaders have an obligation to serve their own citizens, and the nation-state remains the best vehicle for elevating the human condition.

But making a better life for our people also requires us to work together in close harmony and unity to create a more safe and peaceful future for all people.

The United States will forever be a great friend to the world, and especially to its allies. But we can no longer be taken advantage of, or enter into a one-sided deal where the United States gets nothing in return. As long as I hold this office, I will defend America's interests above all else.

But in fulfilling our obligations to our own nations, we also realize that it's in everyone's interest to seek a future where all nations can be sovereign, prosperous, and secure.

America does more than speak for the values expressed in the United Nations Charter. Our citizens have paid the ultimate price to defend our freedom and the freedom of many nations represented in this great hall.

America's devotion is measured on the battlefields where our young men and women have fought and sacrificed alongside of our allies, from the beaches of Europe to the deserts of the Middle East to the jungles of Asia.

It is an eternal credit to the American character that even after we and our allies emerged victorious from the bloodiest war in history, we did not seek territorial expansion, or attempt to oppose and impose our way of life on others. Instead, we helped build institutions such as this one to defend the sovereignty, security, and prosperity for all.

For the diverse nations of the world, this is our hope. We want harmony and friendship, not conflict and strife. We are guided by outcomes, not ideology. We have a policy of principled realism, rooted in shared goals, interests, and values.

That realism forces us to confront a question facing every leader and nation in this room. It is a question we cannot escape or avoid. We will slide down the path of complacency, numb to the challenges, threats, and even wars that we face. Or do we have enough strength and pride to confront those dangers today, so that our citizens can enjoy peace and prosperity tomorrow?

If we desire to lift up our citizens, if we aspire to the approval of history, then we must fulfill our sovereign duties to the people we faithfully represent. We must protect our nations, their interests, and their futures. We must reject threats to sovereignty, from the Ukraine to the South China Sea. We must uphold respect for law, respect for borders, and respect for culture, and the peaceful engagement these allow. And just as the founders of this body intended, we must work together and confront together those who threaten us with chaos, turmoil, and terror.

The scourge of our planet today is a small group of rogue regimes that violate every principle on which the United Nations is based. They respect neither their own citizens nor the sovereign rights of their countries.

If the righteous many do not confront the wicked few, then evil will triumph. When decent people and nations become bystanders to history, the forces of destruction only gather power and strength.

No one has shown more contempt for other nations and for the wellbeing of their own people than the depraved regime in North Korea. It is responsible for the starvation deaths of millions of North Koreans, and for the imprisonment, torture, killing, and oppression of countless more.

We were all witness to the regime's deadly abuse when an innocent American college student, Otto Warmbier, was returned to America only to die a few days later. We saw it in the assassination of the dictator's brother using banned nerve agents in an international airport. We know it kidnapped a sweet 13-year-old Japanese girl from a beach in her own country to enslave her as a language tutor for North Korea's spies.

If this is not twisted enough, now North Korea's reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles threatens the entire world with unthinkable loss of human life.

It is an outrage that some nations would not only trade with such a regime, but would arm, supply, and financially support a country that imperils the world with nuclear conflict. No nation on earth has an interest in seeing this band of criminals arm itself with nuclear weapons and missiles.

The United States has great strength and patience, but if it is forced to defend itself or its allies, we will have no choice but to totally destroy North Korea. Rocket Man is on a suicide mission for himself and for his regime. The United States is ready, willing and able, but hopefully this will not be necessary. That's what the United Nations is all about; that's what the United Nations is for. Let's see how they do.

It is time for North Korea to realize that the denuclearization is its only acceptable future. The United Nations Security Council recently held two unanimous 15-0 votes adopting hard-hitting resolutions against North Korea, and I want to thank China and Russia for joining the vote to impose sanctions, along with all of the other members of the Security Council. Thank you to all involved.

But we must do much more. It is time for all nations to work together to isolate the Kim regime until it ceases its hostile behavior.

We face this decision not only in North Korea. It is far past time for the nations of the world to confront another reckless regime — one that speaks openly of mass murder, vowing death to America, destruction to Israel, and ruin for many leaders and nations in this room .

The Iranian government masks a corrupt dictatorship behind the false guise of a democracy. It has turned a wealthy country with a rich history and culture into an economically depleted rogue state whose chief exports are violence, bloodshed, and chaos. The longest-suffering victims of Iran's leaders are, in fact, its own people.

Rather than use its resources to improve Iranian lives, its oil profits go to fund Hezbollah and other terrorists that kill innocent Muslims and attack their peaceful Arab and Israeli neighbors. This wealth, which rightly belongs to Iran's people, also goes to shore up Bashar al-Assad's

dictatorship, fuel Yemen's civil war, and undermine peace throughout the entire Middle East.

We cannot let a murderous regime continue these destabilizing activities while building dangerous missiles, and we cannot abide by an agreement if it provides cover for the eventual construction of a nuclear program . (Applause.) The Iran Deal was one of the worst and most one-sided transactions the United States has ever entered into. Frankly, that deal is an embarrassment to the United States, and I don't think you've heard the last of it — believe me.

It is time for the entire world to join us in demanding that Iran's government end its pursuit of death and destruction. It is time for the regime to free all Americans and citizens of other nations that they have unjustly detained. And above all, Iran's government must stop supporting terrorists, begin serving its own people, and respect the sovereign rights of its neighbors.

The entire world understands that the good people of Iran want change, and, other than the vast military power of the United States, that Iran's people are what their leaders fear the most. This is what causes the regime to restrict Internet access, tear down satellite dishes,

shoot unarmed student protestors, and imprison political reformers.

Oppressive regimes cannot endure forever, and the day will come when the Iranian people will face a choice. Will they continue down the path of poverty, bloodshed, and terror? Or will the Iranian people return to the nation's proud roots as a center of civilization, culture, and wealth where their people can be happy and prosperous once again?

The Iranian regime's support for terror is in stark contrast to the recent commitments of many of its neighbors to fight terrorism and halt its financing.

In Saudi Arabia early last year, I was greatly honored to address the leaders of more than 50 Arab and Muslim nations. We agreed that all responsible nations must work together to confront terrorists and the Islamist extremism that inspires them .

We will stop radical Islamic terrorism because we cannot allow it to tear up our nation, and indeed to tear up the entire world.

We must deny the terrorists safe haven, transit, funding, and any form of support for their vile and sinister ideology. We must drive them out of our nations. It is time to expose and hold responsible those countries who support and finance terror groups like al Qaeda, Hezbollah, the Taliban and others that slaughter innocent people.

The United States and our allies are working together throughout the Middle East to crush the loser terrorists and stop the reemergence of safe havens they use to launch attacks on all of our people.

Last month, I announced a new strategy for victory in the fight against this evil in Afghanistan. From now on, our security interests will dictate the length and scope of military operations, not arbitrary benchmarks and timetables set up by politicians.

I have also totally changed the rules of engagement in our fight against the Taliban and other terrorist groups. In Syria and Iraq, we have made big gains toward lasting defeat of ISIS. In fact, our country has achieved

more against ISIS in the last eight months than it has in many, many years combined.

We seek the de-escalation of the Syrian conflict, and a political solution that honors the will of the Syrian people. The actions of the criminal regime of Bashar al-Assad, including the use of chemical weapons against his own citizens — even innocent children — shock the conscience of every decent person. No society can be safe if banned chemical weapons are allowed to spread. That is why the United States carried out a missile strike on the airbase that launched the attack.

We appreciate the efforts of United Nations agencies that are providing vital humanitarian assistance in areas liberated from ISIS, and we especially thank Jordan, Turkey and Lebanon for their role in hosting refugees from the Syrian conflict.

The United States is a compassionate nation and has spent billions and billions of dollars in helping to support this effort. We seek an approach to refugee resettlement that is designed to help these horribly treated people, and which enables their eventual return to their home countries, to be part of the rebuilding process.

For the cost of resettling one refugee in the United States, we can assist more than 10 in their home region. Out of the goodness of our hearts, we offer financial assistance to hosting countries in the region, and we support recent agreements of the G20 nations that will seek to host refugees as close to their home countries as possible. This is the safe, responsible, and humanitarian approach.

For decades, the United States has dealt with migration challenges here in the Western Hemisphere. We have learned that, over the long term ,

uncontrolled migration is deeply unfair to both the sending and the receiving countries.

For the sending countries, it reduces domestic pressure to pursue needed political and economic reform , and drains them of the human capital necessary to motivate and implement those reforms.

For the receiving countries, the substantial costs of uncontrolled migration are borne overwhelmingly by low-income citizens whose concerns are often ignored by both media and government.

I want to salute the work of the United Nations in seeking to address the problems that cause people to flee from their homes. The United Nations and African Union led peacekeeping missions to have invaluable contributions in stabilizing conflicts in Africa. The United States continues to lead the world in humanitarian assistance, including famine prevention and relief in South Sudan, Somalia, and northern Nigeria and Yemen.

We have invested in better health and opportunity all over the world through programs like PEPFAR, which funds AIDS relief; the President's Malaria Initiative; the Global Health Security Agenda; the Global Fund to End Modern Slavery; and the Women Entrepreneurs Finance Initiative, part of our commitment to empowering women all across the globe.

We also thank — (applause) — we also thank the Secretary General for recognizing that the United Nations must reform if it is to be an effective partner in confronting threats to sovereignty, security, and prosperity. Too often the focus of this organization has not been on results, but on bureaucracy and process.

In some cases, states that seek to subvert this institution's noble aims have hijacked the very systems that are supposed to advance them . For example, it is a massive source of embarrassment to the United Nations that some governments with egregious human rights records sit on the U.N. Human Rights Council.

The United States is one out of 193 countries in the United Nations, and yet we pay 22 percent of the entire budget and more. In fact, we pay far more than anybody realizes. The United States bears an unfair cost burden, but, to be fair, if it could actually accomplish all of its stated goals, especially the goal of peace, this investment would easily be well worth it.

Major portions of the world are in conflict and some, in fact, are going to hell. But the powerful people in this room , under the guidance and auspices of the United Nations, can solve many of these vicious and complex problems.

The American people hope that one day soon the United Nations can be a much more accountable and effective advocate for human dignity and freedom around the world. In the meantime, we believe that no nation should have to bear a disproportionate share of the burden, militarily or financially. Nations of the world must take a greater role in promoting secure and prosperous societies in their own regions.

That is why in the Western Hemisphere, the United States has stood against the corrupt and destabilizing regime in Cuba and embraced the enduring dream of the Cuban people to live in freedom . My administration recently announced that we will not lift sanctions on the Cuban government until it makes fundamental reforms.

We have also imposed tough, calibrated sanctions on the socialist Maduro regime in Venezuela, which has brought a once thriving nation to the brink of total collapse.

The socialist dictatorship of Nicolas Maduro has inflicted terrible pain and suffering on the good people of that country. This corrupt regime destroyed a prosperous nation by imposing a failed ideology that has produced poverty and misery everywhere it has been tried. To make matters worse, Maduro has defied his own people, stealing power from their elected representatives to preserve his disastrous rule.

The Venezuelan people are starving and their country is collapsing. Their democratic institutions are being destroyed. This situation is completely unacceptable and we cannot stand by and watch.

As a responsible neighbor and friend, we and all others have a goal. That goal is to help them regain their freedom , recover their country, and restore their democracy. I would like to thank leaders in this room for condemning the regime and providing vital support to the Venezuelan people.

The United States has taken important steps to hold the regime accountable. We are prepared to take further action if the government of Venezuela persists on its path to impose authoritarian rule on the Venezuelan people.

We are fortunate to have incredibly strong and healthy trade relationships with many of the Latin American countries gathered here today. Our economic bond forms a critical foundation for advancing peace and prosperity for all of our people and all of our neighbors.

I ask every country represented here today to be prepared to do more to address this very real crisis. We call for the full restoration of democracy and political freedoms in Venezuela. (Applause.)

The problem in Venezuela is not that socialism has been poorly implemented, but that socialism has been faithfully implemented. (Applause.) From the Soviet Union to Cuba to Venezuela, wherever true socialism or communism has been adopted, it has delivered anguish and devastation and failure. Those who preach the tenets of these discredited ideologies only contribute to the continued suffering of the people who live under these cruel systems.

America stands with every person living under a brutal regime. Our respect for sovereignty is also a call for action. All people deserve a government that cares for their safety, their interests, and their wellbeing, including their prosperity.

In America, we seek stronger ties of business and trade with all nations of good will, but this trade must be fair and it must be reciprocal.

For too long, the American people were told that mammoth multinational trade deals, unaccountable international tribunals, and powerful global bureaucracies were the best way to promote their success. But as those promises flowed, millions of jobs vanished and thousands of factories disappeared. Others gamed the system and broke the rules. And our great middle class, once the bedrock of American prosperity, was forgotten and left behind, but they are forgotten no more and they will never be forgotten again.

While America will pursue cooperation and commerce with other nations, we are renewing our commitment to the first duty of every government:

the duty of our citizens. This bond is the source of America's strength and that of every responsible nation represented here today.

If this organization is to have any hope of successfully confronting the challenges before us, it will depend, as President Truman said some 70 years ago, on the "independent strength of its members." If we are to embrace the opportunities of the future and overcome the present dangers together, there can be no substitute for strong, sovereign, and independent nations — nations that are rooted in their histories and invested in their destinies; nations that seek allies to befriend, not enemies to conquer; and most important of all, nations that are home to patriots, to men and women who are willing to sacrifice for their countries, their fellow citizens, and for all that is best in the human spirit.

In remembering the great victory that led to this body's founding, we must never forget that those heroes who fought against evil also fought for the nations that they loved.

Patriotism led the Poles to die to save Poland, the French to fight for a free France, and the Brits to stand strong for Britain.

Today, if we do not invest ourselves, our hearts, and our minds in our nations, if we will not build strong families, safe communities, and healthy societies for ourselves, no one can do it for us.

We cannot wait for someone else, for faraway countries or far-off bureaucrats — we can't do it. We must solve our problems, to build our prosperity, to secure our futures, or we will be vulnerable to decay, domination, and defeat.

The true question for the United Nations today, for people all over the world who hope for better lives for themselves and their children, is a

basic one: Are we still patriots? Do we love our nations enough to protect their sovereignty and to take ownership of their futures? Do we revere them enough to defend their interests, preserve their cultures, and ensure a peaceful world for their citizens?

One of the greatest American patriots, John Adams, wrote that the American Revolution was “effected before the war commenced. The Revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people.”

That was the moment when America awoke, when we looked around and understood that we were a nation. We realized who we were, what we valued, and what we would give our lives to defend. From its very first moments, the American story is the story of what is possible when people take ownership of their future.

The United States of America has been among the greatest forces for good in the history of the world, and the greatest defenders of sovereignty, security, and prosperity for all.

Now we are calling for a great reawakening of nations, for the revival of their spirits, their pride, their people, and their patriotism .

History is asking us whether we are up to the task. Our answer will be a renewal of will, a rediscovery of resolve, and a rebirth of devotion. We need to defeat the enemies of humanity and unlock the potential of life itself.

Our hope is a world of proud, independent nations that embrace their duties, seek friendship, respect others, and make common cause in the greatest shared interest of all: a future of dignity and peace for the people of this wonderful Earth.

This is the true vision of the United Nations, the ancient wish of every people, and the deepest yearning that lives inside every sacred soul.

So let this be our mission, and let this be our message to the world: We will fight together, sacrifice together, and stand together for peace, for freedom , for justice, for family, for humanity, and for the almighty God who made us all.

Thank you. God bless you. God bless the nations of the world. And God bless the United States of America. Thank you very much

المستخلص

التعبيرية هي تلك الأنواع من أفعال الكلام التي توضح ما يشعر به المتحدثون. يعبرون عن ظروف نفسية ويمكن أن يكونوا يبيانات عن السعادة والألم والإعجاب والكرهية والفرح والشكوى. عندما يتعامل الناس مع أشخاص آخرين، فإنهم لا يوافقون أو يعجبون دائمًا. إنهم يختلفون أحيانًا أو لا يعارضون ذلك أحيانًا. من أجل إظهار عدم موافقتهم أو عدم موافقتهم على ذلك، فإنهم يعارضون ذلك. وفقًا للكلام، فإن متحدثي نظرية التصرف يمنحون الكلام للتعبير عن نواياهم بما في ذلك الشكاوى. الشكاوى هي الشاغل الرئيسي للدراسة الحالية هي المساهمة الأكثر نفوذًا للبراغماتيين. في خطاب خطاب الشكاوى، "يعبر المتحدث عن أو استيائه أو إزعاجه كرد فعل على الفعل الماضي أو المستمر.

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى وصف طرق التعبير عن فعل خطاب الشكاوى من قبل السياسيين في الخطب التسعة لرؤساء الولايات المتحدة بوش وأوباما وترامب. يحاول إظهار وظائف الشكاوى التي يستخدمها السياسيون في الخطب السياسية. كما يبرز ويحدد استراتيجيات الشكاوى التي يستخدمها السياسيون الثلاثة. تم اختيار نماذج (Trosborg's (1994 و (Olshtain and Weinbach (1987) لتحليل المقطعات المختارة.

تكشف النتائج أنه فيما يتعلق بالأفعال التوجيهية المحددة في البيانات التي تم تحليلها، يتم استخدام طلب الإصلاح أكثر من طلب الصبر أو التهديد. علاوة على ذلك، يتم استخدام استراتيجية الاتهام المباشر بشكل متكرر للتعبير عن خطاب الشكاوى الذي استخدمه السياسيون، ومع ذلك فإن استراتيجية اللوم المعدل لم تستخدم قط.

تنقسم الدراسة إلى خمسة فصول: الفصل الأول يهتم بالمواد الأولية للدراسة مثل المشكلة، وأهداف الدراسة، والفرضية، والإجراءات، وحدود الدراسة، وقيمة الدراسة. الفصل الثاني مكرس لمراجعة الأدب. الفصل الثالث يتضمن منهجية البحث في حين يقدم الفصل الرابع تحليل بيانات الخطاب السياسي الذي



يغطي- تحليل-المشكلة. الفصل
الخامس- يوضح-الاستنتاجات
والاقتراحات لمزيد من البحث.

جامعة ميسان
كلية التربية
قسم اللغة الإنجليزية

دراسة تداوليه لغويه لافعال التشكي
في خطابات سياسية مكتوبة مختارة

اطروحه مقدمه إلى مجلس كلية التربية ، جامعة ميسان
في الإنجاز الجزئي لمتطلبات درجة الماجستير في
الآداب في اللغة الإنجليزية واللغويات

اعداد الطالبه

شيماء حمد سعد الموسوي

**باشراف الاستاذة
اقبال صاحب دشر**

2019