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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the metaphors embedded in President Barack Obama’s speech in Cairo, delivered on June 4, 2009. Mr. Obama delivered his speech at a time when the dissonance between the Muslim world and the West expanded. The rhetor’s motive was to arrest the increasingly compounded atmosphere of rapprochements between the two worlds. The study employed two philosophical foundations, Burkean identification- consubstantiation and Buber’s I-thou personality theory. The two philosophies promote the notion of humankind’s sharing of a bond. The study categorizes the deployment of metaphors into archetypal and transcendent metaphors; the results show that both types of metaphors serve a cohesive function and entail the potential bridging of an ideological or perceived divide that inspires hostilities and conflicts around the world.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Because metaphoric analysis is a subsidiary of rhetorical criticism, it is necessary, from the outset, to define the term *rhetoric* and thereafter to determine the function of rhetorical criticism in knowledge building and meaning making. Then, it follows that one should evaluate the notion of metaphors and their value in rhetorical understanding, especially in building global rapport. One way of constructing global rapport is by creating archetypal and transcendent metaphors. Archetypal and transcendent metaphors promote understanding and advance universal cohesion. The following section will define *rhetoric*.

The Word *Rhetoric*

The word *rhetoric* originally referenced speech and dialogue. However, the term’s meaning has since evolved to encompass all aspects of culture in representing a sign or symbol that speaks to and persuades society. This sign or device (rhetorical object) in its expanded interpretation could be verbal or nonverbal, textual or nontextual. Rhetoric, therefore, is the act of creating signs and symbols of communication and the strategies employed to achieve the communicative act (Foss, 2009).

Rhetorical Criticism

*Rhetorical criticism* seeks to discover the stylistic structure of a rhetorical object. The rhetorical critic starts with the assumption that every rhetorical object is purposive. He or she seeks to understand the objectives of the rhetorical artifact through a dynamic or fixed systematic process and then generates generalizations from singularities. In the end, the rhetorical critic displays how the different parts of the artifact logically forward or thwart the object’s intended purpose. This final product provides a utile value that constructs a theoretical tributary to the
discipline of rhetoric. Such activity also defines the critic as an active participant in shaping the nature of the worlds in which we live (Foss, 2009).

What Is Metaphor Analysis?

*Metaphor analysis*, as its name suggests, places metaphor at the heart of rhetorical criticism. As a means for expressing arguments, metaphor may provide insight into a speaker’s motives or an audience’s social reality. Metaphor is not a simple substitution of one term for another but a way of creating a powerful perceptual link between the two things (Foss, 2009). According to Lakoff and Johnson (as cited in Foss, 2009), substituting one thing for another can cause an auditor to view the entailments of the metaphor as being true, even if there is no objective basis for doing so.

Metaphoric Clusters

Koller (2003) observed that metaphoric expression tends to organize in chains across texts. Clusters raise the question as to the role that the disparate metaphoric expressions serve in different parts of a text as well as in relation to each other. The critic usually investigates the multifunctionality of the metaphoric chains or clusters and the implications of the cognitive scenarios they invoke. For instance, President Franklin Roosevelt, in an attempt to convince Americans of his presidential capacity, described himself as a physician who would heal the nation from the disease of fear. The metaphoric clusters are *physician, heal, fear,* and *disease* (Kiene, 2007). President Roosevelt used those metaphoric clusters to confront the realities that faced the United States at the time.

Metaphor is a vital mechanism by which symbols construct reality (Foss, 2009). In the United States, one reality that asserts profound influence over the history of presidential rhetoric is the Persian Gulf War. This war developed a genre of rhetoric with *savagery* and *civilization*
chains (Bates, as cited in Foss, 2009); President George W. Bush exploited such metaphoric clusters after the September 11, 2001, attacks on the U.S. Pentagon and World Trade Center (hereinafter referred to as 9/11) to launch an invasion on Iraq.

**Metaphor Defines and Redefines Perspective**

Benjamin Bates (as cited in Foss, 2009), in the essay “Audiences, Metaphors, and the Persian Gulf,” depicted how metaphors redefine perspective. The essay analyzed the former President George H. W. Bush’s savagery–civilization metaphors deployed to engender global approval for his Operation Desert Storm in 1990. President W. Bush’s speech entailed “constant motive force that emphasized common values and collective interest” (p. 279). It advocated that the coalition constituted an embodiment of civilization, whereas Saddam Hussein was metaphoric of savagery. By applying the archetypal intended savagery–civilization clusters, Bush cemented his logic to wage war against Iraq.

**Archetypal Metaphors**

Archetypal (universalized) metaphors allow all sides to find ideological justification for political action. When a rhetorical subject is related to an archetypal metaphor, a kind of double association occurs. According to Ivie (as cited in Foss, 2009), the subject is associated with a prominent feature of experience that has already become associated with basic human motivation. President Barack Obama’s Cairo speech faced the same challenge: It relied on archetypal metaphors to make its argument stronger.

According to Foss (2009), archetypal metaphors hold “persuasive power and potential for cross-cultural communication” (p. 282). Obama’s speech challenged the metaphors manifest in arguments that enshrine hidden wholeness and persuade people of the need for an undivided life, to welcome souls to weave a community in a wounded world (Palmer, 2004).
Metaphor and American Postwar Experience

Research on the metaphoric analysis of post-9/11 events is scarce. The challenge in this critical investigation is to identify how the rhetor strategized and replaced savagery–civilization brands with the rhetoric of transcendence, and of an ever-deepening authenticity that cuts across all categories and apply to every human activity (Carey, 2012, p.3).

Metaphor and 9/11 Events

The explosion that consumed the Twin Towers in New York City, leading to the death of many, was metaphoric of hatred for the United States and the Christian world; there was a need to arrest this unfortunate trend. This need required a highly potent cluster of metaphors that replaced old, dysfunctional paradigms with new ones. In addition, such new metaphors were required to provide psychic healing (especially after the subsequent, controversial invasion of Iraq) and chart a viable course toward global peace and coexistence.

The Metaphoric Challenge of Obama’s Speech in Cairo

Obama delivered his speech in Cairo at a time when hostility toward the United States was high. A series of threats led to the 9/11 saga, and thereafter, the war in Iraq and Afghanistan painted the United States as a bully, thereby justifying terrorist actions toward the nation. This thesis seeks to discover how Obama’s Cairo speech redefined and upturned the terrorist group’s generative metaphor of hatred toward the Christian world and the United States in particular. Among the challenges posed to the rhetor include the argument that (as Obama stated in the 11th paragraph of his speech) “Muslims do not fit a crude stereotype, [and in a similar manner that] America is not the crude stereotype of a self-interested Empire” but a willing partner in the global progress of the world in collaboration with universal cohesion and prosperity. Utilizing Buber’s I–thou personality theory and the Burkean principle of identification–consubstantiation,
this study dissects Obama’s speech in Cairo with the aim of identifying the metaphoric content and how it helped to promote or demote the rhetor’s rhetorical vision.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of this study is that since George Bush’s era, war rhetoric has been prevalent, but war rhetoric has no healing, holistic character. The rhetor in the artifact of study seeks to establish a peace rhetoric to supplant his predecessor’s rhetoric, which inspired division and hostility.

**Projection.**

Chapter 2 entails the literature review; this chapter presents philosophical foundation of the study and concludes with three research questions. Chapter 3 discusses the scope and methodology of the study. Chapter 4 presents, analyzes and interprets the artifact of the study. Chapter 5 summarizes the research, pinpoints its limitations, and suggests recommendation for further studies.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Two philosophical foundations, Burkean identification–consubstantialization and Buber’s I–thou personality theory, open this review. Thereafter, a discussion of the concept of metaphor and its construal processes follows. Then the review scrutinizes two functional characteristics of metaphor: archetypal, and transcendent. Afterward, an assessment of the function of the rhetorical critic and, specifically, the function of a metaphor critic follows. Thereafter, the research reviews the rhetorical subgenre of presidential speeches and delineates that researchers have not been keen on investigating the field of metaphorical analysis of presidential speeches. The last argument then ushers in the motivation behind this study. The presentation of three research questions concludes chapter 2.

Philosophical Foundations

This section presents the research’s two philosophical approaches. A uniform thread that runs through the three listed philosophies is that humankind has a singular bond; therefore there is a need to regard the Other as compassionately as the self (Brock, 1999).

Identification–consubstantialization. Kenneth Burke pioneered the term *consubstantialization* in rhetorical studies. In his book *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Burke, 1969), he paired the term with the concept of *identification*. Burke defined the principle of consubstantiation in the following way:

A is not identical with his colleague B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B or he may identify with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are or is persuaded to believe so. (p. 180)

(Burke’s definition is somehow confusing, but Buber’s concept of I–thou rapture, discussed later, will make it clearer). Four words in the preceding definition simplify the term
**consubstantiation**: “joined,” “interest,” “persuade,” and “believe.” Burke means that a common bond and existential interest join humanity. Humankind has common transcendent sensations and attitudes toward life that create affinity (Burke, 1969). Consubstantiation seeks a global, common interest and indicts contrary acts. Burke, in his *A Rhetoric of Motives*, referred to “contrary acts” as actions of conflict and war and labeled them as a “perversion of humankind’s communion” (p. 22).

Consubstantiation assists in identifying metaphoric points of unity, common truths, and collective existential goals. The challenge for a rhetorical critic in this context is to identify persuasive elements depicting the path of peace (Burke, 1969) through manifest metaphoric clusters of rapprochement and cohesion.

The significance of consubstantiation as a philosophical foundation for this research is that it assists the rhetor in making arguments on “preestablished harmony” (Burke, 1969, p. 193) between conflicting factions. This is a perspective in consonance with the concept of moral transcendence in Kant, in which the notion of a *universal whole* provides an expanded consciousness and cohesion. The rhetor’s motive is ultimately, as the spirit of consubstantiation dictates, to douse hostilities among humankind globally.

**Bubers’ I-Thou Philosophy**

Buber’s I-thou philosophy is in tandem with Burke’s notion of consubstantiation in that to identify with another is to seek a connection with the “thou” (Griffin, 2009; Smith, 2000). Buber (as cited in Smith, 2000) made this clear in a series of images:

A spinner is spinning the orbits of all stars and the life of all creation and the history of the universe. Everything is woven on the thread, and is no longer called stars and
creation, but . . . Soul . . . The I is embedded in the world and there is really no I at all.

(p. 74)

“Spinner” is a reference to one common deity that brings all creation into existence. In that view, flowing from the Burkean identification principle to Buber’s bond of union theory is the argument that to unleash chaos on anyone is to unleash chaos on oneself.

The relevance of “I-thou” philosophy to this research is that it resolves feelings of antagonism and terrorist acts globally. The philosophy suggests that terrorism, for instance, aims at destroying perceived Others but is an equally self-destructive action. This principle will help to delineate the rhetor’s arguments on “the journey toward an undivided life” (Palmer, 2004, p.ix) among humankind and advance the agenda of rapprochement between the Muslim world and the United States.

The next point to consider is the kind of conceptual work toward which this philosophy directs the rhetorical critic. The philosophy directs the critic toward contexts in which individuals and groups are at odds with one another. According to Gusfield (1989), “the question is why at odds when the titular term is identification?” (p. 181). The response is that “I-thou” ideology is an instrument that effectively confronts existent division or conflict (Gusfield, 1989). Equally, it assists the rhetorical critic in diagnosing such conflicts as a “pervasion of communion” (p. 181); “after all, if men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to [campaign] for their unity” (p. 182). The next section defines metaphor as a concept and discusses the functions of a rhetorical critic.

The Concept of Metaphor

Metaphor is a device for seeing something in terms of something else (Gusfield, 1989). Metaphor tells us something about one character as considered from the point of view of another
character. According to Burke (as cited in Gusfield, 1989), to consider A from the point of view of B is, of course, to use B as a perspective upon A. Such substitution leads to the awareness of a new reality.

Seeing something in terms of something else involves carrying over a term from one realm into another, a process that necessarily involves varying degrees of incongruity in that the two realms are never identical. For instance, the metaphor “the man has a lion’s heart” consists of the tropes “man” and “lion.” In this instance, the man is the trope or topic, and the lion is the vehicle or phenomenon conveyed. The interacting attributes are like filters that highlight certain associations, suppress some, and redefine others. After the transfer of attributes takes place, ideas, situations, and feelings reorganize and vivify or, paradoxically, condense and expand. The result generates associations and deeper levels of meaning with an emergent conceptual insight (Feinstein, 1984; Zhang & Gao, 2009).

When metaphors are systematic, they help order the thought flow of speech interaction. However, no such ordering is possible without the rhetor’s awareness of contextual and cultural influences surrounding the speech delivery. Milonowski (as cited in Williams, 2005) considered the cultural settings of metaphors and defined the dynamics of metaphors: “The contextualization of meaning connects [significant attitude] with embodied experience” (p. 171). We order attitude about material things with the spirit of language; metaphors help shape our attitude effectively because people use language pragmatically to effect action (Williams, 2005). The effecting of action is more challenging in a multicultural context, but archetypal metaphors help to score cultural convergence. This review goes into detail about the concept of the archetype in the next section. This next section discusses the functional characteristics of metaphors such as metaphor as archetype, and metaphor as transcendent.
Characteristics of Metaphors

Archetypal metaphors. Human beings share kinship or oneness invoked through images, symbols, and metaphors. When such invocation is enacted in speech, a very deep chord is struck, or universal reaction results. Philip Wheelwright (as cited in Guerin, Labor, Morgan, Reesman, & Willingham, 2005), in his *Metaphors and Reality*, described archetypes as concepts which carry the same or very similar meanings for a large portion, if not all, of mankind. . . . Symbols, such as the sky, father and earth mother, light, blood, up-down the axis of a wheel, and others, recur again and again in cultures so remote from one another. (p. 184)

Images such as father, mother, light, or blood are primordial, which is to say, they are common to humankind no matter one’s creed, color, or race. Archetype is the universal language of humankind. According to Stephen (2004), Jung was conclusive in his studies that the human mind comprises some common deep structures.

Just as the physicist investigates particles and waves, and the biologist genes, so Jung held it to be the business of the psychologist to investigate the collective unconscious and the functional units of which it is composed - the archetypes, as he eventually called them. Archetypes are 'identical psychic structures common to all', which together constitute 'the archaic heritage of humanity.'(para.5)

After all, from the physiological perspective, we come into this world with a certain structure: We see in a certain way, hear in a certain way, process information in a certain way, and behave in a certain way because our neurons, glands, and muscles are structured in a certain way. “The phenomenon is a biological fact” (Stephens, 2004, para.14).
Guerin et al. (1979 pp. 182-191), in their book *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*, proposed what looks like a consensus list of universally acceptable archetypes. They divided archetypes into three categories: *images*, *motives*, and *genres*. Some examples of images are “water,” symbolic of the mystery of creation, and the sea, symbolic of timelessness. Others are the color red, symbolic of violent passion, and green, symbolic of death and decay. Other subcategories under image are cycle and number; cycle, for instance, is symbolic of wholeness and unity, whereas Guerin et al; identified the numbers three, four, five, and seven as significant archetypal numbers. Three, for instance, is symbolic of completeness, whereas seven symbolizes unity. Two other categories under images are desert, symbolize spiritual aridity and mountain, symbolizes spiritual elevation.

Under the genre category, Northrop Frye (as cited in Guerin et al., 1979), in his *Anatomy of Criticism*, correlated the literary genres with the seasons: spring is comedy; summer is romance; fall is tragedy; and winter is irony. Metaphors, if properly universalized, enact a conceptual model that allows all sides to find ideological justification for sociopolitical action (Foss, 2009). A contemporary example of rhetorical criticism that works with archetypes is the analysis by Hardy-Short and Bryant (1995) titled “Fire, Death, and Rebirth: A Metaphoric Analysis of the 1988 Yellowstone Fire Debate.” This essay analyzed the public debate concerning management of the 1988 Yellowstone forest fires. Two fundamental archetypal metaphors—*death* and *rebirth*—emerged from the debate. These metaphors provided a conceptual worldview that helped observers define the situation and gave advocate an intentional tool for advancing their own agendas regarding fire policy and national park management. The crisis brought a novel ecological perspective of public land management to the forefront of
public discussion; it evoked an urgency to resolve public lands crisis from a holistic, human-centered approach.

In a context in which a rhetorician speaks to an audience beyond his own people, archetypal metaphors, because of their persuasive power and potential for cross-cultural communication (Foss, 2009), are ideal. President Obama’s speech in Cairo comprised archetypal metaphoric clusters that emphasized the preeminence of our common humanity and inspired action that transcended a perceived divide. The next sections discuss transcendent metaphors.

**Transcendent Metaphors**

The concept of transcendence implies lifting (Gusfield, 1989). This lifting is from a normal self to a superior self. Kuspit (1991) called it an understanding that goes beyond the inauthentic self to the innermost self. This innermost self is the true self of humankind, whereby metaphysical experiences take place.

At the level of this authentic self, humankind is able to use symbols. As Gusfield (1989) stated, “when we use symbols for things, such symbols are not merely reflections of things symbolized . . . , they are to a degree a transcending of the things symbolized” (p. 200). But it was actually Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his essay “Nature,” that struck a chord regarding the meaning of transcendence when he said (as cited in Baym, 2003), in line with the preceding quotation, that the “intellect searches out the absolute order of things as they stand in the mind of God” (p. 492).

This is also to say, as Emerson advocated, that there is a supremacy of mind over matter; hence humankind can access the correspondence between the world and spirit through nature. Consequently, nature could become the catalyst through which humankind could perceive the divine. Transcendentalism is therefore a merger between God, Nature, Individuals, and Art.
Emerson stated that metaphors are important because they link individuals to nature and to the spirit. This link is symbolized by the universality of the soul. According to Emerson (as cited in Baym, 2003), “man is conscious of a universal soul within or behind his individual life” (p. 494).

One example of a practical use of the transcendental metaphor is Gleason’s (1964) research, titled “The Melting Pot: Symbol of Fusion or Confusion?” Gleason argued that the symbol—“melting pot”—provides a supernatural sanction for America’s existing social order. He said that it intimately relates to the origins and nature of American society in a sort of transcendental bond; it is descriptive of immigrants “blending,” “fusing,” and “smelting” processes (p. 23). The phrase was first made popular in a play by Israel Zangwill titled Are We A People? This play debuted in Washington, D.C., on October 5, 1908. The play boasted President Theodore Roosevelt as one of its first critics, who referred to the impact of the play as “stirring” (p. 24), echoing Emerson’s “universal soul” transcendent phenomenon. The researcher explored the rejection of the phrase melting pot by scholars on the grounds that it had inherent rhetorical inadequacy. He presented scholars’ replacement suggestions such as Karl E. Meyer’s culinary proposal of salad bowl because it depicts different nationalities as coexisting; Emily Green’s irradiation because it describes how the various ethnic groups interact with each other and their American surroundings; and Horace Kallen’s orchestra, which suggests how the various nationalities act like a choir that sings together in harmony. Gleason argued that those suggestions are rhetorically seductive but do not address the immigrants’ transcendent experiences as they adjust to their new environment or even to the reality of America’s ethnic interaction. Gleason concluded that melting pot as a phrase should stay because it is of a superior transcendent quality. The phrase’s merits include its entailment of America’s cultural pluralism, its reflection of America’s national aspiration of receptiveness, its respect for
America’s cultural values, and finally, its depiction of her harmonious integration and ever-evolving life as a nation. President Obama’s speech in Cairo had a similar ambition of making the Arab world see the United States from an integrated, harmonious, and transcendent perspective. The rhetorical choices made by President Obama as he gleaned transcendent metaphors to make a case for harmonious coexistence globally are the interest of this research.

It is the job of a rhetorical analyst to determine what is most valuable and worthwhile in a body of work. Rhetorical analysis endeavors to provoke an audience to think differently in a socially responsible way (Nothstine, Blair, & Copeland, 2003). The next section discusses in detail the functions of a rhetorical analyst.

**The Rhetorical Analyst**

Rhetoric is the use of symbols to communicate (Foss, 2009). A rhetorical analyst systematically determines the effectiveness of the symbols as deployed by the rhetor in making us see the world in one way rather than another (Foss, 2009). For instance, a rhetorical analysis of Obama’s speech may entail determining how the audience in Cairo perceived Obama’s speech or how the speech swayed minds to see the essence of our common humanity and the transcendental truth that to be violent to an innocent person is to be violent to the entire human race. When a rhetorical analyst telescopes metaphors in a speech, he or she plays the role of a metaphor critic or analyst.

**Metaphor Criticism**

The metaphor critic or analyst determines how a rhetor has successfully deployed symbols to construct reality (Foss, 2009). With regard to Obama’s speech, for instance, the question a metaphor critic may ask is, To what extent has Obama utilized metaphors to “organize attitudes” (p. 269) to plug into his vision? Metaphor criticism determines how metaphors assist
in creating a mirror of society. According to Foss, when metaphors help to shape the world or construct perspectives, they play a crucial role in “argumentation” (p. 270). Research studies on the critical role played by metaphors in swaying opinions “have been little studied” (p. 279); even less studied has been the role of metaphors in forging presidential speeches. The next section will discuss presidential speeches and the metaphor critic’s endeavors so far.

**Presidential Rhetoric**

At the national and global level, one reality that forges a common stimulus is presidential rhetoric. The character of presidential rhetoric reflects Lakoff and Johnson’s (as cited in Schmitt, 2005) assertion that presidential speeches assume “homology of thought of the nation” (p. 366). Kiene (2007) demonstrated how presidential rhetoric connects to the national will, conscience, and vision. At the time of FDR’s leadership, the country was gripped by economic fear, and FDR had a tendency to refer to such fear as a *disease* and himself as the *physician* who could cure the disease. At that *time*, FDR’s health was suspect. He also oftentimes deployed the metaphoric clusters of *health* and *vigor* to depict that his physical disability could never impede his political potential.

Another example of presidential rhetoric is Eubanks’s (2005) research, who pointed out the cognitive structure that underlies rhetorical language. He assessed Lakoff’s analysis of the Gulf War and of electoral politics. Lakoff, in his seminal work, showed that conceptual metaphors such “A Nation Is a Person” and “A Nation Is a Family” structure political discourse. In my view, If a nation is a family, then the president is the head of the household, and hence his speeches seek to represent current stimuli of the nation and “conceptual ensemble” (Eubanks, 2005, p. 186) of national feelings and attitudes.
Presidential Speech as Reflection of the Psyche of a Nation

Perhaps one of the most far-reaching studies on the phenomenon that presidential speech reflects the psyche of the nation is Rottinghans’s (2006), whose research examines a direct and continuous connection between presidential rhetoric and public opinion. Rottinghans asserted that being hypercongruent with public preferences is symptomatic of modern political concerns, including electoral and public pressure for presidents to maintain an elevated public stature for the short-term purposes of bargaining with Congress and with public goodwill. Rottinghans cited the instance of President John F. Kennedy’s speech on a minimum wage increase on June 22, 1961. The president proposed a raise to $1.25 per hour; a poll released 4 months previous indicated that 76% of the nation approved of the increase. The presidential statement was congruent with majority public opinion.

Surveying presidential speeches across time from President Eisenhower to President Clinton (Rottinghans, 2006, p.725), Eisenhower was the most congruent with public opinion (96%), followed closely by Kennedy. Clinton in his second term was the least congruent, followed closely by President Ford. There are 13 presidents from Eisenhower to Clinton, and according to the survey, Eisenhower was the most hypercongruent with public opinion, whereas Presidents Reagan and Nixon were designated as the least hypercongruent. Most of the presidents depicted adjust to public opinion during electioneering seasons (Rottinghans, p. 723).

Roderick P. Hart (as cited in Nothstine et al., 2003), in his essay “Wandering With Rhetorical Criticism,” stated that presidential speeches record the wishes and dreams of a nation and, if read carefully, could unveil “who we are and who we wish to be” (p. 76). However, who we are as a nation undergoes constant transformation and the construction of novel aspirations and targets. Different eras encapsulate the life of a president commencing from campaign
speeches to inaugural speeches and therefore generate different bodies of rhetorical interest. There are also speeches of ideology such as President Jimmy Carter’s much reviled “Malaise Speech” of 1979 (Nothstine et al., 2003), and ideologies differ in any given context.

War rhetoric is usually a component of the vast array of experiences that constitute the life of an American president and that warrant speech communication. Usually, war rhetoric entails data justifying war action. According to Ivie (as cited in Nothstine et al., 2003), metaphor is an inevitable dynamic and unifying principle of forging war rhetoric and its justification (p.155).

The justification for campaign of war rhetoric depicts that presidential speeches are not always in tandem with public opinion; therefore, a war agenda has to be constructed and sold. The next section on metaphor of war will dig deeper into this assertion.

**The Metaphor of War**

Ivie’s (as cited in Nothstine et al., 2003) essay “The Metaphor of Force in Pro-war Discourse” debunked Rottinghans’s generalization that public opinion and presidential speeches are always in congruence. Ivie went down memory lane to the republic’s first war in 1812; he quoted Samuel Eliot Morrison’s statement that reflects the public view describing the war as “the most unpopular war that this country has ever waged, not even excepting the Vietnam conflict” (p. 153).

Bates (as cited in Foss, 2009) argued that to relate presidential views and public opinion in the current global world, the concept of *public* goes beyond national boundaries to a global context. For instance, the United States, convinced that waging war on Iraq was justified, still needed an international coalition to prosecute the war in line with the spirit of the league of nations. The research question, in this case, according to Bates was, “What strategies can be
used to build international coalitions of nations to cooperate effectively on a joint venture such as war?” (p. 275). Bates’s conclusion was that George Bush deployed metaphoric clusters of savagery and civilization to achieve congruence between the American domestic perspective and the international view of the war. The appeal of the savagery–civilization cluster is that those who join the coalition are civilized, whereas those who refuse to join are the opposite and worthy of elimination.

Foss (2009) regretted that such cross-cultural appeals, though replete in historical, political, and diplomatic contexts, are virtually absent in rhetorical criticism, except for few war rhetoric endeavors. War rhetoric mostly sought “bonds of union” to administer war to purchase peace. Metaphoric, critical endeavors that seek peace and jettison war are absent. This research intends to record an entry in the gap. In an era in which the war was over, global rapprochement goals demanded new metaphoric paradigms in which peace was the supreme denominator. As Bates (as cited in Foss, 2009) put it, “these cross- and intercultural appeals have been little studied as rhetoric in the traditional sense of public address . . . but left only for students of political science or diplomatic history” (p. 279).

This research seeks to uncover a new metaphoric repertoire that redefines the relationship between the United States and the Muslim world. As Bates (as cited in Foss, 2009) stated, “in an increasingly interconnected and globalized world, rhetoricians should be more than willing to assist in finding a [vernacular of hypercohesion] for auditors outside of US borders” (p. 279) and a new perspective of global coexistence and peace.

This research seeks to contribute to the few rhetorical materials exclusively focused on global rapprochement. Bush’s speeches in pursuance of global cohesion deployed a divide tactic and clearly fall into a category of war rhetoric (Foss, 2009). In war rhetoric, metaphors reshape
public perceptions of the enemy so that there is no alternative to war (Foss, 2009). The challenge Obama faced was to shape an argument that suggested peace as an alternative. Therefore Obama’s speech in Cairo constituted a glaring, rare representative anecdote that fell into the category of peace rhetoric.

**Research Questions**

The research questions of the study follow:

RQ1: How does Obama’s use of archetypal metaphor contribute to a discourse of cohesion?

RQ2: How does a transcendent metaphor generate rhetoric to promote mutuality?

RQ3: How can metaphor inspire rapprochement in a context of discord?
CHAPTER 3: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Scope

This study investigated the metaphoric content of Obama’s speech in Cairo, Egypt, on June 4, 2009. Obama delivered the speech 4 months after he was sworn in on January 20, 2009. At that time, America’s trauma from the 9/11 terrorist attacks, leading to the invasion of Iraq, was subsiding, but the Muslim world’s feelings of hostility toward the United States looked unyielding. Bush’s foreign policy’s savagery—civilization metaphoric divide of the world (Foss, 2009), which Obama had inherited, compounded the atmosphere of global rapprochement. Marzetti (2006), confirming the precarious situation, reported that the Iraq War had spawned a new generation of radical Islamism.

At the time of the speech, the United States still had troops stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan. This added to the feeling of dissonance between the United States and the Arab world. The Muslim world perceived Iraq’s invasion as a jihad owing to the apparent injustice of the operation (Azeez, n.d.). Most Arabs condemned the United States and considered its war exploits in the Middle East as bullying (Azeez, n.d.). These circumstances created a rhetorical challenge for an American leadership willing to forge new metaphoric paradigms of healing, peace, and mutual cohesion (Rizzuto, 2009).

This research focused on the metaphoric elements of rapprochements and global coexistence in Obama’s Cairo speech. Egypt represented the cradle of civilization. Its choice had a symbolic ripple effect on the vision of the rhetor. Former White House press secretary Robert Gibbs indicated that Egypt was chosen because “it is a country that in many ways resymbolized the heart of the Arab world” (CNN, 2009, para. 2). Equally, it resonated with the challenge of metaphors in connecting separate spheres and invoked moral questions of
coexistence, while giving clues to the basic spiritual issues about the world’s existential condition (Kuusisto, 1998). This research sought to identify how the rhetor deployed metaphors through categorization, inferences, or bridging of “personal truth” and universal fraternity. The scholar Rizzuto (2009) acquiesced that such bridging rhetorically collates the compassionate self and the world.

**Methodology**

The scope of this research was to identify how the rhetor deployed metaphor to address issues of deeply sited antagonisms between two worlds. The metaphoric approach was appropriate because the context and purpose of the speech was conflict resolution and global discord intervention. According to Moser (2003), metaphoric analysis was an instrument of intervention because it enhanced a process of knowledge, cooperation, and transfer to induce different actors’ perspectives. The cooperation and connection achievable were purposive in reconciling factors that created conflict between a past and present embedded in both conscious and repressed selves (Moser, 2003); Schmitt (2005), in a similar view, suggested that metaphors afford us opportunities to evoke the hidden aspects of ourselves as they obliviously impact the world. Metaphors are availed not only in the conception of ideas but also in the clarification, the reordering, and in the inducing of novel action and attitude (Foss, 2009). The need to induce a new attitude amid incessant global terrorist attacks and misunderstandings of motives between the East and West, Muslim and Christian, the United States and the antagonist factions around the world, was crucial at the time of this artifact’s enactment.

**Research Design**

This research on Obama’s speech in Cairo aimed to uncover a new global psyche on peaceful coexistence from the avenue of metaphors. The research hoped to identify pacifistic
metaphoric nomenclature in Obama’s speech that supplanted Bush’s existing war rhetoric brand (Foss, 2009; Nothstine et al., 2003).

Metaphor analysis constituted the primary theme of analysis (Foss, 2009). According to Foss, metaphor was a crucial means of constituting reality. Different systematic approaches to metaphoric analysis were proposed by the few scholars in the field. For instance, Schmitt (2005, pp.369-375) made the following propositions:

1. Identify the target area for metaphoric analysis: Determine the topic, decide on the right question, and draft a plan for the survey and evaluation.

2. Unsystematic broad-based collection of background metaphors: Entails searching for metaphors in a wide range of materials containing references to the topic investigated.

3. Systematic analysis of subgroups: This takes place in two stages—first, the identification of metaphors through segmentation of the texts, followed by reconstruction of metaphoric concepts.

4. The reconstruction of individual occurrences of metaphoric concepts: This entails carrying out biographical analysis against the background of collective occurrences of metaphors.

5. Comparison of metaphoric concepts: The collected metaphoric concepts are compared and contrasted to reconcile their diverse experiences within the text.

In contrast to Schmitt, Foss (2009) recommended the procedure suggested by Michael Osborn and Robert Ivie. This process entailed four stages: (a) select an artifact, (b) analyze the artifact, (c) formulate a research question, and (d) write the essay. To amalgamate the preceding suggestions of Schmitt and Osborn and Ivie, this research pursued the following procedure, which aligns with the research’s theories and responds to research questions (Foss, 2009):
1. Identify and analyze archetypal metaphors and proceed to discussing how they are influential in shaping visions of global rapport as stimulated by the research question.

2. Track and analyze metaphors of cohesion. Thereafter, investigate how they forge archetypal and transcendent rhetorical motives of the rhetor.

3. Identify and analyze metaphors of transcendence and discuss how they connect to the research philosophies and respond to the research questions.

4. Finally, embark on a general discussion focused on reconciliation of semantic oppositions and conciliation with identified philosophical perspective and rhetorical vision.

**Reliability and Ethics**

According to Foss (2009), metaphor joins two terms normally regarded as belonging to different classes of experience. Experiences differ, and therefore the possibility of multiple interpretations may arise; as Ivie (as cited in Nothstine et al., 2003) stated, “the doing of criticism is an individual thing” (p. 77). Nonetheless, Ivie counseled that it was indispensable to “choose the right way to examine the right text” (p. 77). Metaphoric criticism was one right way to examine the text under study because metaphors play an interventionist role in conflict resolution (Moser, 2000). Obama’s speech in Cairo was meant to resolve conflicts and repair the relationship between the Muslim world and the United States.

As a qualitative inquiry, metaphor analysis was reliable because it shared the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and conformability (Heppner & Heppner, 2004)—these features are feasible because the document was archival and in the public domain, and the rhetorical vision was durable. It was credible because the document was generated by the U.S.
president; it was transferable, dependable, and confirmable because it was just a click away on
the Web (Hoyle, Harris, & Judd, 2002).

Rubin, Rubin, Harridakis, and Piele (2010) stated that the criteria of a worthy criticism
are that it must focus on a significant topic, apply appropriate criteria to examine the topic, and
be reasoned and well presented. I believe that this research had a significant theme, which was
the speech of a U.S. president to promote global coexistence. This research outlined appropriate
steps to examine the topic.

Ethically speaking, issues of confidentiality and anonymity (Hoyle et al., 2002) were
inapplicable to this research because the artifact was a public document. The researcher
endeavored to acknowledge all references and citations. Although in qualitative, critical
research, the research tells what the critic asks it to tell, nevertheless, a researcher must strive to
show “full allegiance to the phenomenology” (Nothstine et al., 2003 p.75) of the artifact, within
the premise of the rhetorical vision, and with appropriate textual support.
CHAPTER 4: ARTIFACT AND SELECTION

This study analyzed Obama’s speech in Cairo delivered on June 4, 2009. Many versions of the speech exist on the Web. This research selected the version published by the New York Times for analytic purposes (see the appendix). The New York Times has been published since 1851 and has won more than 106 Pulitzer Prizes (Pérez-Peña, 2009). The newspaper was the most popular online newspaper at the time of writing, with about 30 million visitors per month (Russell, 2011).

Artifact Description

The artifact is an address given by U.S. president Obama to the Muslim world on June 4, 2009, from a major reception hall at Cairo University. This address fulfilled the promise Obama made during his inaugural speech as president that he would deliver a crucial address from a major Muslim city. Cairo University and Al-Azhar University co-hosted the event. Obama stated his purpose: “I have come here to seek a new beginning between the United States and the Muslim world” (para. 5). In his speech, Obama urged Islamic nations to embrace democracy, women’s rights, religious tolerance, and the right of Israel to coexist with an independent Palestinian state. Obama’s address was designed to change perceptions of the United States in the Arab Middle East and beyond. He reviewed the troubled historical legacy between Islam and the rest of the world, from colonialism through the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the uncertainty surrounding cultural and economic globalization, and he declared,

So long as our relationship is defined by our differences, we will empower those who sow hatred rather than peace, and who promote conflict rather than the cooperation that can help all of our people to achieve justice and prosperity. . . . This cycle of suspicion and discord must end. (para. 4)
Presenting an olive branch to the Muslim world was the crux of Obama’s speech. The printed speech has 67 paragraphs and entails visions of rapprochement regarding relations between the United States and Islamic states.

The metaphoric elements embedded in the vision of rapprochement were the foci of this research. The research intended to identify and analyze the effectiveness of the rhetor’s employment of archetypal metaphors of cohesion and transcendence to achieve the vision of concord between the West and the Muslim world.

**Categorization of the Artifact**

There are two categories for the purpose of analysis of the artifact of Obama’s speech in Cairo: archetypal metaphors and transcendent metaphors. This section begins with the rationale for the categories, outlines the anecdotal focus, and ends with the reconciliation between the two categories, as well as, a statement on their contribution to rhetorical criticism.

**Archetypal metaphor.** According to Foss (2009), an archetypal metaphor bridges the ideological divide. One type of representative rhetorical data under archetypal metaphors is KNOWLEDGE. Archetypal metaphor seeks to establish a connection and unity among humankind (Guerin et al., 2005). In that view, the second example is the notion of unity expressed in the Latin phrase *e pluribus unum* (out of many, one; para. 11), which clusters COHESION as archetype, anecdotally reflected in TRADITION and PROGRESS (para. 1) and in COOPERATION and CONFLICT (para. 4).

**Transcendent metaphor.** There are two definitive elements of transcendent metaphor: First, it is concerned with the correspondence between matter and spirit (Baym, 2003); second, transcendent metaphor searches out the absolute order of things as they stand in the mind of God. In that view, the concept of brotherhood as transcendent is an example, suggested, for instance,
in the sentence, “The Holy Koran teaches that whoever kills an innocent, it is as if he has killed all mankind; and whoever saves a person, it is as if he has saved all mankind” (para. 22).

Corollary to the last example is the statement “violence is a dead end” (para. 3); the statement suggests the second example of transcendence—the Golden Rule (para. 65) as a transcendent metaphor. The Golden Rule advocates the lifting of consciousness from an inauthentic, violent self to an authentic, superior, peaceful self (Gusfield, 1989).

Analysis and Interpretation

Archetypal metaphors. The following paragraphs discuss archetypal metaphors.

Knowledge as archetype. The rhetor on stage in Egypt focuses on issues of humankind’s primal interconnectedness. He argues that issues of discord around the world emerge from lack of knowledge of humanity’s cohesion. This lack of knowledge is exemplified in the hostility of Islam against the United States and remains a threat to global civilization and progress.

Knowledge of our oneness should have dissuaded all forms of violence threatening world civilization. Lack of knowledge of our oneness unleashes tension, suspicion, and stereotyping. Nonetheless, “just as Muslims do not fit a crude stereotype, the United States is not the crude stereotype of a self-interested empire” (para. 11). The United States as a nation embraces “e pluribus unum: out of many, one” (para. 11), which is to say that there may be different nationalities that make up the United States, but it remains a melting pot. The symbol of melting pot is functionally “plural” (Gleason, 1981, p.46) of all the nations and beliefs that comprise the Union. This implies that Islam is part of the United States. America cannot be hostile to its part.

The spirit of identification suggests that to be hostile to a part is to be hostile to the whole.

Applying Guerin et al.’s (2005) archetypal categories from chapter 2, terrorist activities around the world are tantamount to spiritual “aridity” or a “desert” (p. 189). What the rhetor
sought is an elevation of consciousness of humankind that equates the mountain archetype, whereby humankind can see itself as a unified whole, to the archetypal cycle, where only peace and unity reigns, as in the archetypal seven. These images, mountain, cycle, and desert, represent the foregrounded paradigms that forge the vision of the rhetor on stage in Egypt. Islam is part of the United States. To perceive that the United States is hostile to Islam is to assume that the whole is hostile to the part. If the whole is hostile to the part, it is hostile to its own self, and vice versa. The rhetorical archetype of oneness or interconnectedness of the part–whole concept informs America’s commitment to douse tensions around the world created, for instance, by the Israel–Palestine conflict (para. 28). Obama counsels the warring factions that “violence is a dead end” (para. 33) and admonishes that the instinct to shoot rockets at sleeping children, or to blow up old women on a bus, cannot harvest peace, but the opposite (para. 33).

In a similar vein, the instinct to acquire nuclear weapons is equally discouraged because it will launch the world down a hugely dangerous path (para. 41). Nuclear armament is a symbol of death; hence the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (para. 42), which is a treaty in pursuance of the attainment of peace and the preservation of life. This treaty is the police force of the fundamental human rights to life, without which other common, unyielding freedoms, such as the freedom of speech, the freedom of democratic choice, and the freedom of movement, may not be attained (para. 44).

For instance, the Latin phrase *e pluribus unum* (out of many, one; para. 1) suggests the cooperation of the cultural knowledge of the past with current realities of modern existence. Just as the past and the present collaborate to form an affinity, and a foundation for the future, so it is expected that humankind will collaborate, despite differences, to build a peaceful, sustainable society.
The clarion call to jettison division is a persuasion to adopt humankind’s primal interconnectedness. That assertion emerges from the logic that, without consciousness of a collective, pre-existence affinity, any persuasion of interconnectedness of man is a hard sell. The purpose here is to evoke conscience and ethical conduct. Such archetypal knowledge breeds compassionate action that discourages the acquisition of lethal nuclear armaments (paras. 41 and 42). It bolsters the suspension of suspicion triggered by the spirit of divide, which motivates terrorist acts around the world. Archetypal knowledge of the primal bonding of humankind suggests the need for mutual respect, through the upholding of human rights and the promotion of the spirit of democracy. The spirit of democracy is immune from exercising terrorism; therefore, democratization is the ultimate solution to terror (Shalom, 2008).

One manifestation of the freedom of choice is the freedom to choose one’s religion. Some Muslims tend to hold a contrary view because they possess a “disturbing tendency to measure their faith based on the rejection of another’s” (para. 48). Respect for one another’s beliefs and values generate a cohesive and progressive society. The next section will discuss the archetype of cohesion.

**Archetypal metaphor of cohesion: Tradition and progress.** Cohesion means “sticking together”; it is deployed here to correlate tradition and progress, metonymically projected by the two hosts of the president of the United States and Al-Azhar University, famed to be over 1,000 years old, representing *tradition*, and the University of Cairo, over a century old, representing *progress*. Such mitosis of tradition and progress yields a new breed because, as Eliot (1980) stated, “Time past and time future / What might have been and what has been / Point to one end which is always present” (p. 117). The phenomenon—the “present”—should display progress achieved in cooperation, devoid of negativity and discord. The craving for cooperation
drives the “sweeping change which modernity and globalization has brought, championed by the West, that Muslims view as hostile to the tradition of Islam” (para. 2). Such suspicion has bred tension into the relationship between Muslims and the West—the epitome of modernity—with a resultant “fear and mistrust” (para. 3) on the part of the Islamic world. Fear and suspicion empower the seed of hatred rather than peace and promote conflict rather than cooperation, justice, and prosperity (para. 4).

What drives modernity is the cohesive actions of the past and its interconnectedness with the present. Since Islam supplied the framework on which modernity attained its current prosperity, civilization is indebted to Islam. Al-Azhar University paved the way for Europe’s Renaissance and Enlightenment through the discovery of the order of algebra, writing, printing, science, internal medicine, and art. The argument is that the foundation of the technological progress made today is the inventions of the past through Islamic culture. This is to say that everything the United States boasts of in terms of science and technological advancement has its root in the “light of learning through many centuries” (para. 8) that Islamic culture produced. It is therefore illogical and incoherent that the United States should have any enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquility of Muslims (para. 9).

Therefore the notion that the United States is antagonistic to Islam is a misperception. There is much proof that the soul of the United States is cohesive with Islam. Since its founding, Muslims have enriched the United States in several ways. Muslims have fought in wars, served in government, stood for civil rights, started profitable businesses, taught at American universities, excelled in sports, won Nobel Prizes, built the tallest buildings, and lit the Olympic torch. When the first Muslim American was elected into office, he took an oath to defend the
Constitution using the same Holy Koran that one of America’s Founding Fathers, Thomas Jefferson, kept in his personal library (para. 9).

As further evidence of America’s cohesion with Islam, more than 7 million American Muslims enjoy higher than average incomes. They thrive in an atmosphere of freedom of religion. That is why there are mosques in every state of the union and over 1,200 mosques within American borders (para. 13).

**Archetypal metaphors of conflict and cooperation.** Of utmost importance to the concept of metaphor of cohesion is the need to jettison conflict and embrace cooperation and peace between the two worlds. To meet such a benchmark, tradition must reconcile with progress. The United States already embraces Islam, so the Islamic world ought to show reciprocity and not antagonism. As Obama stated,

Islam is part of America. . . . America holds within her the truth that regardless of race, religion, or station in life, all of us share common aspirations—to live in peace and security; to get an education and to work with dignity; to love our families, our communities, and our God. These things we share. This is the hope of all humanity.

(para. 13)

The “common aspirations” of peace and security, family, love, community, and God are parameters relevant to the description of our common humanity. These data confirm the Burkean essence of consubstantiation, indicating that humankind has a singular bond (Burke, 1969); therefore we should deploy compassionate consideration toward one another. The archetype also promotes the philosophy of Buber’s I–thou personality theory that there is a need to regard the Other as sensitively as the Self (Brock, 1999). Consequently, there is a need for Muslims and the United States to focus on the common bond of existential interest because
contrary acts of conflict and discord constitute “perversions of humankind’s communion” (Burke, 1969, p. 22).

The appeal to the essence of our common humanity through arguments on consubstantiation responds to RQ3 of this research: How would metaphors inspire rapprochement in a conflicting context? The response lies in the preceding quotation from the artifact. It lies in respect for freedom of worship, adherence to common aspirations to peace and security, and appreciation of love for family and community. The embedded metaphors of cohesion here are cooperation, family, community, worship, and peace, which jettison generated antonyms such as conflict and discord.

**Transcendent metaphor.** The following sections discuss transcendent metaphor.

**Brotherhood as transcendent metaphor.** The spirit of brotherhood is reflected in the statement that “all people yearn for certain things” (para. 44). That projection has a transcendental quality. One echo is “religious freedom.” According to Obama, “people in every country should be free to choose and live their faith based upon the persuasion of the mind, heart and soul” (para. 47). The images “mind,” “heart,” and “soul” are transcendental and share a primal interconnectedness. The images define the spirit of brotherhood because at that level of esoteric consciousness, division and conflict are mirages. These assertions form the basis for the rhetor’s catechism that “the Holy Koran teaches that whoever kills an innocent, it is as if he has killed all mankind; and whoever saves a person, it is as if he has saved all mankind” (para. 22).

**The Golden Rule as transcendent metaphor.** The last rhetorical statement indicts the tendency of terrorist minds to use religion as an argument to unleash violence and death around the world. The United States’s November 9, 2001, experience is a case in point, as “al Qaeda killed nearly 3,0000 people on that day” (para. 20). The rhetor counseled that such violence is
unprofitable; it “is a dead end” (para. 33). The dastardly act violates the Golden Rule, the one rule that lies at the heart of every religion—that we do unto others as we would have them do unto us. This truth transcends nations and peoples—a belief that isn’t new; that isn’t black or white or brown; that isn’t Christian, or Muslim or Jew (para. 65). The Golden Rule advises that it is best for humankind to focus less on what pushes apart and more on things of common ground that enhance the future sought for our progeny and that promote the dignity of all human beings (para. 64).

**Abraham and Jerusalem as transcendent metaphors.** One symbol of common ground is ABRAHAM (para. 39), common to Jews, Christians, and Muslims. Second is the city of JERUSALEM (para. 39), to which the three religions have affinity. These two rhetorical images have transcendence and the power to promote peace among the divided factions. A meditation on the common transcendent affinity could reduce the feeling of tension and enhance the spirit of fraternal dialogue that has eluded even the Israeli–Palestinian objective to achieve accord in that region. The transcendent images can also douse the suspicion between the West and Islam and launch both worlds on a path of global peace and partnership.

Nonetheless, the advisement to embrace peace is a nonnegotiable option because enshrined in the holy books of the different religions are the notions of peaceful coexistence. The Holy Koran tells us, “O mankind! We have created you male and female; and we made you into nations and tribes so that you may know one another.” The Talmud tells us, “The whole of the Torah is for the purpose of promoting peace.” The Holy Bible tells us, “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God” (para. 67). Since it is the vision of God that humankind live in peace, it is equally a supreme, transcendent manifesto to all religions to
embrace peace. Viewed from that vantage point, the rhetor is not a herald but an amplifier of the preexisting divine mandate.

On the relevance to the research philosophy, the preceding mandate is sourced from a common, divine identification or consubstantiation. “Abraham” and “Jerusalem” (para. 39) are images of common identity to Islam and the West. They are powerfully persuasive in closing the perceived divide among factions and in forwarding an agenda of peaceful coexistence.

The rhetorical images of Abraham and Jerusalem aim at the forging of an agenda of peace in the conflicting Palestinian region. Abraham is the father of all nations based on the Holy books of Islam, Judaism, and Christianity. The fraternal link deployed by the patriarchal status of Abraham makes his progeny’s engagement in any conflict ridiculous. The images bring the warring factions to a negotiating table of mutual respect and compassion for one another, motivated by regard for the historical and spiritual blood tie.

**Connecting the Dots**

**Cohesion, mutuality, and rapprochement.** The functional elements of the three research questions are cohesion, mutuality, and rapprochement. These three words equate with the notion of global concord that drives the rhetor’s metaphoric gestures while on stage in Cairo. The rhetoric sues for suspension of suspicion and the promotion of collaboration among nations to launch peace and prosperity. Both philosophies entail the thread of universal survival linking them, which in itself constitutes a transcendent instinct.

**Resolving the instinct of division.** Discord, suspicion, and disrespect for fundamental human rights are products of the ignorance of humankind’s timeless, primal bond. As Long (2006) stated, “all things are interconnected with one another and the bond is holy” (p. 107).
Rhetoric that suggests a timeless bond can penetrate instincts of division and convert the same to intuitions of fraternity and cohesion.

**Reconciling the past and the present.** Metaphor is a device for seeing something in terms of something else (Gusfield, 1989). There is a “semantic interaction” (Ortony, 1993, p. 115) between the two metaphors of Abraham and Jerusalem. As transcendent metaphor, they reconcile the past and present; they forge notions of unity and peace.

Islam has always been part of the progress of the Unites States and Western civilization. The U.S. Constitution upholds the dignity of humankind and respect for human rights. There is a need for Muslims to suspend suspicion of the United States because that attitude breeds division and promotes violence and death. The hostile disposition, with terrorism as arrowhead, discourages rapprochement, which can lead to a global peaceful coexistence and prosperity.

**Toward a New Dawn**

Although the United States’s international behavior seems in dissonance with the current disposition of the rhetor, his rhetoric and metaphoric choices of cohesion, archetype, and transcendence seek to establish a new dawn—a new global reunion—that upholds the paradigm of global interdependence and respect for human dignity.

Both archetypal and transcendent metaphor advocate rapprochement amid deployment of the Golden Rule. This rule decries the *live and let die* practiced by terrorist groups. The Golden Rule endorses an agenda of unity, promotes cohesion, and entertains mutuality.

Therefore, from the transcendent force that defines the Golden rule emerges the assertion that hostile events around the world violate the Golden rule’s benchmark, and constitutes the main threat against universal, peaceful coexistence.
Research Contribution to the Field of Rhetoric

This research sought to contribute to the few existing studies in the field of rhetoric exclusively focused on global rapprochement and peace, devoid of division and enmity. We order and are ordered by rhetorical contexts (Williams, 2005). Bush’s speeches, in pursuance of global cohesion, deployed a divide tactic and clearly fell into a category of war rhetoric (Foss, 2009). In war rhetoric, metaphors order and reshape public perceptions of the enemy so that there is no alternative to war (Foss, 2009); Obama’s metaphoric argument reorders Bush’s war rhetoric and suggests peace as an alternative. In that view, Obama’s speech in Cairo constitutes a glaring, representative anecdote that falls into the rare category of peace rhetoric.
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARIES AND CONCLUSIONS

Cohesion and Rapprochement

In this study, the core of President Obama’s argument is that humankind has a common thread of identification (Burke, 1969) and that reinforcing the common thread is a transcendent affinity. The affinity argument deployed by the rhetor labels terrorist acts around the world as negations of our bond of union. Sentiments of antagonism toward the United States, and all forms of socioreligious intolerance, constitute “pervasions of humankind’s communion” (Burke, 1969 p. 22). Focusing on our common existential goals, expressed in the form of archetypal and transcendent metaphors like peace and progress, encourages cohesion and rapprochement around the world.

A Case of Preestablished Harmony

Metaphor by its nature forges a new conceptual insight and reality (Gusfield, 1989). The conceptual insight a metaphor provides has the capacity to reconcile conflicting realms by evoking humankind’s preestablished harmony (Burke, 1969). President Barack Obama, on stage in Egypt, utilized the potential a metaphor possesses to persuade the antagonistic Muslim world to recognize a preestablished harmony with the United States.

Oneness as Both Archetypal and Transcendent

In a context in which a rhetor speaks to an audience beyond his or her own people, archetypal and transcendent metaphors come to the rescue because they have a capacity for cross-cultural communication (Foss, 2009). For instance, ABRAHAM and JERUSALEM are effective metaphors that are both archetypal and transcendent in that they provide bridging functions to the ideologically divided conflicting factions. Metaphoric clusters of transcendence and archetypal nature potentially emphasize the preeminence of our common humanity. They
inspire action capable of jettisoning sentiments of division. The transcending of perceived division has a peculiar dynamic in that it involves some sort of lifting of the mind to a level that approximates the mind of God (Bayn, 2003). The rhetor in Cairo focused on persuading his audience to connect to the lifting and the frequency that consciousness of oneness yields.

**Buber’s and Burke’s Pacifistic Philosophies**

Buber’s I–thou personality theory and Burke’s consubstantiation philosophy promote unity and concord among humankind. Since this study emerges from the foundation of war created by ex-president George Bush, confronting that foundation with a version of rhetoric that reestablishes arguments of mankind’s bond of union was urgent. This study considers Obama’s rhetoric’s motif to annul wars and all forms of conflict around the world by replacing Bush’s speech model.

At the time of the speech enactment, America’s relationship with the Muslim world was highly precarious—the hostility of Muslims toward America, and vice versa, created mutual suspicion. Besides, the Iraq War created a new generation of Islamism that deepened the brewing hostility. As a panacea, Obama sought metaphors that provided paradigms for healing, peace, and mutual cohesion (Rizzuto, 2009).

**The Golden Rule Paradigm**

The concept of the Golden Rule emerges from the principle of the absolute order of things. The concept advocates brotherhood among humankind so that peace may reign (Gusfield, 1989). The concept suggests “violence as dead end” (see appendix, para. 22). For instance, Islamic extremists unleashed much violence on the United States on 9/11, and the aftermath has had no positive effect but has engendered further destruction in geometric proportions. The actions of terrorists are born of suspicion and hatred of the West.
**Limitation**

The document utilized in this study is archival. My observation is that the video version differs from the script. I watched the video online and observed points that the written script could not articulate: the rhetor’s responses to the audience, the audience’s interjections to the speech process, and the rhetor’s pauses during delivery to allow points in rhetorical argument to amplify. These missing rhetorical devices deprive the auditor of sufficient information to report on the rhetorical processes that led to the reinvention of a novel perspective (Foss, 2009). According to Roderick Hart (as cited in Nothstine et al., 2003), rhetoric is a vast repository of truths and visions; it takes many hands to understand it. It also takes multiple rhetorical approaches to unveil the entire truth embedded in an artifact. For instance, Obama employed the storytelling technique several times in the enactment of his speech in Cairo. The style confirms that human beings are “essentially a story-telling animal” (Foss, 2009, p. 307). Perhaps a combination of metaphoric and narrative approaches may have done greater justice to the analysis of the rhetorical vision of this research.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

A study of the video version of the speech, with emphasis on the paralinguistic -or nonverbal components, is my first recommendation. Obama’s speech in Cairo is rich in paralanguage such as gestures, facial expressions, voice quality, and rhythm. There was much audience participation in terms of applause and other forms of approval behaviors. Collecting data on the various forms of paralanguages and interpreting them from the light of how they promote or demote the rhetorical vision would be an interesting study. A possible research question is, How do the paralanguages employed by President Obama in his Cairo speech promote his rhetorical vision?
Another suggestion for further study is to employ ideological criticism in the study of Obama’s speech in Cairo because Obama’s speech text embeds arguments on beliefs, values, and assumptions. According to Foss (2009), “ideology is a pattern of beliefs that determines a group’s interpretations of some aspects of the world” (p. 209). In his speech, Obama attempted to forge an ideology of mutual cohesion and global coexistence. A hypothetical research question for an ideological criticism is, What character of rhetorical persuasion constructs a universal ideological perspective, or how would a rhetorical persuasion create a cohesive ideological agenda in a multicultural community?

**Nipping the Wings of Hatred and Suspicion**

Islam has no need to be hostile or suspicious toward the United States. Contrariwise, Islam should see that the Unites States recognizes a sense of indebtedness to Islam. President Obama’s speech shows that the United States, being an arrowhead of modernity, acknowledges that Islamic traditions and culture constitute the foundation of modernity on which America thrives. The Islamic culture supplied the inventions, algebra, science, and medicine that are the bases of technological advancement (see appendix, para. 8). By that argument, the United States is hardly suspicious of Islam, nor does it have any justification to be hostile to Islam; rather it seeks cohesion and cooperation to ensure mutual, global peace and progress.

Viewed in the preceding way, Obama’s speech in Cairo generates a more glaring agenda of rapprochement between the Islamic world and the West, symbolized by the United States. In addition, because Obama’s predecessor, George W. Bush, was more interested in war rhetoric, Obama’s speech is special in rhetorical study as it supplants Bush’s war rhetoric to establish a new paradigm of global harmony and peaceful coexistence.
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APPENDIX:

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA’S SPEECH IN CAIRO

The following is a transcript of President Obama’s prepared remarks to the Muslim world, delivered on June 4, 2009, as released by the White House and as printed in the New York Times (“President Obama’s Speech,” 2009):

I am honored to be in the timeless city of Cairo, and to be hosted by two remarkable institutions. For over a thousand years, Al-Azhar has stood as a beacon of Islamic learning, and for over a century, Cairo University has been a source of Egypt’s advancement. Together, you represent the harmony between tradition and progress. I am grateful for your hospitality, and the hospitality of the people of Egypt. I am also proud to carry with me the goodwill of the American people, and a greeting of peace from Muslim communities in my country: assalaamu alaykum.

We meet at a time of tension between the United States and Muslims around the world—tension rooted in historical forces that go beyond any current policy debate. The relationship between Islam and the West includes centuries of co-existence and cooperation, but also conflict and religious wars. More recently, tension has been fed by colonialism that denied rights and opportunities to many Muslims, and a Cold War in which Muslim-majority countries were too often treated as proxies without regard to their own aspirations. Moreover, the sweeping change brought by modernity and globalization led many Muslims to view the West as hostile to the traditions of Islam.

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

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

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

I do so recognizing that change cannot happen overnight. No single speech can eradicate years of mistrust, nor can I answer in the time that I have all the complex questions that brought us to this point. But I am convinced that in order to move forward, we must say openly the things we hold in our hearts, and that too often are said only behind closed doors. There must be a sustained effort to listen to each other; to learn from each other; to respect one another; and to seek common ground. As the Holy Koran tells us, “Be conscious of God and speak always the truth.” That is what I will try to do—to speak the truth as best I can, humbled by the task before us, and firm in my belief that the interests we share as human beings are far more powerful than the forces that drive us apart.

Part of this conviction is rooted in my own experience. I am a Christian, but my father came from a Kenyan family that includes generations of Muslims. As a boy, I
spent several years in Indonesia and heard the call of the azaan at the break of dawn and the fall of dusk. As a young man, I worked in Chicago communities where many found dignity and peace in their Muslim faith.

As a student of history, I also know civilization’s debt to Islam. It was Islam—at places like Al-Azhar University—that carried the light of learning through so many centuries, paving the way for Europe’s Renaissance and Enlightenment. It was innovation in Muslim communities that developed the order of algebra; our magnetic compass and tools of navigation; our mastery of pens and printing; our understanding of how disease spreads and how it can be healed. Islamic culture has given us majestic arches and soaring spires; timeless poetry and cherished music; elegant calligraphy and places of peaceful contemplation. And throughout history, Islam has demonstrated through words and deeds the possibilities of religious tolerance and racial equality.

I know, too, that Islam has always been a part of America’s story. The first nation to recognize my country was Morocco. In signing the Treaty of Tripoli in 1796, our second President John Adams wrote, “The United States has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Muslims.” And since our founding, American Muslims have enriched the United States. They have fought in our wars, served in government, stood for civil rights, started businesses, taught at our Universities, excelled in our sports arenas, won Nobel Prizes, built our tallest building, and lit the Olympic Torch. And when the first Muslim-American was recently elected to Congress, he took the oath to defend our Constitution using the same Holy Koran that one of our Founding Fathers—Thomas Jefferson—kept in his personal library.
So I have known Islam on three continents before coming to the region where it was first revealed. That experience guides my conviction that partnership between America and Islam must be based on what Islam is, not what it isn’t. And I consider it part of my responsibility as President of the United States to fight against negative stereotypes of Islam wherever they appear.

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

Much has been made of the fact that an African-American with the name Barack Hussein Obama could be elected President. But my personal story is not so unique. The dream of opportunity for all people has not come true for everyone in America, but its promise exists for all who come to our shores—that includes nearly seven million American Muslims in our country today who enjoy incomes and education that are higher than average.

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

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

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

For we have learned from recent experience that when a financial system weakens in one country, prosperity is hurt everywhere. When a new flu infects one human being, all are at risk. When one nation pursues a nuclear weapon, the risk of nuclear attack rises for all nations. When violent extremists operate in one stretch of mountains, people are endangered across an ocean. And when innocents in Bosnia and Darfur are slaughtered, that is a stain on our collective conscience. That is what it means to share this world in the 21st century. That is the responsibility we have to one another as human beings.

This is a difficult responsibility to embrace. For human history has often been a record of nations and tribes subjugating one another to serve their own interests. Yet in this new age, such attitudes are self-defeating. Given our interdependence, any world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail. So
whatever we think of the past, we must not be prisoners of it. Our problems must be dealt with through partnership; progress must be shared.

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

The first issue that we have to confront is violent extremism in all of its forms.

In Ankara, I made clear that America is not—and never will be—at war with Islam. We will, however, relentlessly confront violent extremists who pose a grave threat to our security. Because we reject the same thing that people of all faiths reject: the killing of innocent men, women, and children. And it is my first duty as President to protect the American people.

The situation in Afghanistan demonstrates America’s goals, and our need to work together. Over seven years ago, the United States pursued al Qaeda and the Taliban with broad international support. We did not go by choice, we went because of necessity. I am aware that some question or justify the events of 9/11. But let us be clear: al Qaeda killed nearly 3,000 people on that day. The victims were innocent men, women and children from America and many other nations who had done nothing to harm anybody. And yet Al Qaeda chose to ruthlessly murder these people, claimed credit for the attack, and even now states their determination to kill on a massive scale. They have affiliates in many countries and are trying to expand their reach. These are not opinions to be debated; these are facts to be dealt with.
Make no mistake: we do not want to keep our troops in Afghanistan. We seek no military bases there. It is agonizing for America to lose our young men and women. It is costly and politically difficult to continue this conflict. We would gladly bring every single one of our troops home if we could be confident that there were not violent extremists in Afghanistan and Pakistan determined to kill as many Americans as they possibly can. But that is not yet the case.

That’s why we’re partnering with a coalition of forty-six countries. And despite the costs involved, America’s commitment will not weaken. Indeed, none of us should tolerate these extremists. They have killed in many countries. They have killed people of different faiths—more than any other, they have killed Muslims. Their actions are irreconcilable with the rights of human beings, the progress of nations, and with Islam. The Holy Koran teaches that whoever kills an innocent, it is as if he has killed all mankind; and whoever saves a person, it is as if he has saved all mankind. The enduring faith of over a billion people is so much bigger than the narrow hatred of a few. Islam is not part of the problem in combating violent extremism—it is an important part of promoting peace.

We also know that military power alone is not going to solve the problems in Afghanistan and Pakistan. That is why we plan to invest $1.5 billion each year over the next five years to partner with Pakistanis to build schools and hospitals, roads and businesses, and hundreds of millions to help those who have been displaced. And that is why we are providing more than $2.8 billion to help Afghans develop their economy and deliver services that people depend upon.
Let me also address the issue of Iraq. Unlike Afghanistan, Iraq was a war of choice that provoked strong differences in my country and around the world. Although I believe that the Iraqi people are ultimately better off without the tyranny of Saddam Hussein, I also believe that events in Iraq have reminded America of the need to use diplomacy and build international consensus to resolve our problems whenever possible. Indeed, we can recall the words of Thomas Jefferson, who said: “I hope that our wisdom will grow with our power, and teach us that the less we use our power the greater it will be.”

Today, America has a dual responsibility: to help Iraq forge a better future—and to leave Iraq to Iraqis. I have made it clear to the Iraqi people that we pursue no bases, and no claim on their territory or resources. Iraq’s sovereignty is its own. That is why I ordered the removal of our combat brigades by next August. That is why we will honor our agreement with Iraq’s democratically-elected government to remove combat troops from Iraqi cities by July, and to remove all our troops from Iraq by 2012. We will help Iraq train its Security Forces and develop its economy. But we will support a secure and united Iraq as a partner, and never as a patron.

And finally, just as America can never tolerate violence by extremists, we must never alter our principles. 9/11 was an enormous trauma to our country. The fear and anger that it provoked was understandable, but in some cases, it led us to act contrary to our ideals. We are taking concrete actions to change course. I have unequivocally prohibited the use of torture by the United States, and I have ordered the prison at Guantanamo Bay closed by early next year.
So America will defend itself respectful of the sovereignty of nations and the rule of law. And we will do so in partnership with Muslim communities which are also threatened. The sooner the extremists are isolated and unwelcome in Muslim communities, the sooner we will all be safer.

The second major source of tension that we need to discuss is the situation between Israelis, Palestinians and the Arab world.

America’s strong bonds with Israel are well known. This bond is unbreakable. It is based upon cultural and historical ties, and the recognition that the aspiration for a Jewish homeland is rooted in a tragic history that cannot be denied.

Around the world, the Jewish people were persecuted for centuries, and anti-Semitism in Europe culminated in an unprecedented Holocaust. Tomorrow, I will visit Buchenwald, which was part of a network of camps where Jews were enslaved, tortured, shot and gassed to death by the Third Reich. Six million Jews were killed—more than the entire Jewish population of Israel today. Denying that fact is baseless, ignorant, and hateful. Threatening Israel with destruction—or repeating vile stereotypes about Jews—is deeply wrong, and only serves to evoke in the minds of Israelis this most painful of memories while preventing the peace that the people of this region deserve.

On the other hand, it is also undeniable that the Palestinian people—Muslims and Christians—have suffered in pursuit of a homeland. For more than sixty years they have endured the pain of dislocation. Many wait in refugee camps in the West Bank, Gaza, and neighboring lands for a life of peace and security that they have never been able to lead. They endure the daily humiliations—large and small—that come with occupation. So let there be no doubt: the situation for the Palestinian people is intolerable. America will not
turn our backs on the legitimate Palestinian aspiration for dignity, opportunity, and a state of their own.

For decades, there has been a stalemate: two peoples with legitimate aspirations, each with a painful history that makes compromise elusive. It is easy to point fingers— for Palestinians to point to the displacement brought by Israel’s founding, and for Israelis to point to the constant hostility and attacks throughout its history from within its borders as well as beyond. But if we see this conflict only from one side or the other, then we will be blind to the truth: the only resolution is for the aspirations of both sides to be met through two states, where Israelis and Palestinians each live in peace and security.

That is in Israel’s interest, Palestine’s interest, America’s interest, and the world’s interest. That is why I intend to personally pursue this outcome with all the patience that the task requires. The obligations that the parties have agreed to under the Road Map are clear. For peace to come, it is time for them—and all of us—to live up to our responsibilities.

Palestinians must abandon violence. Resistance through violence and killing is wrong and does not succeed. For centuries, black people in America suffered the lash of the whip as slaves and the humiliation of segregation. But it was not violence that won full and equal rights. It was a peaceful and determined insistence upon the ideals at the center of America’s founding. This same story can be told by people from South Africa to South Asia; from Eastern Europe to Indonesia. It’s a story with a simple truth: that violence is a dead end. It is a sign of neither courage nor power to shoot rockets at sleeping children, or to blow up old women on a bus. That is not how moral authority is claimed; that is how it is surrendered.
Now is the time for Palestinians to focus on what they can build. The Palestinian Authority must develop its capacity to govern, with institutions that serve the needs of its people. Hamas does have support among some Palestinians, but they also have responsibilities. To play a role in fulfilling Palestinian aspirations, and to unify the Palestinian people, Hamas must put an end to violence, recognize past agreements, and recognize Israel’s right to exist.

At the same time, Israelis must acknowledge that just as Israel’s right to exist cannot be denied, neither can Palestine’s. The United States does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements. This construction violates previous agreements and undermines efforts to achieve peace. It is time for these settlements to stop.

Israel must also live up to its obligations to ensure that Palestinians can live, and work, and develop their society. And just as it devastates Palestinian families, the continuing humanitarian crisis in Gaza does not serve Israel’s security; neither does the continuing lack of opportunity in the West Bank. Progress in the daily lives of the Palestinian people must be part of a road to peace, and Israel must take concrete steps to enable such progress.

Finally, the Arab States must recognize that the Arab Peace Initiative was an important beginning, but not the end of their responsibilities. The Arab-Israeli conflict should no longer be used to distract the people of Arab nations from other problems. Instead, it must be a cause for action to help the Palestinian people develop the institutions that will sustain their state; to recognize Israel’s legitimacy; and to choose progress over a self-defeating focus on the past.
America will align our policies with those who pursue peace, and say in public what we say in private to Israelis and Palestinians and Arabs. We cannot impose peace. But privately, many Muslims recognize that Israel will not go away. Likewise, many Israelis recognize the need for a Palestinian state. It is time for us to act on what everyone knows to be true.

Too many tears have flowed. Too much blood has been shed. All of us have a responsibility to work for the day when the mothers of Israelis and Palestinians can see their children grow up without fear; when the Holy Land of three great faiths is the place of peace that God intended it to be; when Jerusalem is a secure and lasting home for Jews and Christians and Muslims, and a place for all of the children of Abraham to mingle peacefully together as in the story of Isra, when Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed (peace be upon them) joined in prayer.

The third source of tension is our shared interest in the rights and responsibilities of nations on nuclear weapons.

This issue has been a source of tension between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran. For many years, Iran has defined itself in part by its opposition to my country, and there is indeed a tumultuous history between us. In the middle of the Cold War, the United States played a role in the overthrow of a democratically-elected Iranian government. Since the Islamic Revolution, Iran has played a role in acts of hostage-taking and violence against U.S. troops and civilians. This history is well known. Rather than remain trapped in the past, I have made it clear to Iran’s leaders and people that my country is prepared to move forward. The question, now, is not what Iran is against, but rather what future it wants to build.
It will be hard to overcome decades of mistrust, but we will proceed with courage, rectitude and resolve. There will be many issues to discuss between our two countries, and we are willing to move forward without preconditions on the basis of mutual respect. But it is clear to all concerned that when it comes to nuclear weapons, we have reached a decisive point. This is not simply about America’s interests. It is about preventing a nuclear arms race in the Middle East that could lead this region and the world down a hugely dangerous path.

I understand those who protest that some countries have weapons that others do not. No single nation should pick and choose which nations hold nuclear weapons. That is why I strongly reaffirmed America’s commitment to seek a world in which no nations hold nuclear weapons. And any nation—including Iran—should have the right to access peaceful nuclear power if it complies with its responsibilities under the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. That commitment is at the core of the Treaty, and it must be kept for all who fully abide by it. And I am hopeful that all countries in the region can share in this goal.

The fourth issue that I will address is democracy.

I know there has been controversy about the promotion of democracy in recent years, and much of this controversy is connected to the war in Iraq. So let me be clear: no system of government can or should be imposed upon one nation by any other.

That does not lessen my commitment, however, to governments that reflect the will of the people. Each nation gives life to this principle in its own way, grounded in the traditions of its own people. America does not presume to know what is best for everyone, just as we would not presume to pick the outcome of a peaceful election. But I
do have an unyielding belief that all people yearn for certain things: the ability to speak your mind and have a say in how you are governed; confidence in the rule of law and the equal administration of justice; government that is transparent and doesn’t steal from the people; the freedom to live as you choose. Those are not just American ideas, they are human rights, and that is why we will support them everywhere.

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

This last point is important because there are some who advocate for democracy only when they are out of power; once in power, they are ruthless in suppressing the rights of others. No matter where it takes hold, government of the people and by the people sets a single standard for all who hold power: you must maintain your power through consent, not coercion; you must respect the rights of minorities, and participate with a spirit of tolerance and compromise; you must place the interests of your people and the legitimate workings of the political process above your party. Without these ingredients, elections alone do not make true democracy.

The fifth issue that we must address together is religious freedom.

Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance. We see it in the history of Andalusia and Cordoba during the Inquisition. I saw it firsthand as a child in Indonesia, where devout Christians worshiped freely in an overwhelmingly Muslim country. That is the spirit we
need today. People in every country should be free to choose and live their faith based upon the persuasion of the mind, heart, and soul. This tolerance is essential for religion to thrive, but it is being challenged in many different ways.

Among some Muslims, there is a disturbing tendency to measure one’s own faith by the rejection of another’s. The richness of religious diversity must be upheld—whether it is for Maronites in Lebanon or the Copts in Egypt. And fault lines must be closed among Muslims as well, as the divisions between Sunni and Shia have led to tragic violence, particularly in Iraq.

Freedom of religion is central to the ability of peoples to live together. We must always examine the ways in which we protect it. For instance, in the United States, rules on charitable giving have made it harder for Muslims to fulfill their religious obligation. That is why I am committed to working with American Muslims to ensure that they can fulfill zakat.

Likewise, it is important for Western countries to avoid impeding Muslim citizens from practicing religion as they see fit—for instance, by dictating what clothes a Muslim woman should wear. We cannot disguise hostility towards any religion behind the pretence of liberalism.

Indeed, faith should bring us together. That is why we are forging service projects in America that bring together Christians, Muslims, and Jews. That is why we welcome efforts like Saudi Arabian King Abdullah’s Interfaith dialogue and Turkey’s leadership in the Alliance of Civilizations. Around the world, we can turn dialogue into Interfaith service, so bridges between peoples lead to action—whether it is combating malaria in Africa, or providing relief after a natural disaster.
The sixth issue that I want to address is women’s rights.

I know there is debate about this issue. I reject the view of some in the West that a woman who chooses to cover her hair is somehow less equal, but I do believe that a woman who is denied an education is denied equality. And it is no coincidence that countries where women are well-educated are far more likely to be prosperous.

Now let me be clear: issues of women’s equality are by no means simply an issue for Islam. In Turkey, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Indonesia, we have seen Muslim-majority countries elect a woman to lead. Meanwhile, the struggle for women’s equality continues in many aspects of American life, and in countries around the world.

Our daughters can contribute just as much to society as our sons, and our common prosperity will be advanced by allowing all humanity—men and women—to reach their full potential. I do not believe that women must make the same choices as men in order to be equal, and I respect those women who choose to live their lives in traditional roles. But it should be their choice. That is why the United States will partner with any Muslim-majority country to support expanded literacy for girls, and to help young women pursue employment through micro-financing that helps people live their dreams.

Finally, I want to discuss economic development and opportunity.

I know that for many, the face of globalization is contradictory. The Internet and television can bring knowledge and information, but also offensive sexuality and mindless violence. Trade can bring new wealth and opportunities, but also huge disruptions and changing communities. In all nations—including my own—this change can bring fear. Fear that because of modernity we will lose of control over our economic
choices, our politics, and most importantly our identities—those things we most cherish about our communities, our families, our traditions, and our faith.

But I also know that human progress cannot be denied. There need not be contradiction between development and tradition. Countries like Japan and South Korea grew their economies while maintaining distinct cultures. The same is true for the astonishing progress within Muslim-majority countries from Kuala Lumpur to Dubai. In ancient times and in our times, Muslim communities have been at the forefront of innovation and education.

This is important because no development strategy can be based only upon what comes out of the ground, nor can it be sustained while young people are out of work. Many Gulf States have enjoyed great wealth as a consequence of oil, and some are beginning to focus it on broader development. But all of us must recognize that education and innovation will be the currency of the 21st century, and in too many Muslim communities there remains underinvestment in these areas. I am emphasizing such investments within my country. And while America in the past has focused on oil and gas in this part of the world, we now seek a broader engagement.

On education, we will expand exchange programs, and increase scholarships, like the one that brought my father to America, while encouraging more Americans to study in Muslim communities. And we will match promising Muslim students with internships in America; invest in on-line learning for teachers and children around the world; and create a new online network, so a teenager in Kansas can communicate instantly with a teenager in Cairo.
On economic development, we will create a new corps of business volunteers to partner with counterparts in Muslim-majority countries. And I will host a Summit on Entrepreneurship this year to identify how we can deepen ties between business leaders, foundations and social entrepreneurs in the United States and Muslim communities around the world.

On science and technology, we will launch a new fund to support technological development in Muslim-majority countries, and to help transfer ideas to the marketplace so they can create jobs. We will open centers of scientific excellence in Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia, and appoint new Science Envoys to collaborate on programs that develop new sources of energy, create green jobs, digitize records, clean water, and grow new crops. And today I am announcing a new global effort with the Organization of the Islamic Conference to eradicate polio. And we will also expand partnerships with Muslim communities to promote child and maternal health.

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

The issues that I have described will not be easy to address. But we have a responsibility to join together on behalf of the world we seek—a world where extremists no longer threaten our people, and American troops have come home; a world where Israelis and Palestinians are each secure in a state of their own, and nuclear energy is used for peaceful purposes; a world where governments serve their citizens, and the rights of all God’s children are respected. Those are mutual interests. That is the world we seek. But we can only achieve it together.
I know there are many—Muslim and non-Muslim—who question whether we can forge this new beginning. Some are eager to stoke the flames of division, and to stand in the way of progress. Some suggest that it isn’t worth the effort—that we are fated to disagree, and civilizations are doomed to clash. Many more are simply skeptical that real change can occur. There is so much fear, so much mistrust. But if we choose to be bound by the past, we will never move forward. And I want to particularly say this to young people of every faith, in every country—you, more than anyone, have the ability to remake this world.

All of us share this world for but a brief moment in time. The question is whether we spend that time focused on what pushes us apart, or whether we commit ourselves to an effort—a sustained effort—to find common ground, to focus on the future we seek for our children, and to respect the dignity of all human beings.

It is easier to start wars than to end them. It is easier to blame others than to look inward; to see what is different about someone than to find the things we share. But we should choose the right path, not just the easy path. There is also one rule that lies at the heart of every religion—that we do unto others as we would have them do unto us. This truth transcends nations and peoples—a belief that isn’t new; that isn’t black or white or brown; that isn’t Christian, or Muslim or Jew. It’s a belief that pulsed in the cradle of civilization, and that still beats in the heart of billions. It’s a faith in other people, and it’s what brought me here today.

We have the power to make the world we seek, but only if we have the courage to make a new beginning, keeping in mind what has been written.
The Holy Koran tells us, “O mankind! We have created you male and a female; and we have made you into nations and tribes so that you may know one another.”

The Talmud tells us: “The whole of the Torah is for the purpose of promoting peace.”

The Holy Bible tells us, “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.”

The people of the world can live together in peace. We know that is God’s vision. Now, that must be our work here on Earth. Thank you. And may God’s peace be upon you.