

BARACK OBAMA AND WORLD PEACE, A RHETORICAL INQUIRY

A Thesis by

Samuel Onyenachi Nze

Bachelor of Science, Imo State University, 2005

Submitted to the Department of Communication  
and the faculty of the Graduate School of  
Wichita State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts

May 2010

© Copyright 2010 by Samuel Onyenachi Nze

All Rights Reserved

## BARACK OBAMA AND WORLD PEACE, A RHETORICAL INQUIRY

The following faculty members have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content, and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts with a major in Communication.

---

Richard N Armstrong, Chair

---

Jeffrey Jarman, Committee Member

---

Randolph Ellsworth, Committee Member

## ABSTRACT

The thesis, entitled *Barack Obama and World Peace: A Rhetorical Inquiry*, is a qualitative research paper that appraises President Obama's commitment to global peace, through a thematic analysis of a cross section of his speeches. Against the background of Mr. Obama's receipt of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize, the thesis evaluates in five chapters Mr. Obama's merit as an icon of global peace by seeking a possible rhetorical vision of peace emerging from a cross section of his speeches, and consequently establishing a possible justification for his receipt of the Nobel Prize, using the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism. The thesis concludes that there is a rhetorical vision of peace emerging from a cross section of President Obama's speeches, and that he may consequently be called an icon of global peace, deserving of having won the Nobel Prize.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background to the Study .....	2
1.2 Objectives of the Study .....	7
1.3 Rationale of the Study .....	11
1.4 Research Questions .....	17
1.5 Definition of Terms .....	22
2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....	28
2.1 Nobel Committee's Rationale for Award.....	29
2.2 Biographical Accounts of Obama's Commitment to Peace .....	35
2.3 Autobiographical Accounts of Obama's Commitment to Peace .....	41
2.4 Theoretical Framework .....	48
3. METHODOLOGY .....	54
3.1 An Overview of Qualitative Communication Research .....	55
3.2 Rhetorical Criticism as Qualitative Research .....	60
3.3 Fantasy Theme Criticism .....	65
3.4 Description and Delimitation of Study .....	69
4. ANALYSIS .....	74
4.1 Barack Obama's Cairo Speech to the Muslim World .....	75
4.2 Barack Obama's Speech in Ghana .....	81

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Chapter	Page
4.3 Barack Obama’s Speech to the LGBT Community .....	87
4.4 Barack Obama’s Presidential Acceptance Speech .....	92
4.5 Barack Obama’s Speech to the United Nations General Assembly .....	97
5. CONCLUSION .....	104
5.1 Barack Obama’s Rhetorical Vision .....	106
5.2 Barack Obama as an Icon of Global Peace .....	111
5.3 Justification of Obama’s Nobel Prize Receipt .....	115
5.4 Suggestions for Further Research .....	120
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	125
APPENDICES .....	131
A. Barack Obama’s Speech to the Muslim World .....	132
B. Barack Obama’s Speech to the People of Ghana .....	149
C. Barack Obama’s Speech to the LGBT Community .....	160
D. Barack Obama’s Acceptance Speech .....	169
E. Barack Obama’s Speech to the United Nations .....	175

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The justification in conceiving of peace as the attainment of universal equality is not far fetched. The premise that the removal of jealousy and its concomitant aggression procures peace among peoples is historically entrenched in the works of scholars like Hobbes, Voltaire, Marx, Hegel and Kant, to mention but a few. These scholars have variously said that the end of conflict includes the resolution of the dialectical struggle between the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots, the prideful and the humiliated.

It is for the foregoing that this thesis approaches peace from the position of the emancipation of the underdog, the tolerance of the minority, the egalitarianism of the proletariat, and the avoidance of aggression by the oppressed. The aim of law, of diplomacy, of negotiation and of referendum may easily be seen as the pacification of the factions of global society most prone to aggression, aggression consequent on want, on self reproach, on dissatisfaction with a status-quo deemed repressive, on envy of those perceived to be favored.

This thesis therefore looks at the brokering of peace as attempts to include the obscure; efforts to empower the poor; blitz at pacifying the humiliated, as well as minority and historically disadvantaged populations. In a global society like ours, these efforts are no longer confined to one state or nation, but to all the world, seeing that the interconnectedness of nations brings about what scholars have called a shared destiny, to wit that events occurring in one part of the world necessarily affect other parts of it, and efforts to alleviate problems in one part of the world benefit all parts thereof, as a simple consequence of the historical mix of cultures and nations.

Scholars have conceived of the world as perennially changing. Friedman (2009) has adduced three stages of global transformation, brought about by nations, organizations and

individuals respectively. The current era of global transformation in his view is consequent on the efforts of individuals who, through their speeches and actions, have tried to “flatten” the world. This notion of flattening allegorically ties with our earlier premise of the removal of the occasions of jealousy to secure peace. If the deprived are elevated, the obscure accepted and the aggrieved placated, the occasions of jealousy are removed, and peace is supposedly attained.

Also, this removal of jealousy, occurring as it is in Friedman's third era of globalization, is often carried out by individuals working astutely to broker peace: like Nelson Mandela trying to end apartheid; like Muhammad Yunus, trying to empower the poor, and like Martin Luther King trying to end segregation. All these people, and many others besides, have been recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize because, in trying to flatten the world, they have become viewed as icons of peace, through their speeches and efforts.

This thesis will hence examine the speeches and efforts of Barack Obama as an agent and icon of peace. It will criticize his speeches and document his efforts at leveling the global playing field and removing jealousy, the jealousy that sets the deprived against the privileged, the obscure against the popular; the humiliated against the prestigious. It will examine his messages of inclusion, emancipation, egalitarianism and tolerance, and in them try to discover a possibly emerging rhetorical vision that would justify a possible accolade as icon of global peace.

## BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Peace is a very old concept. Thousands of years ago, biblical prophets conceived of peace in much the same way as we have, as a leveling of the universal playing field, by emancipation, tolerance and egalitarianism. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and John the Baptist all spoke of

the progressive attainment of equality through the removal of the various differences among peoples. They also foretold of champions of this attainment, especially of the coming of Jesus, whom Isaiah described as the Prince of Peace, an individual filled with God's spirit, called and set apart to bring the Gospel to the poor, free all the imprisoned and oppressed; restore sight to the blind, and declare the arrival of the Kingdom of God.

Classical philosophers extended the notion of the attainment of peace through the removal of differences among peoples. In situations where differences could not be outrightly removed, methods for containing them were adduced. Locke, Hobbes and Rousseau all proposed the social contract theory, by which citizens surrender their wants and natural desires to an overarching system of government, a Leviathan, so as to escape the “state of nature,” which Hobbes described as “nasty, brutish and short.” They also spoke of government by authority instead of force, and of morality instead of avarice, of individual rights, and a general will.

In modern times, with the increasing interconnectedness of nation-states, the need for global peace and stability has necessitated the extrapolation of the same principles of morality, social contract and universal will to an international scale. The first and second world wars made the need more crucial. Countries realized that they needed to be at peace both within and without their borders. They saw that, as cultures and creeds interacted, they needed to allay occasions of aggression, so as to preserve prosperity for themselves and for all people.

These occasions of aggression were incumbent on the harping of the differences among peoples. The belief that one race was superior to another; the belief that one country deserved a pride of place in the global community over others; the belief that one religion was better than another – these were the instigators of universal conflict; they sparked the crusades, the inquisitions and the world wars that ravaged Europe and much of the world for centuries. The

Roman Catholic Church fought Islam for centuries over religion; Germany fought Jews and the rest of the world over race and nationalism. Indeed, a simple evaluation of the causes of war leads to the conclusion that aggression thrives on inequality.

Hence, the removal of inequality inevitably furthers the attainment of peace. Yet, how is inequality removed? Coexisting in this world are peoples of different races, creeds and dispositions. Some of these differences manifest themselves in physical ways, and so they cannot ordinarily be eliminated. Others are social and psychological constructs by which people define themselves, and upon which they build their lives and understand their position in the world, in short how their identities are established. Many of these ideals have been held by these peoples for as long as they can recall, and would be difficult to surrender.

Therefore, elimination becomes necessarily replaced with accommodation. Peoples of different races, cultures and creeds decide to accommodate one another and live together in spite of differences. They either forget that these differences exist, or rationalize their existence in such a way that they do not create angst. Many modern societies have done this through referendum, constitution and democracy. Historical societies have done so through priestly institutions. Yet, because humans are naturally prone to imperfection, many of these attempts at accommodation have failed. Civil societies have so borne the scourge of deviants and rebels that scholars have found it expedient to justify the institutionalization of crime, and crime prevention.

Be all the foregoing as it may, there have historically emerged institutions and individuals that have brokered for peace within nations and across the world. These individuals and institutions have on occasion taken it upon themselves to further bridge the divides existing among peoples, divides that engendering civilizations could not. Woodrow Wilson established the League of Nations, a precursor to the current United Nations Organization, in response to the

world wars. Nelson Mandela spent about twenty-seven years in prison to help end apartheid. Martin Luther-King organized and championed the cause of Civil Rights in a segregation-ridden America.

All these individuals and the institutions they started or belonged to helped further peace by challenging the differences among peoples that civil contracts could not remove or best accommodate. They saw that in spite of Leviathan's desire to accommodate these differences, human failing kept it powerless at effectively preserving peace by resolving these differences. Mandela saw that the constitution, referendum and democracy of Apartheid-ridden South Africa could not free the Natives there, but rather preserved a condition of debasement that on many occasions spurred civil unrest. Martin Luther-King saw that the laws and social contract of the United States could not emancipate and enfranchise African Americans, nor could the laws of nation states keep them from being aggressive towards one another in campaigning for territory in the cause of nationalism, as was the case in the world wars.

In all these occasions, these champions of peace stepped in to fill the void, to make themselves heard, and to force societies to live up to their obligations towards the masses, to remove or accommodate differences, and to further the attainment of universal peace for all peoples. There are many such champions of peace, such as: Mother Teresa and Muhammad Yunus, whose duty was to emancipate the poor; Desmond Tutu and Frederick de Klerk, whose duty was to procure egalitarianism, and many less known individuals, some of whom worked in relative obscurity to challenge Leviathan to live up to its responsibilities concerning its people.

A curious thing to note, in any case, is that many of the names previously mentioned: Martin Luther-King, Desmond Tutu, Frederick de Klerk, Nelson Mandela, Mother Teresa and Muhammad Yunus, are all recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize. CNN has described this Prize as

the most prestigious of international prizes. These individuals, to have merited this illustrious award, must have been viewed across the world as universal champions of peace. In short, they must have become icons of peace, so distinguished in their efforts at securing global harmony through the accommodation of human differences that they were deemed worthy of receiving such a grand prize.

A crucial factor in their becoming respected as universal icons of peace was their rhetorical vision, what they stood for and expressed repeatedly in their speeches; the message they conveyed to their audiences when they rallied and organized and marched. Their rhetorical visions became shared by their audiences. The people that marched with them, that campaigned with them, that rallied with them, that boycotted with them – these people bought into their vision; they shared their dream; they came to see the world through their eyes. They believed them. Because of the fidelity of their messages, these icons of peace sparked an idealism in their hearers, and moved these otherwise common folk to join in their struggle.

For Desmond Tutu and Martin Luther-King, it was their congregations; for Nelson Mandela, it was the ANC; for Mother Teresa, it was her Religious Order. But it was not just these small communities of people that were touched by the message of these champions of peace. The vast majority of people that came in contact with these icons, or their congregations, orders or parties were similarly affected: those that attended rallies and conventions; that marched on government institutions to demand change; that boycotted and picketed – these all became sharers of the rhetorical vision, and ultimately agents of peace through the removal or accommodation of human differences.

Hence, like the Prince of Peace, these icons inseeded a rhetorical vision of peace through their communications with their collaborators, and were able to further the

accommodation of the differences among peoples. In the same way recently, Barack Obama, the forty-fourth President of the United States received the Nobel Peace Prize. He was recognized as a global agent of peace. He was selected to join the ranks of the prestigious few who, through their outstanding rhetorical vision for peace in the world, have been honored with what CNN has called the most prestigious international prize.

His receipt of the Prize in December 2009 spurred controversy, though. People sought to know if he was truly deserving of being called an icon of peace. They sought to discover if, like Desmond Tutu, Nelson Mandela, Mother Teresa, Frederick de Klerk and Martin Luther-King, he was able to inspire in his hearers a rhetorical vision of peace; if he was able to communicate a commitment to the removal or accommodation of the differences among peoples; if he could indeed be called a universal icon of peace, thus justifying his receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize. In short, it was called to question the notion that a young, new United States President could so quickly have merited the receipt of the world's most prestigious award, and the underpinnings of such merit were similarly quizzed.

#### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Being such an old concept, peace has been variously defined. There probably are as many definitions of peace as there are dictionaries. It is not the aim of this thesis to procure a compendium of such definitions, nor to evaluate their aptitudes. The functional conceptualization of peace previously afforded suffices for this research effort. It is not either the aim of this thesis to procure an extensive biography of the man, Barack Obama. There currently exist a huge collection of both biographical and autobiographical accounts on the subject. Subsequently, this thesis will aim at accomplishing a succinct range of objectives.

Firstly, this thesis aims at providing sufficient support for the conceptualization of peace as a removal or accommodation of human differences. It aims at clearly showing that true peace exists not simply as a result of the absence of conflict, even though this is its consequence, but largely as a resolution of the conflicts engendered by the differences existing among populations. These differences include race, religion, economic status, sexual orientation, social class and worldview. This thesis acknowledges that, in view of the reality of diverse populations coexisting in the world, the potential for conflict is ratified.

This conflict is as a result of the clash of experiences, the experiences due to diverse formative cultures and the resulting diverse frames of reference among various elements of distinct populations. It bears witness to the fact that peace emerges not as a denial or a suppression of the diversity of humankind, but as a resolution or an accommodation thereof, how through the collaboration of a *mélange* of worldviews and differing proclivities, harmony among peoples is ratified and preserved for the universal good.

In any case, however, this harmony is viewed on a global scale. The thesis does not aim at showing how accommodation of differences brings about peace within individual nations. It incorporates the enduring notion of globalization, in much the same way that Friedman (2009) and McLuhan (1989) have in speaking of global villages having formed in the past century as a result of the activities of countries, organizations and individuals, helped by an increasing proliferation of information technology. The thesis bears witness to the fact that in modern times, peace is a borderless concept. It shows how peace must be sought within as well as without nations, by the accommodation not of national differences, but of global ones.

The world as a whole has evolved over the centuries. Scholars agree that what we know as the world today started as a band of tribes existing disparately on various continents and isles,

not cognizant of the existence of other populations on the same earth. Tribes claimed a sense of self-sufficiency, and the absence of sophisticated communication technologies made it more or less impossible for any interconnection among the far-flung tribes. They cultivated land, and carried on indigenous cultures largely uninfluenced by the world without their tentative borders, even as they sought their actualization.

However, as populations swelled, and technologies developed, tribes and populations interacted and influenced one another. Trade in goods, services, ideas and information among various populations led to what Friedman (2009) has called a “flattening” of the world, a shrinking from large to little, based on progressive interconnectedness. In modern times, this shrinking has been done at a dizzying rate. Ships, planes and other forms of transportation served to connect the world quite expediently historically, but the emergence of the Internet has made it instantaneous. People from all over the world can communicate with one another with alacrity.

Much of the technology that makes the foregoing possible has helped to further peace in the world, but also hate and war, depending on their use. It is not the instruments of global interconnectedness that bring about peace or war, but the nature of the overarching interrelationships among otherwise diverse populations existing in an ever shrinking world, where it is common knowledge that occurrences in one part thereof necessarily affect the other, even to such hitherto unknown concepts as climate change, how the industrial waste of say, Japan can affect the weather and people of say, Kenya, even though the two nations exist on different continents.

All of this becomes crucial in the distribution of global power. The nations that thrive in a globalized world will have to arm themselves with a mastery of international communications, in addition to diplomacy and international law. Much of this relates to the subject matter of this

thesis, how through proper cultivation of diplomacy, observance of universal human rights, and the actions of champions of global peace, harmony is preserved across the world, through the resolution and accommodation of the differences that exist among various populations of the world.

An overflow of this is a scrutiny of these champions of global peace. It has been established that this thesis is interested in explaining global peace as the accommodation of global human differences, in the pursuit of harmonious coexistence in a rapidly shrinking world. It has also been said that individuals, often working as representatives of nations or organizations, often help to bring about this resolution or accommodation. Many of them campaign, organize and push for change in society, so that others may live out their individual aspirations without conflict.

A privileged few of these have received global recognition, particularly the prestigious Nobel Peace Prize. Only recently, Barack Obama, the forty-fourth President of the United States, was awarded the Prize in recognition of his efforts at achieving global peace. This thesis is interested in evaluating his merit in receiving the award, by appraising his efforts at accommodating universal human differences. This thesis seeks to place his receipt of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize in the context of his rhetorical vision concerning global inclusion and the ratification, resolution and accommodation of global differences in the quest for world peace.

By criticizing a cross section of his speeches, this thesis aims at finding fantasy themes of global inclusion threading through the speeches, and thus availing a rhetorical vision that President Obama's audiences can socially converge around, and be sufficiently influenced by, in mobilizing for social change. Through a cursory scrutiny of his personality as availed in biographical and autobiographical accounts of him, and through a rhetorical inquiry of his

express communications, this research effort aims at juxtaposing Mr. Obama's communicative efforts at securing global peace through the accommodation of global differences with his recent recognition as a global icon of peace, and attempting where possible to justify the latter with the former.

A third objective may be to apply Bormann's Fantasy Theme method of Rhetorical Criticism. As a method, the Fantasy Theme analysis is apt in underpinning the theory of social convergence, a theory very much pertinent to the subject matter of this thesis. In applying this method to the cross section of President Obama's speeches, and in trying by this application to ferret fantasy peace themes in an effort to identify a rhetorical vision of peace, the method itself is ratified. In a sense, therefore, this thesis validates the Fantasy Theme method, and provides intellectual material for its continued evaluation. Hence, it bears witness to how this method of rhetorical criticism may be used in effectively discussing cogent social and communication issues.

#### RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

In cognizance of the plenitude of academic literature in communication, it is pertinent to establish a rationale for this research endeavor. The importance of conducting an inquiry into President Obama's rhetorical vision of global peace is underscored by the subsequent argument, concerning the gravity of the subject of peace itself, especially when viewed from a historical blitz at the accommodation and resolution of perennial human inequalities and differences, as hitherto stated. Also, the value of increasing academic literature in matters of the humanities and the social sciences for the sheer utility of prompting further research in related issues cannot be overemphasized.

To begin with, the justification of criticizing Mr. Obama's speeches in order to discover a possible rhetorical vision of global peace can be availed by a cursory examination of the gravity of the subject of peace and the underpinnings of the historic efforts at its attainment. This availment proceeds naturally from a provision of stimulant premises to the justification, how different populations have sought over time to resolve their differences, allay the occasions of conflict, secure harmonious coexistence and further the common will, as scholars have historically argued.

The differences that exist among people, as has been previously argued, underpin the conflicts among them, and an understanding of how this has occurred over the ages is apt to be reviewed. This understanding, and the consequent realization that individuals, through their communicative commitments based on the understanding, have spoken to inspire others to create change in society, leads the majority of people to believe in the possibility of mobilizing for peace and perennially securing the harmonious coexistence of diverse populations in the world. This is the rationale for this thesis, proceeding in the subsequent.

Firstly, race has historically divided populations. Historically, people have segregated on the basis of racial difference and inequality. The existence of Black, White, Yellow and Brown populations across the world has led to disharmony and strife: the Holocaust; slavery and segregation in the United States; genocides and ethnic cleansing efforts in various parts of the world – all these have been spurred by racial disharmony. These evils have arisen because different racial populations did not seek a peaceful resolution to the conflicts arising out of racial difference. Rather, they acted on the impulse of ignorant hate.

Historically, scholars have tried to understand racial differences among peoples. Charles Darwin for example conjectured that races are the proof of serial epochs in the evolution of man.

He tried to justify this argument by biological and environmental premises. However, modern science has proved him wrong, especially in his hypothesis that certain races were lower forms of evolution than others, and that all populations started with one, and migrated elsewhere, experiencing in the absolute migration diverse biochemical mutations crystallizing into new racial identities.

Curiously, rather than lead to peace and understanding, Darwin's work drove people further apart, and even justified slavery and the denial of human rights, for it led people who otherwise might have tried to believe in the universal equality of humans to think that it was fair to keep supposedly inferior races debased. In light of refuting evidence to Darwin's work, nonetheless, astute scholars have perennially argued that all races are equal, even if different, and it is morally unjust for one race to try to subdue another in the erroneous belief of superiority.

Secondly, religion has often been the occasion of hate among people. It is ironic to realize that faiths, supposedly originating from God, can cause such strife among populations. Perhaps it is expected, though. Jesus himself told his apostles in the Bible that he had come to bring a sword, to divide peoples from one another.

Theologians have argued in this regard that he was foreshadowing the perennial strife that would be the consequence of different faiths coexisting alongside Christianity. Instances of this strife abound: the Crusades and Inquisitions; Jihads and suicide bombings, notably the September 11 attacks on the USA; mindless slaughters of civilians based on perceived sacrileges, and so forth – all these are testaments of the horrors of disharmony occasioned by religious differences among peoples.

Religion appears to be the current most divisive factor among universal populations, and so it is not fortuitous that scholars have perennially tried to understand how humans become

vitriolic over faith, and how understanding based on mutual acceptance and respect can be brokered in the interest of enduring universal peace. For example, when in 2006 Pope Benedict XVI made a supposedly innocent remark about Islam, the Muslim world argued that he was insulting Islam. It took series of apologies and discussions with Islamic scholars in Rome for the Islamic world to be placated and stop all the brouhaha that had consequently arisen.

A third factor that drives people apart is social status. Social status is tied to issues of self-esteem and the ownership of wealth. Albert Einstein (1958) in his historic article, *Why Socialism?*, argued that when conquering powers establish dominion over conquered peoples, they humiliate the conquered and force them into the status of second class citizens in their own land. Instances of this abound: William the Conqueror subjugated the Saxons in his conquering of England; Pilgrims, Columbus and his ship's crew, as well as all of the European colonizers subjugated the Native American population in conquering the American continent. Europe conquered much of Africa, as well as Australia and Asia.

This historic conquer-and-subdue mentality has led to strife over the ages. The conquered populations have sought always in each instance to rid themselves of the yoke of domination and oppression by the conquerors. Classic examples are the Jews under the despotic rule of the Egyptians, and African Americans under the slavery of Caucasian Americans, both of which endured for centuries. It took the mobilizing efforts of Moses and Dr. King as well as President Lincoln and his legislative efforts to respectively free these peoples from their despots. In modern times as well, scholars have tried to expose frameworks by which popular struggles for emancipation from despotic rule may be understood.

It is not only self-esteem issues that underscore social status, however. The ownership of wealth is a crucial variable in this regard. It is ownership of wealth that has historically kept

oppressive regimes in power, controlled the minds of otherwise free people, and paid for numerous wars that have timelessly driven peoples further apart. Indeed, Karl Marx believed that all the structures of society: polity, culture and society were all dependent on the economic infrastructure. In his view, supported by Hegel (in Smith, 1990) and Engels, this historical materialism gave rise to a dialectic struggle between the rich and the poor.

In his work, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Engels (1975) testifies that there exists a conflict of material interests between the haves, also called the bourgeois, and the have-nots, also called the proletariat. The bourgeois on the one hand seek to rip off the poor by making them work for little pay, while the proletariat wish to acquire control of the factors of production and be their own boss. This conflict of interests, according to Engels, leads to a revolution, in which the poor fight for their freedom and vanquish the oppressive rich, leading to the entrenchment of socialism, as occurred in Soviet Russia, and other parts of the world influenced by socialist teachings.

Scholars, in trying to understand socialism and its consequences, have taught that law exists to protect the wealthy from the poor, and that socialism in its ideal is an answer to the overriding issue of jealousy, to wit that ideal socialism is a response to perceived injustice, a ratification of human jealousy, and a subtle precursor of democracy. This democracy could also be seen to proceed from premises of historical ideology, consequent on the hypothesis that states are founded on the possession of ideas, which results in a dialectic between those that possess them and those that do not, or between those that possess differing worldviews.

This dialectic ideology leads to a conflict, not of material interests, but of ideological interests, for example, between the Democratic Party and Republican Party in the United States. The conflict of ideological interests in turn leads to elections and the triumph of one party over

another, the party that then occupies power and enacts and carries out policies to govern the people.

One more factor that separates people is sexual orientation. The existence of gays and lesbians has always been a thorn in the flesh of many. Being gay or lesbian is not new. As far back as the Old Testament times, the phenomenon has endured. It has historically, in any case, been viewed as an odious deviation from the norm, as horrific as witches that of old have been burnt at stake, and as deserving of the highest form of social opprobrium. Indeed, in recent times, Uganda has enacted harsh governmental policies to severely punish and on occasion to even kill homosexuals.

In the United States on the other hand, the LGBT community has struggled for equal marital and other rights with their heterosexual siblings. Some states of the Union have legalized gay and lesbian marriage, while others have not. The debate as to what should be the legal rights of gays and lesbians when it comes to marriage and other social rights and privileges is ongoing, and so are the strifes occasioned by misunderstanding based on sexual orientation. The debate in any case also includes what the cause of being gay or lesbian is, biological or psychological. Many have died as a result of violence against gays and lesbians; some of these have been murdered for being openly gay or lesbian, while others have been driven to take their own lives by persistent psychological torture.

Recently, the Obama Administration signed into law the hate crimes bill, part of which protects the LGBT community from those who would heckle and taunt them, and the move for overall equality for the LGBT community in the US and all over the world proceeds. It is apt in any case to examine how the efforts at understanding the gay and lesbian community may lead to acceptance and peace, as populations seek to transcend the limitation of prejudice and further

acceptance of people that differ on the basis of sexual orientation.

Ultimately hence, the rationale for this thesis is that there are indeed differences that threaten the harmonious coexistence of humans in the world. These differences are crucial, and they include: race, religion, social status and sexual orientation. A universal acceptance of human differences supposedly leads to peace, and understanding of these differences and how they may be ratified and resolved is a step along the way to doing so. Champions over the ages have mobilized for peace through their communicative efforts. One such champion is Barack Obama. An inquiry into his possible rhetorical vision of peace will hence provide an example of the possibility of success in the blitz at containing and resolving historically crucial divisive factors in the interest of global peace.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This qualitative research effort concerns itself with answering three research questions. It has hitherto been established that the thesis, entitled *Barack Obama and World Peace: A Rhetorical Inquiry*, is concerned with evaluating the concept of peace as a resolution of the differences existing among various peoples, as well as showing that certain individuals have been champions of peace through their communicative efforts. It has also been previously stated that a privileged few of these champions, including Barack Obama, have been recipients of the prestigious Nobel Peace Prize.

Both a succinct biographical account of Barack Obama and an explanation of the circumstances that caused the Nobel Peace Committee to award Mr. Obama the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize will be afforded in latter portions of this thesis. It suffices for now to say that the committee members were unanimous in naming him the prizewinner. As a young president in his

first year in office, controversy arose as to whether he deserved to receive the prize. Mr. Obama himself called his own worthiness to question more than once.

Controversy breeds debate. On the one hand, some people argued that, as the first African American President of the United States, he bridged a major divide among populations and for that alone could be deemed worthy of the prize. Nelson Mandela became the first African President of post-apartheid South Africa, and he received a Nobel Peace Prize as well. The counter argument to this assertion was that it undermined the value of the Prize, if it was awarded solely on the basis of race. The proponents of the counter argument averred that the Prize should be given to individuals for what they have done, and not for what they look like.

A second argument was that Mr. Obama received the prize for being different from his predecessor, George W Bush. On the one hand, some people felt that Mr. Obama, in differing from President Bush on aspects of foreign policy, like the war in Iraq, Guantanamo Bay, the prohibition of the use of torture in interrogating terrorism suspects, and the use of diplomacy in engaging Iran and other historically unfriendly nations, was deserving of the prize. Others argued, however, that the prize should not be given based on political exigency. They also named previous presidents, like Bill Clinton, who carried out policies that could be deemed similar to Mr. Obama's, but did not receive the prestigious Prize.

A third argument was that Mr. Obama, even though new in office, was a voice for the propagation of change, hope and popular accent. Mr. Obama himself, in signing the Nobel Prize Book, thanked the Committee for “giving voice to the voiceless.” It has been argued in this regard that, by speaking on various occasions and in various places about peace and its concomitants, Mr. Obama was revealing himself as an indisputable champion of peace. They cited key speeches he had rendered within his one year of being in office, the speeches in Egypt,

Ghana; at the United Nations; to the LGBT community, and on the day of his historic election to office, to mention a few.

These communicative efforts, it was argued, in addition to the few tangible things he had begun to do, like calling for the end of the use of torture, closing the facility at Guantanamo Bay and working on climate change among other things, put Mr. Obama on the Committee's list of favorites. The substance of Mr. Obama's speeches in all cases seemed to be a crucial variable in his being chosen to receive the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize, a prize that CNN for example has on occasion called the most prestigious prize in the world.

In view of the foregoing, it is apt to then question the substance of Barack Obama's presidential speeches. If indeed his speeches were a crucial variable in his selection to receive the Nobel peace Prize, then it is an expected research endeavor to inquire into them. This underpins the first research question. The first research question for this thesis is: Can concurrent themes of world peace be found in a cross section of Barack Obama's presidential speeches? In other words, could we find messages of world peace based on the accommodation of popular differences emerging from a cross section of Mr. Obama's speeches?

This first research question is answered by applying the Fantasy Theme method of Rhetorical Criticism. Even though this method will be fully elaborated upon later on in this thesis, it suffices to state that using this method in criticizing a cross section of President Obama's speeches will expose fantasy themes, which crystallize into fantasy chains, and then fantasy types, and then a rhetorical vision. Hence, this first question spurs the ferreting of fantasy themes of world peace from each of the speeches being criticized, revealing a possible chain of such fantasy themes running through all the speeches being criticized; classing this possible fantasy chain of world peace into a possibly existent fantasy type, and describing a possibly

emergent rhetorical vision consequent on all the foregoing.

The value of asking this first research question, hitherto justified by the premise that a chief consideration in the award of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize to Mr. Obama was the substance of his speeches around the world within his first year of office, lies in the fact that this question sets the stage for the two other questions the thesis hopes to answer. These questions seek to discover if Mr. Obama's possible rhetorical vision of world peace may lead to his being viewed as an icon of global peace, and also if he ultimately deserved to have received the Nobel Peace Prize.

The second research question may be stated thus: Can it be argued that Barack Obama is an icon of global peace based on the rhetorical vision emergent from his speeches? As a necessary overflow of the first research question, this second question speculates into whether Mr. Obama, through his communicative efforts may be named a champion of peace, like some of the names earlier mentioned who, through their own communicative efforts became known all over the world as champions or icons of universal peace.

This second research question seeks particularly not simply to argue if Mr. Obama is an icon of peace by virtue of his rhetorical vision, but to possibly show that he is an icon of peace, based on a possibly emergent rhetorical vision of global peace consequent on the accommodation of popular differences. It has been perennially stressed in this essay that peace is the accommodation of popular differences, such as race, religion, social status and sexual orientation. Hence, the second research question seeks to discover if Mr. Obama is a champion of world peace because he is possibly a champion of equality, egalitarianism, emancipation, tolerance and the avoidance of conflict.

From a theoretical point of view, this second question seeks to possibly establish that Mr.

Obama's rhetorical vision has led to a symbolic convergence of his audiences, by making them sensitive to his message of global peace, and by mobilizing them in support of it. It also seeks to possibly establish that Mr. Obama's rhetorical vision has led to his audiences symbolically interacting with him as an icon of global peace, in such a way that they learn, through his example, how to work and speak in favor of harmonious coexistence among otherwise different peoples. Also, this second question seeks to possibly discover if Mr. Obama's speeches inspire social constructs in the minds of a global audience by their identification with him and his message.

In short, the second question explores the relevance of symbolic convergence, symbolic interactionism and social constructionism in arguing for whether or not Mr. Obama may be viewed as a champion or icon of peace, against the background of his emergent rhetorical vision. It seeks to establish a possible connection between the rhetorical vision emerging from a critique of his speeches and his image and credibility before a global audience. It is also a precursor to the third research question, which seeks to possibly justify Mr. Obama's receipt of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize.

The third research question may be stated thus: If there is an emergent rhetorical vision of world peace from Mr. Obama's speeches, and if he is arguably an icon of global peace, then can it be argued that he deserved to have received the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize? In view of the controversy that has engulfed the phenomenon of Mr. Obama's receipt of the prestigious prize, a controversy that instigated the debates hitherto exposed, can a research effort like this explain in humanistic research terms that the Nobel Committee was justified in giving the award to President Obama? Could the argument be conclusive in this regard? This is the essence of the third research question.

Hence, the task of this thesis, against the background of all the foregoing, is to answer three research questions: firstly, whether a rhetorical vision of peace may be seen to emerge from a critique of a cross section of President Obama's speeches, using the Fantasy Theme method of rhetorical criticism developed by Bormann; secondly, whether Mr. Obama, as a consequence of the emergent rhetorical vision, may be termed an icon or champion of global peace, and thirdly, whether it may be argued that, having possibly become an icon or a champion of global peace consequent on his emergent rhetorical vision, he was deserving of the Nobel Peace Prize he received this year.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

An operationalization of the concepts pertinent to this research endeavor is here apt. These terms are central to a holistic appreciation of the pith of the thesis, and hence deserve definition. The terms are: Barack Obama, world peace and rhetorical inquiry. These terms are explained as they relate in functionality to this thesis, and not in plain dictionary terms, and they are best conceived of against the backdrop of all that has previously been explained. All three terms are noun phrases. A noun has generally been defined as a name of a person, animal, place, thing or idea.

Firstly, the term Barack Obama is conceptualized for our purposes. A conceptualization of the name, Barack Obama, is availed in the subsequent. Barack Obama is ordinarily the name of a person, and hence a proper noun. Its operationalization for purposes of this thesis does not in any case imply the rendition of a biography of the bearer of the name, as a succinct biographical evaluation is afforded in the second chapter. It suffices for now to demonstrate how the term is used throughout the thesis.

In a recent interview actor Will Smith had with Oprah Winfrey, he said that there are two

ways by which Barack Obama may be conceived of. He said that Barack Obama might be conceived of as a person, or as an idea. As a person, Will Smith said, Barack Obama is a relatively young man, lawyer, father, husband and the forty-fourth President of the United States of America. As an idea however, Will Smith further states, Barack Obama is an icon of hope, change and progress. In the same interview, Will Smith describes how he cried on the day that Barack Obama, the person, was elected president and, according to Will Smith, the election to office of Barack Obama the person brought about a didactic moment for all African Americans, who would consequently begin to “take charge” of their destinies in the United States of America, as they no longer had any excuse not to.

This thesis operationalizes the term, Barack Obama, in much the same way as Will Smith did in the Oprah interview. It sees the term as both the name of a person and the name of an idea. In latter portions of the thesis, the reader will be able to understand the situations in which either definition is in use, by examining the context of its use. Albeit, the subsequent conceptualization will facilitate this understanding.

To begin with, Barack Obama the person, according to several biographical sources, was born on August 4, 1961, in Honolulu, Hawaii, to Ann Durham, a white mother from Wichita, Kansas, and a black father from Kogelo, Kenya, who had come to America on a college scholarship. His parents had met at the University of Hawaii, where both of them were students, and had subsequently been married. When Barack Obama was two years old, his father left to do postgraduate studies at Harvard, and subsequently abandoned the young Barack and his mother, and returned to Kenya.

As a young boy, Barack Obama lived in Hawaii, and in Indonesia, when his mother married a certain Mr. Soetoro. He also acquired a baby sister, Maya Soetoro. Barack Obama

attended the prestigious Punahou Academy in Hawaii. He then proceeded to Columbia University to study political science and international relations. He subsequently studied at the Harvard Law School, where he became the first African American Editor of the Harvard Law Review. He married Michelle Robinson in 1992, and they have two children, Sasha and Malia.

Barack Obama was a State legislator for Illinois from 1997 to 2004. In 2004, he gave the famous Democratic National Convention speech that arguably rocketed him into political prominence. By 2005, he was a United States senator for Illinois, where he was instrumental in the passage of legislation to help ordinary Americans lead better lives. In 2007, he announced his candidacy for the Presidency and thus began the long and arduous journey that led him towards becoming the first African American President of the United States of America.

As an idea, Barack Obama, the first African American President of the United States is a huge inspiration to black people all over the world. When his presidency is viewed against the backdrop of the fact that barely fifty years ago black people could hardly vote or be voted for, his landmark achievement gives hope to any black person that anything is possible, that the color of one's skin need not prevent that person from being what he or she wants to be in America and indeed the world.

This is probably the reason that some people argued that by the virtue of his being the first African American President of America, he deserved to have received the Nobel Peace Prize, whether or not he did anything else. It is permissible to think that the people who argued in this manner were conceiving of Barack Obama not just as a man with an impressive resume, but also as an ideal of egalitarianism, a living testament that all peoples have equal chances in the global playing field.

Barack Obama as an idea is a wake-up call to those who would despair from being

disadvantaged by race, social class or any other minority background. Barack Obama the idea is a signal of how far America has come in the “perfection of racial union.” Barack Obama as an idea has also been described as a resolution to the work and preaching of Martin Luther King, who himself was a Nobel Prize recipient. Barack Obama the idea is a symbol of the mantra he himself proliferated: “Yes, we can.” To those who perceived themselves as incapacitated, subjugated or oppressed, his example was supposed to make them believe that they could do anything they set their minds to.

This term, Barack Obama, as used in this thesis, is hence the name of a young President, with an impressive biography and laudable achievements; a father, husband and distinguished personality, but also a testament to change, hope, egalitarianism and possibly world peace. It is the task of this thesis to research into whether in fact he is a testament to world peace and a deserving recipient of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize, by criticizing a cross section of his international speeches, to possibly find themes of world peace contained therein.

World peace, as noted, is conceptualized as synonymous with all the following: equality, egalitarianism, tolerance, emancipation and the avoidance of conflict. The premises for the foregoing are here posited. Firstly, the world is a *mélange* of diverse populations, different on the bases of race, religion, social status, sexual orientation and worldview. These differences provoke conflict, wherein a population seeks to subdue another, through wars, sanctions and other forms of aggression.

Secondly, the world is highly interconnected, and various nation states influence one another through the proliferation of information technology, trade, transportation and diplomacy. Citizens of individual nation states are also citizens of the world, and should rightly be concerned about world peace. Also, world peace involves the ratification, resolution and accommodation of

the differences among populations, and that individual sovereignties should respect the boundaries of other states, and adhere to the dictates of international law, jurisprudence and diplomacy.

Furthermore, individuals, acting alone or in groups, have often championed the cause of peace, through their communicative efforts in emancipating the poor, enfranchising the humiliated; tolerating the obscure, empowering the enfeebled, and generally avoiding conflict. A privileged few of these have received the prestigious Nobel Peace Prize for their efforts, including Barack Obama, whom this thesis concerns.

Hence, world peace, for purposes of this thesis, is conceived of as that circumstance brought about by the ratification, resolution and accommodation of the differences that exist among populations, notably: race, religion, social status, sexual orientation and worldview, championed by individuals through their communicative activities, a privileged number of whom, including Barack Obama, have won the prestigious Nobel Peace prize in recognition of their efforts at emancipating the poor, enfranchising the humiliated; tolerating the obscure, empowering the enfeebled, and generally mobilizing for the avoidance of international conflict.

The third concept to be operationalized is rhetorical inquiry. Rhetorical inquiry for purposes of this essay refers to rhetorical criticism as a method of qualitative communication research, especially as used in this thesis. Qualitative communication research is humanistic, as opposed to positivistic, and includes focus group studies, in-depth interviews, ethnographic studies, content analysis and rhetorical criticism.

Rhetorical criticism is a method of qualitative communication research that evaluates speeches and other forms of human expression, in order to discover emergent themes, styles and contexts. Rhetorical criticism in this thesis is carried out using the Fantasy Theme Method,

developed by Ernest Bormann. It is applied to a cross section of Barack Obama's speeches to discover a possibly emergent rhetorical vision that would lead to a possible scholastic attempt to justify Mr. Obama's receipt of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize and his appellation as an icon of universal peace.

## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of literature for purposes of this thesis examines relevant material on the Nobel Committee and its rationale for awarding the prestigious Peace Prize; biographical material on Barack Obama himself, as well as theoretical frameworks for the study as a whole. A review of literature finds utility in research as an exposition of the continuity of knowledge in any given field of study, a realization that research does not take place in a vacuum, but that any contribution to the pool of knowledge in any particular scholastic field is an expansion of existing knowledge in the field.

From an epistemological point of view, a review of literature lends credibility to research, in that it situates and classifies it, so that virtual families of learning are knit together in a universal mesh. Aristotle was one of the first scholars to conceive of families of knowledge. He argued that species of human endeavor may be studied in conglomerations or distinct species, and that these species are capable of growth in much the same way that human and biological families are. A review of literature, hence, provides the scholastic foundation for such growth.

In reviewing literature for the thesis, entitled *Barack Obama and World Peace: A Rhetorical Inquiry*, it is apt to examine academic materials that deal with Barack Obama himself, as well as world peace, especially as perceived by the Nobel committee that issued him the Prize. The third chapter will subsequently expound on Rhetorical Criticism, and the Fantasy Theme Method, as developed by Bormann. In this way, the succinct interconnectedness of the various segments of the thesis is demonstrated.

In discussing Barack Obama, both biographical and autobiographical materials are reviewed. Aspects of his personality and life's work, especially those relevant to the matter of world peace, are scrutinized, to possibly reveal patterns that may be germane to the critique and

an understanding of the select cross section of his speeches, when the Fantasy Method is applied in the fourth chapter.

Also, documents concerning the process of nominations and selections by the Nobel committee for the prestigious Peace Prize are reviewed, so as to grasp the underpinnings of Mr. Obama's possible deservedness of the Prize. The review of literature provides apt premises and supporting facts to validate the entire research activity.

#### NOBEL COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE FOR AWARD

The Nobel Peace Prize, according to the Nobel Committee's official website ([http://nobelpeaceprize.org/en\\_GB/about\\_peaceprize](http://nobelpeaceprize.org/en_GB/about_peaceprize)), was established by Alfred Nobel, to reward any individual or entity that “shall have done the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses.” According to Newsweek, Alfred Nobel had the chance of reading of his own purported death in the newspapers. Horrified by his legacy of dynamite invention, a weapon of mass destruction at the time, he resolved to launder his memory by endowing an award for international peace.

According to the Nobel Committee's website, the Peace Prize is presided over by a Norwegian Committee, while the rest of the Nobel prizes, for Chemistry, Economics, Medicine and Physics are awarded by a Swedish Committee. The first Nobel Peace Prize, according to the website, was awarded in 1901 to Frederic Passy, who had been one of the main organizers for the first Universal Peace congress, and a leader in the French peace movement.

Subsequent Prizes were awarded for work in international law and jurisprudence, intergovernmental relations, humanitarian work and universal human rights, among others.

According to the Nobel Committee's website, Theodore Roosevelt was the first American President to receive the Prize, in 1906, for his successful mediation to the end of the Russo-Japanese war and for his interest in arbitration, having provided the Hague arbitration court with its very first case.

According to the Nobel Committee's website, the first and second world wars stunted the activities of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee, because of the universal unrest the wars occasioned. In the Second World War in particular, the Norwegian government was forced to flee to London. However, in both world wars, the Nobel Committee resolved unanimously to give the Peace Prize to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) since, according to the Nobel Committee, the Red Cross did preserve the notions of the universal solidarity of the human race even in the face of global war.

In modern times, the United Nations and globalization have played roles in the decisions of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee, notably in the 1940's and 1950's when most Peace Prizes went to the UN and its affiliates. Humanitarian work was still a germane consideration nonetheless; and in the 1960's, human rights advocacy, as evidenced in the 1964 receipt of the Peace Prize by Martin Luther King, for his efforts at ending segregation in the United States, among other things.

In 1973, the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to US National Security Adviser and Secretary of State, Henry A. Kissinger, and North Vietnamese leader, Le Duc Tho, for the 1973 Paris agreement intended to bring about a cease-fire in the Vietnam War, and a withdrawal of American forces. According to the Nobel website, this award was one of the most controversial in Nobel Prize history, because Le Duc Tho refused the prize for political reasons. Albeit, according to the Nobel website, it was in the 1970's that the Peace Prize became truly global,

encompassing recipients from Asia, Africa and Latin America.

According to Nobel Committee's website, each year the Committee calls for nominations for the Nobel Peace Prize. The Norwegian Parliament selects the Nobel Committee responsible for this nomination and the subsequent selection process. The members of the Committee are very distinguished personalities, related by credentials to the cause of the Nobel Institution, to the Norwegian Parliament and to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

The Nobel Committee's testament concerning the selection process reveals that nominations are to be received by February 1 of each year, and by that date this year, a record 205 nominations were received. The Committee further testified that it was the unanimous decision of all its constituents to award the 2009 Peace Prize to Barack Obama, on the tenth of December, in honor of Alfred Nobel's demise, and in the presence of the Norwegian Royalty.

The Nobel committee stated that it decided to award Mr. Obama the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize "for his extraordinary efforts to strengthen international diplomacy and cooperation between peoples, and for Obama's vision of and work for a world without nuclear weapons" ([http://nobelprize.org/award\\_ceremonies/interviews\\_2009.html](http://nobelprize.org/award_ceremonies/interviews_2009.html)). It is important to take note of the singular word "vision," and juxtapose it with the previously stated objective of this thesis to ferret a possible "rhetorical vision" that would serve to possibly justify Mr. Obama's reception of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize.

The Nobel Committee's Press release, dated October 9, 2009, states that President Obama has created a fresh climate in international politics, by resuming multilateral diplomacy, and engaging international institutions as the primary means for resolving some of the most difficult international conflicts. It goes further to state that Mr. Obama has shown considerable effort in confronting the world's great climatic changes, and strengthening democracy and

human rights. It calls Mr. Obama one of the world's leading spokesmen in adjudicating for global peace. Again, it is pertinent to take note of the appellation, “spokesman,” especially as it relates to the pith of this research effort.

In his speech of presentation dated October 10, 2009, Chairman of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee, Thorbjorn Jagland, commented favorably on the modest attitude of Mr. Obama's earlier remarks on the morning of his selection as the Peace Prize recipient. Mr. Obama had said at the White House that he did not see himself as deserving of being placed in the ranks of the “giants,” such as Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela, seeing that his work on the global stage was only inchoate and relatively slight.

Mr. Jagland went further to concur with Mr. Obama in that the Prize could be viewed as “a call to action,” in such a fashion that, having set the tone for constructive multilateral diplomacy and engaging international institutions as Mr. Obama has, the Nobel recipient could take his receipt as incentive to squarely face the task of furthering the interest of peace around the world with renewed vigor and a sound resolve.

Mr. Jagland also averred that the year's award was to be viewed against the backdrop of the prevailing global situation, which has caused great tension across the world, in light of the threat of war, and the actual occurrences of aggression in various parts of the world, as well as the imminent danger of the spread of nuclear weapons, in a decade that has been described by Time Magazine as the worst since the second world war.

Mr. Jagland also quoted Archbishop Desmond Tutu, himself a Nobel Peace Prize Recipient, as saying that Barack Obama has “lowered the temperature of the world.” He proceeded to cite particular actions Mr. Obama has taken to effect this lower temperature: Mr. Obama's call for the closing of the Prison at Guantanamo; his prohibition of the use of enhanced

interrogation methods; his resetting the stage for multilateral diplomacy, and his work in pushing for a world free from the threat of nuclear weapons, among other things.

In a recent interview he granted the Nobel Committee, former Vice President Al Gore (<http://nobelprize.org/mediaplayer/index.php>), also a recipient of the Nobel Peace prize, stated that he shared the enthusiasm of the Nobel Committee in its award of the 2009 Peace Prize to Mr. Obama, especially for most of the reasons that Mr. Jagland afforded in his speech of presentation. He also agreed that the award coming as early as it did in the Obama presidency was indeed “a call to action.” He expressed hope that the call would be heeded, and that Mr. Obama would continue to work assiduously for the furtherance of peace throughout the world.

Even as the controversy over Mr. Obama's deservedness of the Prize subsists, it is pertinent to have examined the supporting material made available by the Nobel Committee in its testaments, actions and ceremonies concerning the award, as a continual reiteration of its resolve and blitz at the perennial justification of its selection, and the situation of that selection in the context, not only of Alfred Nobel's will, but in keeping with precedents established historically by previous selections, some of which have been similarly controversial, as earlier demonstrated.

The communicative actions of the Nobel Committee in justifying Mr. Obama's receipt of the Prize have been amplified by none other than Mr. Obama himself, as evidenced in his Nobel lecture, at Oslo, in the presence of the King and people of Norway, and indeed before the whole world. In that speech, he reiterated his modest stance of not being worthy of being placed in the ranks of transformational figures of history, like Dr. King and Nelson Mandela, in cognizance of his “slight” achievements on the global stage.

He averred however that his being a Head of State was no doubt a crucial variable in his selection as the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize recipient. He stated that he was aware that the receipt

was a call to action, but also a testament to the new tone he had set with regard to international diplomacy and the universal quest for human rights, among other things. He also pointed out that he was a Commander-in-Chief presiding over two wars, one of which he had had to escalate by the ordering of additional troops to Afghanistan.

Much of his speech, hence, was devoted to justifying his acceptance of a Peace prize, when he was in fact a wartime president. In the thirty-five-minute speech, he spoke extensively of “just war,” and how it is sometimes necessary to wage war so as to secure peace. He said for example that negotiations could not have prevented Hitler's armies from overrunning the world, nor could negotiations call hardened terrorists to broker peace around a diplomatic table. He said that history teaches us that “evil does exist in the world,” and that we cannot stand aside and let evil take its toll unmitigated.

When the crux of Mr. Obama's lecture is juxtaposed with Mr. Jagland's earlier testament as contained in his presentation speech that the year's award was to be viewed in light of the prevailing global tension of wars and numerous other occasions of aggression, a similitude of reasoning is deducible, and a further grasp of the delicate syllogism of Mr. Obama's possible deservedness of the Prize is attempted.

That peace can be a corollary of war, and that both can be simultaneously waged, in the blitz at replacing one with the other; that in escalating a war, a bellicose president can be viewed as an icon of peace deserving of a monumental prize like the Nobel Peace Prize – these conceptions bring to the fore the need to evaluate the nuances of international affairs in the modern world, beset by ageless problems of the accommodation of universal human differences in a world made more interconnected by the perennial proliferation of information technology, among other things.

A subsequent review of literature concerning Barack Obama himself will situate the foregoing from an individual viewpoint, lending credence to the coordinating subject of this thesis, for indeed it is Mr. Obama's communicative efforts that are being criticized, albeit against the backdrop of the efforts the Nobel Committee has displayed in showing these communicative efforts to be deserving of serving as veritable underpinning for Mr. Obama's receipt of the 2009 Nobel Peace prize.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNTS OF OBAMA'S COMMITMENT TO WORLD PEACE

The rationale for a review of relevant biographical literature concerning Barack Obama has hitherto been established. An appreciation of the personality influencing the speeches to be subsequent critiqued is here apt. In the relatively short span of a year, numerous materials have been published about Barack Obama, the once unlikely candidate for Presidency of the United States. This review in any case is not a bare biography seeking to phlegmatically present facts about Mr. Obama, but a tailored biographical rendition of his commitments to world peace. It is interpretive as well as factual.

A gist of his biographical time line has been previously afforded. It has been stated that he was born at the Kapiolani Hospital and Gynecological Maternity in Hawaii at 7.24 pm, on August 4, 1961, to Stanley Ann Durham and Barack Hussein Obama Sr. He lived as a child in Hawaii and in Indonesia. He attended the Punahou Academy, the Occidental College, Columbia University and ultimately the Harvard Law School, where he became the first African American Editor of the Harvard Law Review. He ran for State legislature, and the US Senate, and ultimately the Presidency that he now occupies.

An exhaustive biography of Barack Obama demands a book of its own, and there are

quite a few books of the sort already. It is not the aim of this portion of the thesis to provide such an exhaustive biography, but simply to distil relevant aspects of his life that provide a grid by which his communicative efforts at securing global peace may be looked at and possibly evaluated, among other things.

According to Mendell (2008, p 6), Madelyn Dunham, Barack Obama's grandmother, said of young Barack Obama: “When he was a young man, I asked him what he wanted to do with his life, and he said, 'I want to leave the world a better place than when I came in.' And I believe that has been his guiding light.” Mendell goes further to state, still on page 6 of his book, “Obama without argument is imbued with an abiding sense of social and economic justice.”

The question to ask here is: How so? How is it that Barack Obama is supposedly imbued with an abiding sense of social and economic justice, as Mendell testifies? According to Scott (2008) in a New York Times article, Stanley Ann Dunham, Barack Obama's mother, was a major influence in his personality formation. In that article, Maya Soetoro-Ng, Barack Obama's half sister, was quoted as saying of her mother, “That was very much her philosophy of life — to not be limited by fear or narrow definitions, to not build walls around ourselves and to do our best to find kinship and beauty in unexpected places.”

The article goes further to describe Stanley Ann Dunham, as a “very, very big thinker,” who always told Barack Obama to broaden his own intellectual horizon. Barack Obama himself later said that she used to wake him up by four in the morning, when he was still in middle school, simply to study and grow his mind. The article further hints at Stanley Ann Dunham's intellectual distinction by stating that she wrote an 800-page dissertation on peasant blacksmithing in Java, Indonesia, where she lived awhile with her second husband, Mr. Soetoro, and her two children, Barack and Maya.

According to Mendell (2008), it was not simply Stanley Ann Dunham's intellectual prowess that shaped Barack Obama's personality, though. Mendell is also of the view that Obama's mother's love for other cultures shaped the young politician's ideas about the world. The fact that he spent much of his life in Asia, as well as in America, and that he could identify with Blacks, is owed largely to her two marriages, one to an African, and the other to an Indonesian. According to Mendell, it is easy to agree that Barack Obama was raised Black, White, Indonesian and Hawaiian.

Indeed, Barack Obama would later state in this regard of his experience growing up in Indonesia, in a 2004 radio interview: “I think Indonesia made me more mindful of not only my blessings as a US citizen, but also the ways that fate can determine the lives of young children, so that one ends up being fabulously wealthy, and another ends up being extremely poor.” It is worthy of note as well that it was Stanley Ann Dunham's parents that paid for the young Barack's education at Punahou Academy.

According to Mendell (2008), because of his varied lived experiences, Barack Obama is able to serve as a slate for diverse people to draft their worldviews on, because he is biracial, and lived for awhile in Asia. Indeed, in this regard, Obama himself has been reputed as saying: “Our family get-togethers look like a meeting of the United Nations.” This multilateral view of the world, according to Mendell (2008, p 3), strengthened by his mother's example, was what led Senator Obama to declare at the Democratic National Convention of 2004 that America was a land of good-hearted people, a nation of citizens who have more uniting than dividing traits, a country bound by the common purpose of freedom and opportunity for all.

Mendell (2008, p 9) further states in the foregoing regard that “Obama's come-from-nowhere ascent would make it starkly evident just how passionately many Americans yearned

for an inspirational leader who could mend the various divisions within the country – racial, political, cultural and spiritual.” Indeed, according to Chicago Tribune columnist, Clarence Page, for a while before Obama gave his DNC speech, Democrats were excited because they finally got a black face for the party who was not Jesse Jackson or Al Sharpton, because the country was looking for a come-together feeling, a sensation of being united across demographics.

Mendell (2008, p 10) testifies that this sense of oneness with the world that Obama displays was ingrained in him by Stanley Ann Dunham, who taught him to think deeply, to love diverse cultures, and to reconsider in himself the selflessness that characterizes true humanity. In being at one with the world, according to Bruce Reed, President of the Democratic Leadership Council, Mr. Obama is perennially able to attract people to himself, and inspire them to believe in him, and hope with him for a better world. This, no doubt, is a crucial political asset.

So far in this sub-chapter, we have reviewed relevant biographical literatures that afford background assessment of Mr. Obama's proclivity to peace from the stance of his mother's early influence. In the subsequent part of this sub-chapter, we shall review relevant biographical literatures that afford background assessment of Mr. Obama's proclivity to peace from the stances of the influences of his college education, and his work as a community organizer in Chicago.

Mendell (2008) gives a substantial account of Barack Obama's sojourn in college, and how he gradually acquired an intellectual view of the world. It was in college, according to Mendell, that Barack Obama first confronted himself as an individual. Mendell is of the view that all the while that Barack lived with his Dunham family in Hawaii and attended the Punahou Academy, he was somewhat sheltered, and could not fully confront the issues of identity and self-determination that continually perturbed him. It was in college that he was able to deal with

these concerns in a detached manner.

Maya Soetoro-Ng said in a recent commentary on her brother that one of the issues that college helped Obama deal with was his being black, in the absence of a father figure. His father, Barack Hussein Obama Sr, had earlier abandoned the young Barack Obama and his mother, when the young Barack was only two years old. The young Barack was able to see his father again only once throughout his lifetime, when he was ten.

The absence of a biological father to teach, guide, direct and inspire was a huge loss for the young Barack, and indeed, as Barack Obama himself testified later on, the absence of his father was the chief conflict requiring resolution for much of his life. His best-selling book, *Dreams From My Father*, is a rendition of his long sojourn to resolve this perennial conflict, and was written only after he had visited Africa, and seen the grave of his father.

The college experience for Barack, according to Mendell (2008), was firstly a place for social encounters: girls, parties, basketball and jock life. These social encounters provided him with his first opportunity to interact with the real world, and to foray into the world of public speaking. Being active in organizations on campus, he was able to plan and organize around shared values, like emancipation, African empowerment, and international peace.

However, college also meant serious study for Barack, especially when he began his education at Harvard Law School. According to an article by John McCormick (2007), in the *Chicago Tribune*, Barack Obama distinguished himself as a student of Law at Harvard, because apart from becoming the first African American Editor of the *Harvard Law Review*, which was a huge deal at the time, he was able to display an astuteness that was rare for his age and scope of public experience. Mendell states in this regard that Barack Obama became very serious, at times even brooding, as he was known to spend several hours regularly in the university law library.

In college as well, Mendell (2008) further states, philosophers like Nietzsche, and Shakespeare, and the intellectual giants of history shaped Barack Obama's mind. This mental exposure gave words to many of the latent ideas and ideals he had acquired all through childhood, and which would influence him as a public servant and leader. According to Mendell, it was only in college that he could have these experiences, for it was only as a college student that he could occasionally find the excuse to live as a hermit.

Another formative experience for Barack Obama was his work as a community organizer. Michelle Obama said in her 2008 Democratic National Convention speech that one of her unforgettable experiences of Barack during their courtship was when she once attended a community town hall meeting Barack was moderating, and she heard him speak of the world as it was and the world as it should be, and how sometimes people settle for the world as it is, when in fact they should be striving to bring about the world as it should be.

Mendell (2008, p 72) describes Barack Obama as "a man on a mission to serve society." He goes further to quote Obama as telling Mr. Kellman, Obama's employer as a community organizer, that he had been fortunate in his own life, and so felt a passion to contribute to the betterment of other peoples' lives. Indeed, in a latter speech Mr. Obama delivered to the Congressional Black Caucus, he said that, were it not for the protective climate that his mother's family provided for him while growing up, and his enviable education, at Punahou, Occidental, Columbia and Harvard, he might have turned out to be like many of the helpless, homeless black men he used to encounter as a community organizer in Chicago.

Mendell (2008) avers in this regard that being a community organizer played a huge role in turning Obama from being a self-absorbed teenager and college student into an attentive listener to other people's concerns, a trait that enabled Obama to perceive the world through other

people's eyes. The next sub-chapter will assess the impetus of this perception.

#### AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNTS OF OBAMA'S COMMITMENT TO WORLD PEACE

In the previous sub-chapter, we examined how the early influence of Stanley Ann Dunham, the latter influence of college, and the work experience acquired from being a community organizer all contributed in forming Barack Obama, and preparing him for a lifework of peace. This examination was broached by reviewing biographical sources. In this sub-chapter, however, Barack Obama's own works, notably his two best-selling works, *The Audacity of Hope*, and *Dreams from My Father*, are both reviewed for the purposes of ferreting additional material that serves to further expose perceived influences on the character and personality of Barack Obama.

In *Dreams From My Father*, Barack Obama expressly treats the question of identity. The book begins with his search for a paternal model. Obama (1995, p 5) expresses this search poignantly thus: “At the time of his death, my father remained a myth to me, both more and less than a man. He had left Hawaii back in 1963, when I was only two years old, so that as a child I knew him only through the stories that my mother and grandparents told.”

He summarizes his father's sojourn on page nine, how in 1959 his father, 23 years old at the time, attended the University of Hawaii to study Econometrics, and met his mother in a Russian Language class. The two fell in love and, in spite of the hesitation of his mother's parents and the fact that his father already had a wife back in Africa, got married. The entire first chapter of *Dreams* broaches the concept of interracial marriage, and begins a broader speculation about interracial relations as a whole.

The second chapter of the book talks about Barack's experiences in Indonesia, living with his stepfather, Lolo Soetoro, the man that his mother, Stanley Ann Dunham married after Barack

Obama Sr left. Barack Obama described Lolo as one of the two main fatherly influences he had growing up, the other being his mother's father, a World War II Army Veteran, and a bighearted man, Mr. Stanley Dunham. It is curious to note in this regard how Barack became influenced in childhood by three fathers from three different continents: Soetoro and Dunham by their presence, and Obama by his absence.

When one considers this unique sort of interracial upbringing, it is easy to see how Barack Obama the politician found it relatively easy to speak to the whole of America, to boldly call it the United States of America; to vehemently declare that there is no White or Black or Asian or Latino America; no Red or Blue America; no Gay, Straight, disabled and not-disabled America, but the United States of America. When one considers how the young Barack was able to live on different continents and be significantly influenced by relatives from various continents, it is easy then to understand his profound understanding of the interrelatedness of various otherwise distinct human populations.

In the third chapter of *Dreams*, Barack talks about his father's only visit, when the young Barack was ten. The young Barack describes his apprehension at meeting him, and a light dread of its outcome. He talks about the visit that lasted a month, and the initial interest in Kenya that the visit inspired, an interest that would be actualized by his later visit to the country, and to the hometown of his father in their small village in Kogelo.

In talking about Kenya and his father, Barack Obama rehashes the issue of race, the ever-existent nuance of distinction based on complexion and familial heritage. He discusses his teenage response to this subject, and how he and his black colleagues at Punahou, at Occidental, and at Columbia dealt with it. He talked about the psychological complexities of identity ratification, and its gradual resolution. He talks of self-perception and its concomitants.

As a student at Columbia University, Barack Obama describes himself as relatively isolated from his erstwhile social life. More philosophical thinking, more studying and more introspection claimed much of his time as he lived in New York and pursued his degree in political science and international relations, progressively influenced by the higher calling to serve his fellow human beings and to leave the world better than he found it, as he had told his grandmother was his calling.

The second part of *Dreams* talks extensively of the job Barack Obama took after graduating from Columbia University. He had graduated from Punahou Academy, attended Occidental College briefly; transferred from there to Columbia, obtained his degree and was now working as a community organizer in Chicago, having resigned a previous job because he felt it was too self-serving. He would later attend Harvard Law School.

When one considers the fact that Barack Obama resigned a job in a private company, where he testifies that the prospects were enviable, and where his chances of rising up the corporate ladder were high, simply to work for the poor and needy of Chicago, one begins to understand the young man's outlook on life. It is this outlook of service that has on occasion led him to vigorously champion the causes of the poor and the underrepresented. It is worthy of note in this regard that in signing the Nobel Book, after the award ceremony at Oslo, he thanked the Nobel Committee for “giving a voice to the voiceless,” in their awarding him the Nobel Peace Prize.

In discussing his experiences as a community organizer in Chicago, Barack Obama warns against the implications of abandoning the poor, and the occasions that give rise to this abandonment. He broaches the subject of the structures of society, and how these seem to work better for some more than for others. He speculates about religion, and its place in serving the

economic and social needs of the people, in addition to spiritual needs, especially in view of the existence of real suffering here in the world.

Even though Barack Obama's thoughts about the material conditions of man do not tally with the Marxist view of historical and dialectic materialism, he clearly can be seen to demand an extension of social justice, and a greater sensitivity of the rich to the poor, especially from an inclusive point of view. Rather than a supposed “dictatorship of the proletariat,” Barack Obama can be seen to advocate for an inclusion of the historically disadvantaged, an accommodation of the historically disenfranchised, and a ratification of the historical differences that have made it harder for certain aspects of the population to get ahead.

Barack Obama's discourse favored the expansion of education and employment opportunities to minority populations, the continued inclusiveness of Blacks, Asians and Latinos in the scheme of progress by way of improved living conditions, extended welfare and unemployment benefits, expanded health coverage, education and employment opportunities, as well as improved infrastructure and social amenities for recreation and acculturation.

Barack Obama's discourse also broached the concept of interreligious dialogue, a crucial issue in world peace. In working as a community organizer in Chicago, Barack Obama testifies that he was struck by the large number of churches and mosques, all different in the practice of religion, and seemingly isolated from one another. He narrates his repeated attempts to bring these religious bodies to work together on social and economic programs to help the masses.

In describing his successes and challenges as a community organizer, trying to bring economic and social relief to the needy of Chicago, Barack Obama realized ever more definitively that the larger structures of government and referendum, of law and the legislative process, were even more crucial in bringing about change more rapidly and more significantly.

This definitive realization convinced him that he had to study law, so as to become a public servant.

It was at this juncture in his life that he eventually visited Kenya for the first time. He describes how a brief visit of his half sister, Auma Obama, and a notification of his father's death both served as underpinnings to this eventual visit. At the start of chapter fifteen of *Dreams*, Barack narrates his experiences at the airport and aboard the plane on his way to Nairobi to visit his African family. Through the discussion he has with a fellow passenger aboard the plane, a cursory view of the African situation is broached, Barack's sensitivity to the continent's challenges is hinted at, and his intellectual appreciation of its occasions is lightly appraised.

Latter portions of the chapter narrate his meeting with his brothers and sisters, and extended family members, such as his grandmother, Sarah Obama. He learns firsthand about the economic and social struggles the Obama family faces, and about his father's life and death. He further appreciates the urgency of his mission to do something to help alleviate the economic and social deprivations of disadvantaged peoples all over the world, and upon his return to the US, he enrolls at the Harvard Law School to begin this mission.

So far, we have reviewed *Dreams of My Father*, and exposed Mr. Obama's autobiographical rendition of sensitivity to disadvantaged populations. The rest of this sub-chapter examines *The Audacity of Hope*, to narrate some cogent examples of Mr. Obama's experiences as a public servant. The book opens with a prologue that provides background to Mr. Obama's foray into active politics. It also gives a succinct thesis of the book, in Mr. Obama's own words: a discussion of “how we might begin the process of changing our politics and our civic life” to better the vast citizenry.

The first chapter of *Audacity*, entitled *Republicans and Democrats*, talks about his

campaign for public office as a Democrat, and some of the challenges he faced, some having to do with race and the sound of his given name, others to do with the overall political climate that the US had become since the 1960's and the Civil Rights Movement. He talks about the increasing maturity of US politics, and conjectures on what needs to further be done in escalating the maturation process.

In the second and third chapters of the book, Mr. Obama talks about American values and the US Constitution. He stresses the point that it is through living out her values and abiding by her constitution that the United States remains a “beacon of hope to all the world.” He shares expert opinions on Constitutional matters, having himself taught Constitutional Law briefly upon graduating from Harvard Law School. He talks about the process of legislation; of filibuster, of referendum, of the separation of powers, and of the rule of law. He talks about social change as a function of law, and the progress of peoples as a ratification thereof.

In the fourth and fifth chapters, he talks about politics and opportunity, and seems to set the latter against the foundation of the former, seemingly arguing that the former procures the latter for the generality of the population, regardless of the distinctions of demography that might impinge on the rights of segments of the overarching population to be placed in the way of opportunity. He talks about responsible public service that is responsive to the citizenry, that does not seek self-preservation of politicians in office, or scheme towards winning a next election, but honestly serves the interests of those most needy of government.

Chapters six and seven talk about race and religion, probably the two most divisive characteristics of the human condition. In discussing these two issues, Mr. Obama, writing more sensitively than he did in *Dreams*, talks about the urgent need to transcend these two divisive realities in the blitz at achieving a more united humanity. He cites instances of racism still

occurring in the USA, like an exclusive club he encountered in Chicago that still restricted its membership to Whites. He argues passionately that racism and bigotry are not only detrimental to human progress, but are costly, and have far reaching economic and social implications.

He further stresses how beneficial it would be for religions and denominations to work together for social change. He talks about the passion that churches inspire in people, and bemoans for the most part in chapter seven the fact that this passion is misplaced. He suggests that if this passion were to be used in social projects that serve the people, the rewards would be outstanding. He rehashes some of the challenges he faced as a community organizer in trying to bring religions and denominations together, challenges hitherto exposed in *Dreams*. He expresses hope in chapter seven that denominations could still work together for the welfare of society.

The last two chapters, eight and nine, are entitled *The World Beyond our Borders and Family*. In these two chapters, Barack Obama reveals his sensitivity to the world existing outside the United States, but no doubt influenced by it, in much the same way America itself is influenced by the rest of the world. In this world of global interconnectedness, as previously seen by Friedman (2009), Barack Obama shows how there must be cooperation among nation states; how members of a single family, like his, can exist on practically every continent of the globe.

In chapter nine specifically, he extends the analogy of the universal family, by comparing the human race as a whole with his own multiracial family. Obama (2006, p 351) gives a snapshot of the universality of the human family in the following words: “It was a fine summer afternoon, and the several fields were full of families when I arrived, blacks and whites and Latinos and Asians from all over the city, women sitting on lawn chairs, men practicing kicks with their sons, grandparents helping babies to stand.”

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

It has previously been said that knowledge is epistemologically cumulative, in which case supposedly new knowledge is conceived against the framework of existing knowledge. The catenation of knowledge based on the situation of new knowledge in the context of existing knowledge hence underpins the procurement of a theoretical framework in research activity, as part of an integral, overarching review of literature, as proceeds in the subsequent.

The theories in communication that pertain to this study include: symbolic convergence, symbolic interactionism, social constructionism and self-perception theories. These theories shall be explained in light of the thesis in order to expatiate on their relevance to the thesis. This expatiation takes place for purposes of situating the knowledge possibly derivable from this thesis, and for classifying this knowledge as a progressive swelling of the pool of related information specifically in the field of rhetorical and other human communication, as well as facilitating understanding of such knowledge from conceivable paradigms.

According to Blumer (1969, in Littlejohn, 2002, p 145), the theory of symbolic interactionism is founded on the premise that social structures and meanings are created and maintained in social interaction. Lal (1995, p 421) provides summary conceptualizations of the theory as follows: that people make decisions and act in accordance with their subjective understandings of the situations in which they find themselves; that social life consists of interaction processes rather than structures and is therefore constantly changing; that people understand their experience through the meanings found in the symbols of their primary groups; that the world is made of symbols with socially determined meanings; that people's actions are based on their interpretations of these meanings, and that one's self is defined through social interaction with others.

According to Fine (1993), symbolic interactionism has today incorporated the study of how groups coordinate their actions, how emotions are understood and controlled, how reality is constructed, how self is created, how large social structures get established, and how public policy can be influenced. The theory built significantly on the works of Blumer (1969) and Mead (1910), and expounded on Mead's cardinal concepts of society, self and mind, all of which collaborate in the procurement of a social act. These cardinal concepts are different, depending on the elements of any social act, and depending on the pervading context thereof.

Another scholar of symbolic interactionism is Kuhn (1964). He is more interested in the operationalization of the concept, and in the expansion of the concept of self, as well as attitudes and plans of action. Goffman (1959) in turn harps on the implications and occasions of human interaction, especially in view of the dialectic ambiances that enmesh such interactions, and the varied ways in which communication elements make sense of such ambiances, among other things.

As this theory relates to the subject matter of the thesis, it is apt to conceive of Barack Obama as a self, defined by his communicative interactions with his audiences, capable of mobilizing societies to undertake social acts by the power of his influence on their minds, and by how they perceive him and symbolically interact with him and his rhetoric.

A second theory that serves to ground this thesis is the symbolic convergence theory. This theory gave rise to the fantasy theme method of rhetorical analysis. Ernest Bormann (1985), John Cragan (1992) and Donald Shields (1994) developed it. According Bormann (1985, in Littlejohn, 2002, p 157), the theory posits that individuals' images of reality are guided by stories reflecting how things are believed to be. These stories, he states, are created in symbolic interaction within small groups, and are then chained out from person to person and group to

group.

Bormann (1985, in Littlejohn, 2002) goes further to state that fantasy themes are part of larger dramas that are longer, more complicated stories called rhetorical visions, which in turn may be defined as views of how things have been, are or will be, and which structure our sense of reality in areas capable of being known only by symbolic reproduction. Littlejohn further states that rhetorical visions consist of characters, plot lines, scenes and sanctioning agents, who are defined as sources that legitimize fantasy themes. He avers that fantasy themes find utility in persuasion, notably in public communication and rhetoric.

Symbolic convergence implies that the audience members of a speech typically share common ideals and conceptualizations of the world, formed over time by their exposure to similar fantasy themes. A rhetor is mindful of these fantasy themes and strives to focus on them, so as to identify with the audience members. The audience members subsequently converge on his rhetoric; they buy into his message, and are persuaded by it to take action to bring about the change that the rhetor proposes be brought about in response to an existing social concern.

As it relates to this thesis, symbolic convergence is possibly seen in the audience response to Mr. Obama's speeches. The theory is also brought to question in how Mr. Obama tries to play to the fantasies shared by his audiences, how he is able to identify with his audiences, by tapping into their collective consciousnesses in order to effectively persuade them to act on his message and bring about the social change that he prescribes, in response to existing social concerns that he perceives as plaguing the audience members in question, but also how these concerns plague the world as a whole, in view of the current globalization of the world and its consequent interconnectedness.

A third theory that frameworks this thesis is the theory of social constructionism.

According to Cronen & Lang (1994, in Littlejohn, 2002, p 163), social constructionism rests on the idea that reality is not an objective set of arrangements outside ourselves, but is constructed through a process of interaction in groups, communities and cultures. The tenets of social constructionism are summarized as follows: that communicative action is voluntary, even though limited by its pervading social environment; that knowledge is a social product, attained through interaction with others in particular contexts; that theories create worlds, and that scholarship is value laden (Cronen & Lang, 1994, in Littlejohn, 2002, p 164).

This theory, according to Cronen & Lang, 1994, in Littlejohn, 2002, p 165, sees communication as the process by which all reality is constructed, and posits that all aspects of the human experience can be viewed from the perspective of how it is used in the social construction of reality. He goes further to discuss the availability of resources in this construction of reality, such as: ideas, values, stories, symbols, meanings and institutions, among other things. He states that even persons are socially constructed. Some concepts of social constructionism, according to him, are: the self, emotion and accounts.

Littlejohn (2002) uses a germane allegory to explain the concept of social constructionism. He states that if there are a number of different children in a classroom for example, and there were many objects to be arranged in some way, and these children were isolated from one another, and then invited one after another to arrange the objects in their own way, there would definitely exist different arrangements for these objects, indeed possibly as many arrangements as students.

As it relates to this thesis, the theory of social constructionism is possibly seen to apply to how various members of Mr. Obama's audience are persuaded to see how the world can harmoniously accommodate all of them, in spite of their differences. Another way of looking at

this theory's application to this thesis is in visualizing how, through Mr. Obama's rhetoric, a new social reality of peaceful accommodation of divergent social elements is created, in such a fashion that through his unique rhetorical vision, he is able to create a world of ideals that invites his audience to seek peace for every population in the world.

The fourth theoretical grid for this thesis is self-perception. Riding & Rayner (2001) have seen self perception theory as one of the intervening variables to the effects of human communication and influence, how through the increasing activism of the audiences of communication, especially in the modern school of limited effects, audience members define the effects received communication has had on them, and further define their disposition as a result of such effects.

Self-perception in any case works both on the sender of information and on the receiver. The message a communicator sends is clearly affected by his or her perception of self; the message received by the communicatee is similarly determined, and message fidelity in view of the foregoing is achieved by the presence of a homophily of self perceptions, in which case communication becomes more effective if the participants in a communication encounter both perceive themselves similarly, and vice versa. Self-perception hence becomes a crucial variable in persuasion, especially as it pertains to speech, rhetoric and other forms of public communication.

As it relates to this thesis, self-perception is supposedly examined in that Mr. Obama's audiences perceive themselves either affected or disenchanted by his rhetorical vision, and their affectedness or disenchantment moves them either to take action to bring about social change, or leaves them apathetic to the cause of global peace. On the other hand, Mr. Obama supposedly perceives himself as passionate about the issue of peace, as has been depicted in the

autobiographical accounts hitherto reviewed, and as possibly will be revealed when a cross section of his speeches are subsequently criticized.

### CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with effectively defining, succinctly describing and expediently delimiting the research method. Methodology generally refers to the research instrument by which the research questions will be answered. In this thesis, three research questions have been raised: Is there a rhetorical vision of peace possibly emergent from a cross section of Mr. Obama's presidential speeches? Can we argue based on the foregoing possible emergence that Mr. Obama is an icon of global peace? Can we then ultimately argue that he deserved to have received the Nobel Peace Prize at Oslo earlier this year?

These three research questions build upon one another, and substantiate the entire research effort, and veritably ratify it. It is through their resolution that some measure of finality is brought to the research endeavor. Their resolution in any case suggests the utility of qualitative means of communication research, by the nature and substance of their quizzing. Qualitative research in communication generally include focus groups, ethnographic studies, content analyses, in-depth interviews and specifically in this case, rhetorical criticism, which may cursorily be seen to involve examining express works like speeches, written texts as well as other forms of artistic expression in order to evaluate themes, styles and contexts.

We shall subsequently examine qualitative research in communication, as well as rhetorical criticism as a qualitative research method in the field in a more in-depth manner. We shall also discuss the Fantasy Theme Method of rhetorical criticism, as developed by Ernest Bormann (1982), and justify its utility here, in preference to other possible methods of rhetorical criticism. We shall describe its characteristics, explain its specific use in this thesis, and establish delimitations to this use, among other things.

The Fantasy Theme as explicated in this chapter will then be applied in the subsequent

chapter in order to demonstrate its effectiveness in ferreting out possible fantasy themes from a cross section of Mr. Obama's presidential speeches. These possible fantasy themes will supposedly be the premises upon which a fantasy chain, and then a fantasy type, and ultimately a rhetorical vision are built. The foregoing elucidation informs subsequent sub-chapters.

## AN OVERVIEW OF QUALITATIVE COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

Qualitative research in communication refers to humanistic research, as opposed to positivistic or quantitative research. From an epistemological point of view, qualitative research is of the view that knowledge is subjective and dependent on its observer or gatherer. It sees knowledge as socially constructed, in that the knower is the instrument and embodiment of that which is known. This is opposed to quantitative research, where knowledge is perceived to be objective, and existent apart from the observer, and can only be known in an objective, phlegmatic way.

Ontologically speaking, qualitative research perceives the researcher to take an active part in the discovery of knowledge, in such a way that he or she is able to influence the outcome of knowledge by the quality of his or her perceptions. This is as opposed to quantitative research, where the researcher is seen to be able to play no active role in the attainment of knowledge, but simply that the laws of nature work their will on observable phenomena, which must then be collected as phlegmatically as possible, without the capacity of alteration.

Axiologically speaking, qualitative research is value laden. This means that the researcher proceeds on his or her research, observing his or her values, and owning up to their extent of influence on his or her research. Scholars have historically dealt with the subject of bias in qualitative research. Because of the fact that researchers are wont to carry on their work in cognizance of the influence of their values on the scholarly decisions they make, it has been

ethically prescribed that they own up to such possible biases, and to try to be as objective as they possibly can in spite of such biases, so as not to invalidate the research endeavor. This is as opposed to quantitative research that is perceived as not value laden.

Research, be it qualitative or quantitative, in any case, must measure up to stipulated standards, as scholars have prescribed. Firstly, it must be objective. This is essentially what differentiates research from fiction writing. Objectivity means that the researcher as much as possible refrains from injecting his or her personal opinions, but carefully observes and report matter as it is, or as he or she has found it to be. Objectivity means that the researcher is credible, and scientific in his or her approach to the conduct of research.

Secondly, the research must be valid. This means that it must follow a definite research method, be it qualitative or quantitative. In other words, the researcher must adopt a standard research method, which should be known to his or her readers, and the researcher must follow this method in the standard way, to achieve valid results. This characteristic of validity gives rise to the third characteristic of research, which is replicability. Replicability means that if another researcher uses the exact method that one researcher used in the conduct of a research, be it qualitative or quantitative, the second researcher should be able to reach similar conclusions as the first.

These two characteristics, objectivity and replicability both relate to a third characteristic of research. It must be verifiable. Verifiability is crucial in order to underscore the value and utility of new knowledge as obtained by objective and replicable research be it qualitative or quantitative. This means that if a second researcher should conduct a similar research on a different albeit related topic, using the first researcher's method, the second researcher should reach similar results as the first.

Also, if the second researcher were to carry out research on the same topic as the first, using a different method, the second researcher should as well reach similar results. Moreover, if the second researcher were to carry out the same research, using the same method, but with a different theoretical framework, the second researcher should still arrive at a similar result. The foregoing concepts are known as: subject triangulation, method triangulation, and theory triangulation respectively.

Another characteristic of research is that it is cumulative. This means that one research endeavor builds on a previous, and itself paves the way for further research. Knowledge, as has been previously said, does not exist in a vacuum, but is situated in the context of existing knowledge in such as fashion that knowledge is a string of didactic or scholastic catenations, perennially gathered in a compendium of related contexts in a timeless fashion.

Hence, true research is objective, valid, replicable and cumulative. It also has value for society. It informs policy, influences referendum; spurs decision-making, and swells the universal pool of human knowledge. The purpose of research is both transitive and intransitive, nevertheless, and research may be conducted for itself alone, without necessarily being done for utility in any of the aforementioned ways. True research is “scientific,” in the sense that be it qualitative or quantitative it has the qualities of being objective, valid, replicable and cumulative.

However, qualitative and quantitative research methods differ. Methodology as has been previously explained generally refers to the research instrument by which the research questions will be answered. Usually in qualitative research, the research instrument is verbal, in that it does not make use of numbers, as quantitative research usually does. It is explanatory rather than descriptive, and often inductive rather than deductive. Usually, quantitative research proceeds from a universal principle, which it tests on some observable phenomenon, whereas qualitative

research proceeds from few specific instances in an attempt to make a universal argument.

Scholars have criticized qualitative research in this regard as being prone to the fallacy of hasty generalization, since it is difficult in many cases to extrapolate results obtained from select sample sizes to vast populations that may differ demographically and situationally, among other things. Others have argued, in any case, that qualitative research may be used in setting the stage for quantitative research by making a foray into intellectual limbos, into new areas where there is deficiency in research endeavor. Qualitative research in such a case will “discover” new knowledge, which quantitative research can then test seemingly more objectively.

This process of applying quantitative research methodology on matter “discovered” by qualitative research is known as method triangulation. It has been previously explained in any case that triangulation in its various forms helps to verify the outcome of research. Hence, if a researcher were to find in say, a focus group that certain people responded in a certain way to certain issues, the same research topic could be done by say, a survey administered in quantitative research fashion to a larger sample size, to verify the outcome of the focus group research. Or, an experiment with two groups, one a test and the other a control group, could be carried out for the similar purpose of verification.

Triangulation in short helps to verify and ratify knowledge, and the importance of valid information cannot be overemphasized, in view of its far-reaching utility in improving the lives of people all over the world. Research remains the primary way by which people get this knowledge, and be it qualitative or quantitative, the characteristics of true research must be preserved, in view of its enduring value, among other things.

This thesis, itself a research endeavor, toes the qualitative research Cartesian. It makes use of the epistemological, ontological and axiological proclivities of qualitative research: it

approaches its subject matter from the point of view that knowledge is socially constructed, and that the researcher makes humanistic judgments in a value laden way. Yet, it is credible and scientific in that it is objective in presenting “facts” as they are, without recourse to the undue rendition of personal opinions.

Also, it is replicable, because its standard research method, the Fantasy Theme method of Rhetorical criticism, can be repeatedly applied to this topic or related ones, to achieve a similar result. More than that, it is verifiable, especially by method triangulation, in which case the results obtained from this research may be tested by using say, a survey. The survey would proceed by the issuing of a questionnaire to a large sample size, to discover their perceptions of the rhetorical relevance of Barack Obama's speeches to peace.

Or, an experiment could be carried out, in which case, a certain number of people that have never listened to Barack Obama's speeches are asked to comment on his rhetorical vision of peace, as opposed to those that have listened to his speeches. The hypothesis in the case would be that there would be a significant difference in the perception of those that have listened to him and those that have not. The hypothesis may be that those that have listened would have a different view of the relevance of his rhetorical vision to global peace than those that had not.

Hence, this thesis is a qualitative research effort, making use of rhetorical criticism as its research method in qualitative research. It is a research endeavor that is cognizant of the characteristics of research, and its qualities. It also provides suggestions for further research, in view of its recognition of the value of triangulation, as previously described. Subsequent sub-chapters will expatiate on the foregoing, and further describe and delimit the research.

## RHETORICAL CRITICISM AS QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

One of the kinds of qualitative research in communication is rhetorical criticism. Rhetorical criticism as has been previously defined refers to the evaluation of various kinds of expression, including speech, text, and other forms of artistic material. It is nonetheless most commonly used to refer to public address critique. This thesis is concerned with public address criticism.

The public address, like all communicative activity, consists of diverse elements, such as: source, message, channel, receiver, feedback, setting and interference. These elements interact to bring about the speech communication experience. These elements are in themselves material for study, in the blitz at understanding more critically the speech communication process.

Quintilian, an ancient Roman philosopher, did say that good public address is a good person speaking well. Hitherto, we have taken the time to assess the personality and character of Mr. Obama, the rhetor, the source of the speeches we shall subsequently analyze. His message is to be thematically evaluated, to discover if there are any fantasy types concerning world peace to be found in them, to underpin his possible appellation as an icon of peace, and subsequently as a deserving recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize.

Concomitant with this thematic evaluation is a holistic appraisal of his style, extent of audience identification and situational characteristics of his speeches. This holistic appraisal need not proceed independently of the thematic analysis, but may implicitly en flesh it. The entire effort, including thematic analysis and peripheral analyses as hitherto explicated, could be termed rhetorical analysis, which is a type of qualitative research in communication.

According to Hillbruner (1966, p 29), rhetorical criticism must pay attention not only to the intrinsic factors of speeches themselves, but also to the times and situations in which they were given. What this means is that speeches must be appraised contextually. The times in which

they were given determine to a large extent the situational characteristics as well as use of language in the speech. Hillbruner (1966, p 59) goes further to state that rhetorical analysis should include an examination of the effects that the speech has had on its target audience.

The whole question of effects has been a subject of grand debate among scholars. Historically, there have been two broad schools of thought concerning the effects of human communication. The old school of thought thrived on conceiving of human communication as linear. The old school theorized that when a speaker sent his audience a message, the audience members accepted the message in its entirety, without question or qualms. In short, the message had persuasive and conversionary effects on them. In such a case, the speaker was all powerful, and exercised social control, because his or her message was akin to a magic bullet or a hypodermic needle that pierced the consciousnesses of his or her hearer to achieve previously intended results.

This old school of thought concerning communication effects thrived on the following albeit erroneous assumptions: that communication was transmissionary, without the ingredient of audience feedback; that audience members responded to communication in a stimulus-response fashion, in much the same way that Ivan Pavlov's dog reacted to the bell suggesting the arrival of food, in the scientist's research on classical conditioning with salivating canines; that audience members were more bound to the source of communication than to one another, and thus incapable of being influenced otherwise, and that audiences were incapable of making independent judgments.

The foregoing views concerning communication effects thrived alongside old perceptions concerning the power of audiences and the masses, alongside Plato's philosopher king analogy, and the concept of the divine rights of kings. With the growth and maturity of modern society,

however, and as revolution after revolution empowered the masses to think for themselves and to form groups to mobilize for their needs and ideals, the old school progressively gave way to the modern school of thought, which ascribes to the source of communication only limited, functional effects.

The new school of thought refuted the premises upon which the old school had been built. It stated that communication was not linear or transmissionary, but was circular and transactionary; that audience members were not more linked to the source of communication than to one another; that audience members could make individual decisions and need not rely on the source of communication to do so for them, and that human communication did not rely on the stimulus-response psychology of Ivan Pavlov.

In short, the new school of thought proposed the following intervening variables to the supposed almighty effects of the old school communication paradigm: social categories that could influence the supposed communication-induced behavior of members, deciding the nature of such behavior to a significant extent; the selective processes of exposure, attention, perception and recall; self-perception; individual differences; uses and gratifications, among other things. Berelson (1960) put it succinctly in the following truism: “Some kinds of communication on some kinds of issues, brought to the attention of some kinds of people in some kinds of situations have some kinds of effects.”

The foregoing would imply that, much unlike what was obtainable or perceivable in the old school paradigm of communication effects, modern speakers cannot afford to be smug or slack in their efforts at persuading their target audiences, but must aim to study the techniques that make success more attainable. Aristotle was one of the first scholars to prescribe methods for the attainment of success in public speaking.

He advised rhetors to avail themselves of certain rhetorical proofs: ethos, which refers to source credibility; pathos, which refers to the use of emotions in speaking, and logos, which refers to the use of rational evidence in supporting one's speech. Aristotle further advised the rhetor to undertake an analysis of his or her prospective audience, so as to better structure his or her message to suit them.

A rhetor's ideas provide fodder for scrutiny as part of rhetorical analysis. These ideas are couched in his or her message, which includes his or her style, method of delivery and organization. Hence, it is not just what the speaker says, as Aristotle would aver, but how he or she says it that accounts for his or her success in public speaking. In assessing the speaker's message, the issue of fidelity arises, whether the speaker was able to communicate the same meaning he or she had in mind to his or her target audience, to avoid misunderstanding. All these considerations are part of the rhetorical criticism process.

In short, rhetorical criticism involves investigating the speaker's ideas, as contained in his or her message, the methods of his or her speech delivery; his or her use of language, and the effects he or she had on her target audience. It is worthy of note in this regard that many of the speeches that are evaluated are often justifiably criticized for the benefit of exposing their social relevance and functionality, especially as instruments of social improvement or policy ratification suitable to the times that ambience it, among other things.

It is for the foregoing and more that Nichols (1972, p 1) has described rhetorical criticism as humane study, with significant implication for society, and the understanding of human behavior therein. In explaining the functional relevance of rhetorical criticism, Nichols (1972, p 58) explains that study of oratory as a literary form has value worth preserving in and of itself. Also, the study of oratory as a historical event is germane to the preservation and enforcement of

America's ideals, and the study of oratory finds usefulness as a pedagogical method for learning the art of public speaking.

Communication and literary scholars have developed several methods of rhetorical criticism over time. Some of these methods include: Firstly, Pentadic criticism, as developed by Kenneth Burke who, according to Foss (2008, p 355) made important contributions to our understanding of the utility humans have made of rhetoric, and its social effect. Pentadic criticism is related to dramatism and involves the use of the five basic elements of drama in criticizing speeches: act, agent, agency, scene and purpose.

Another method of rhetorical criticism is the Neo-Aristotelian criticism, which, according to Foss (2008, p 21) is the first formal method of rhetorical criticism in the field of communication. It is also called the traditional method of literary criticism. It prescribes the criticism of speeches through the utility of the following Canons: invention, organization, memory, style and delivery. Invention in this regard refers to the speaker's ideas as couched in the message; organization refers to the structure and morphology of the speech; style refers to the rhetor's use of language, and delivery refers to whether it was impromptu or manuscript. Mastery refers to the rhetor's overall mastery of the subject matter, as evidenced in his or her display of the other four canons.

Other methods of rhetorical criticism exist in the field of communication, but the one applicable here is the Fantasy Theme Criticism. The subsequent sub-chapter will treat this method of rhetorical criticism, which will be applied in the following chapter to a cross section of Mr. Obama's speeches in order to answer the research questions raised, and to ultimately bring about a conclusion to the entire qualitative research effort.

## FANTASY THEME CRITICISM

According to Foss (2008, p 97), “the fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism, created by Ernest G. Bormann, is designed to provide insight into the shared worldview of groups.” Foss goes further to state that the fantasy method developed from the work of Robert Bales, who observed the influence of fantasy types on audiences as prompting dramatic, participatory behavior.

The fantasy-theme method, Foss continues, “can be applied not only to the study of small groups, but also to all kinds of rhetoric in which themes function dramatically to connect audiences with messages” (p 97). Foss stresses as well that in contexts larger than small groups, fantasizing occurs when individuals find some aspect of a message that catches and focuses their attention until they imaginatively take part in the images and actions prompted by the message.

The fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism, closely tied as it is to the symbolic convergence theory, takes it for granted that reality is socially constructed, and that the symbols by which reality is understood and expressed have both individual and collective explications. In short, convergence in this sense has been taken to mean the manner in which individual symbolic worlds converge or overlap during communication.

Symbolic convergence also means consensus or general agreement on subjective meanings (Foss, 2008, p 98). This consensus refers to the situation in which, through communication, individual perceptions merge to form a collective social consciousness that serves as the basis for interaction within functional communities, in order to achieve mutual understanding among the members of that community.

Foss explains in this regard that fantasy themes serve to catenate the express realities of the individuals within the functional communities hitherto described in such a way that motifs

and slogans may often develop within such communities, jointly used by the members therein. In short, Foss states, the core of the fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism is the fantasy theme, fantasy in this regard defined as “the creative and imaginative interpretation of events,” and fantasy theme, “the means through which the interpretation is accomplished in communication (Foss, 2008, p 98).

Foss (2008, p 99) further states that, even though experience itself is often disorganized and chaotic, fantasy themes are structured and artistic. Foss states that fantasy themes are designed to create a credible explanation of an experience. Fantasies in this regard provide foundation for arguments by providing plausible assumptions of reality.

Fantasy themes vary, in any case, depending on the community they apply to. For example, scientists' notion of truth is different from the notion of truth held by say, clergymen. Ultimately though, fantasy themes describe the world from the group's perspective and embrace the dramatic phenomena of setting, character and action, as well as valid plots that connect the three phenomena.

According to Foss (2008, p 100), “when similar scenarios involving particular setting, character and action themes are shared by members of a community, they form a fantasy type, which is defined as “a stock scenario that encompasses several related fantasy themes.” Speakers within the community need not rehash fantasy types once developed. Foss puts this astutely thus: “Once a fantasy type has been developed, rhetors do not need to provide an audience with details about the specific fantasy themes it covers. They simply state the general story line of the fantasy type, and the audience is able to call up the entire scenario (p 100).

Fantasy types have the narrative quality of experience compartmentalization. According to Foss (2008, p 100), a crucial issue in the fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism is the

rhetorical vision, which has been defined as the unified collection of the various shared fantasies of a community or the swirling together of fantasy themes to provide a particular interpretation of reality.

In other words, that a rhetorical vision exists is testament to the formation of a rhetorical community of participants in the fantasy themes and types jointly shared within that community. Foss gives at least two credible examples in this regard: the born-again Christian that is baptized and subsequently adopts a lifestyle that is in keeping with the teachings of his or her religious community, or the willingness of a terrorist to die in support of a cause that ordinarily seems absurd to the rest of us. These examples lend credence to the existence of diverse rhetorical visions existent in diverse communities of individuals that shares them.

Foss lays out procedures for applying the fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism as follows: selecting an artifact; analyzing the artifact; formulating research questions, and writing the essay. According to Foss (2008, p 101), a suitable artifact for a fantasy-theme analysis should be one wherein symbolic convergence has taken place. Foss states in this regard that an artifact produced by a major public figure, such as a US President's speech, constitutes evidence of symbolic convergence, because it “incorporates themes the rhetor knows will resonate with the audience.”

Foss further states that analysis of an artifact using the fantasy-theme method involves two steps: coding the artifact for setting, character and action themes, and then constructing the rhetorical vision from the fantasy themes. The first step, which is coding the artifact for fantasy themes, involves a careful examination of the artifact sentence by sentence in a verbal text. Then the drawing out of setting, character and action themes proceeds.

The second step involves looking for patterns in the fantasy themes in order to construct a

rhetorical vision therefrom. Foss explains that this construction of a rhetorical vision from fantasy themes proceeds first by a determination of which of the fantasy themes are major and which are minor. Foss continues by stating that the themes that appear more often than others are major, while those that appear relatively infrequently are minor. The linking of major setting themes with character and action themes results in a rhetorical vision (Foss, 2008, p 103).

In discussing the formulation of research questions based on the utility of the fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism, Foss (2008, p 103) states *inter alia* that questions may be asked about “the kinds of messages that are being communicated through rhetorical visions,” and this clearly rings true with the three research questions posited for this thesis, as itemized in the first chapter.

Also, in discussing the actual writing of the essay, Foss prescribes an introduction in which the research questions are discussed by way of their significance and contribution to rhetorical theory; a description of the artifact and its context; a report of the findings of the analysis, in which the fantasy themes and the rhetorical vision are identified, and a discussion of the contribution the analysis makes to rhetorical theory.

In applying this method religiously to the speeches considered here, the prescriptions afforded by Foss are strictly adhered to. In the subsequent chapter, the actual application of the method takes place. To begin with, the research questions are rehashed at the outset of that chapter; their importance and contribution to rhetorical theory are similarly rehashed.

More than that, a brief description of each of the five artifacts is also afforded; subsequently as well, a report of the findings of the thematic analysis is provided, from which a possibly emergent rhetorical vision is identified. Then a discussion of the contribution the analysis makes to rhetorical theory is discussed in such a way that some measure of finality is

brought to bear on the entire research endeavor, and all the research questions are sufficiently resolved.

#### DESCRIPTION AND DELIMITATION OF STUDY

The study is concerned with asking three research questions. These questions are as follows: Firstly, is there a possibly emergent rhetorical vision of peace from a cross section of Barack Obama's presidential speeches? Secondly, can we consequently argue that Mr. Obama is an icon of global peace? Thirdly, can we ultimately argue that his receipt of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize was justified? These questions pertain chiefly to the kind of message possibly contained in Mr. Obama's speeches, which Foss (2008) has identified as a possible subject of rhetorical inquiry using the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism.

This section concerns itself with describing and delimiting the study. To begin with, describing the study proceeds by reiterating that as a qualitative research endeavor, this study makes use chiefly of verbal, humanistic tools, as opposed to figures and other quantitative approaches to communication research, as has been previously hinted. It makes use of rhetorical criticism, a qualitative research method, and in this thesis specifically, the Fantasy theme method of rhetorical criticism as developed by Ernest Bormann.

In using the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism, this study applies the method as described earlier to a cross section of President Obama's speeches, in order to ferret a possible rhetorical vision of peace from them. This ferreting leads to a possible appellation of icon of peace, and an ultimate justification of Mr. Obama's receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize.

In using the fantasy method, this thesis is cognizant of the steps and procedures identified by Foss (2009), and observes them strictly. This is in keeping with the tenets of research earlier

itemized, especially validity and replicability. Some of the requirements for the proper use of the method have in any case been met, such as a rationale for the study, to wit the explication of the contribution of the thesis to rhetorical theory, as well as availing suitable research questions, among other things, both of which were dealt with in the first chapter.

Subsequently in the fourth chapter, the actual speech criticism proceeds, towing the Cartesian provided by the fantasy method, for five speeches, which seemingly form a cross section of Mr. Obama's speeches by way of demography. These speeches are: Mr. Obama's Acceptance Speech on the night of his election victory; Mr. Obama's speech to the Muslim world in Egypt; Mr. Obama's speech to the gay and lesbian community; Mr. Obama's speech to the United Nations, and Mr. Obama's speech to the third world in Ghana.

These speeches were chosen consequent on the definition of peace justifiably afforded in the first chapter, as the ratification, resolution and accommodation of the differences existent among diverse populations coexisting in a globalized world. The accommodation of these differences has also been seen to result in: the avoidance of global conflict; the emancipation of the poor; the egalitarianism of the otherwise disenfranchised; the tolerance of the obscure, and the equality of the homosexual. Hence, this thesis is concerned with inquiring into the “kinds of messages” that characterize Mr. Obama's rhetorical vision (Foss, 2008). These messages form the premises on which he may be called an icon of global peace, and possibly a justifiable recipient of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize, among other things.

The thesis takes note of the fact in any case that particular research endeavors must be limited in scope, so that they can be conducted in reasonable time, and with a reasonable amount of resources, and also because research is never finished, but only creates opportunities for further research. Besides, the researcher's interest can only be sustained for a delimited period, in

which case it is sensible to keep the research effort terse. Consequently, the following steps have been taken to delimit the scope of this thesis:

Firstly, only qualitative means of research are used. Even though it is possible to use both qualitative and quantitative research methods in this study, for example by triangulating rhetorical criticism with survey methodology, this thesis will conduct rhetorical criticism only, which in itself delimits the research endeavor by the sheer selection of rhetorical criticism from among other possible methods of qualitative communication research like content analysis, in-depth interviews, ethnographic research studies, participant and non-participant observations, among others.

Secondly, there are many methods of rhetorical criticism, three of which have been identified previously, viz: Pentadic Criticism, Neo-Aristotelian Criticism and Fantasy-theme Criticism. Rather than apply all the methods of rhetorical criticism available, the fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism is the only one utilized. Its steps and procedures are applied carefully, as prescribed by Foss (2008).

Thirdly, in applying the fantasy method, Foss (2008) has stated that there are many things to evaluate speeches for: the rhetor's style; the rhetor's techniques; the rhetor's message, and the social relevance of the rhetor's chosen topics. Instead of criticizing Mr. Obama's speeches based on style, persuasion techniques and message, this thesis concerns itself with the message only, and only as it relates to peace, in view of possible other relationships his message has with other concepts and global issues, *inter alia*.

Hence, as there are many speeches given by President Obama, instead of criticizing each and every one of them, only five will be analyzed here. These five are chosen because of their relevance to the subject of peace, and not randomly selected. This purposive sample size is apt in

view of the research questions previously asked, and the nature of the research endeavor as a whole. The five speeches relate to the five definitive parameters ascribed to peace in this thesis, viz: the egalitarianism of the disenfranchised; the emancipation of the indigent; the tolerance of the obscure; the equality of the homosexual, and the avoidance of global conflict. This supposed relationship is demonstrated in the subsequent chapter.

Another way in which the thesis has been delimited is in its asking only three research questions. There are probably a host of questions that may be asked of Mr. Obama's message as contained in his rhetorical vision. However, the thesis has delimited its scope to ask only the aforementioned three questions, so as to keep the research terse and compact, while leaving opportunities for further research.

In short, this thesis, entitled *Barack Obama and World Peace: A Rhetorical Inquiry*, has been described as a qualitative research effort that applies the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism to a cross section of Mr. Obama's speeches in order to answer three research questions asked, pertaining to the kind of message contained in a possibly emergent rhetorical vision from the analyzed cross section, to ultimately discuss in a succinct manner his possible justification in being called an icon of peace and receiving the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize.

It is worthy of note in this regard that the fantasy method, as subsequently applied best meets the needs of this essay, in view of its historic applications. Foss (2008, p 106) has in this regard for example applied the fantasy method to the analysis of other socially-relevant texts, such as the rhetorical vision of prison inmates in the quotidian penitentiary system, especially in the blitz at further describing outsider journalism, which has been seen to be often characterized by “a tenacious insistence on its own value, despite the recognition of the outcast position of its authors” (p 106).

In applying the fantasy method to the prison texts against the backdrop of the foregoing, Foss (2008, p 107) was able to conclude *inter alia* that prison newspapers function as notable albeit modest demonstrations of inmate agency in the face of the oppression of the incarcerators, and have historically struggled to be instruments of prison reform, as well as champions of the rights of the incarcerated. There are other such studies, done via the utility of the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism, as carried on in the subsequent chapter. The next chapter will in any case simply apply the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism to the five selected speeches, in the blitz at answering the research questions earlier posed.

## CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS

So far, we have introduced the topic of this thesis, have asked pertinent research questions; have established rationale for the study, reviewed literature, and prescribed suitable methodology for answering the research questions. This fourth chapter deals with the actual analysis of the purposive sample of speeches delivered by President Obama, using the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism. The five speeches are criticized one after another.

The five speeches are selected based on the operational definition of peace as it pertains to this thesis. Recall in this regard that we have operationalized peace as meaning the accommodation and resolution of the differences that exist among diverse populations. This accommodation and resolution has specifically been seen in five ways: the tolerance of the obscure, which may ordinarily mean efforts to accommodate differences in religion; the emancipation of the indigent, which may ordinarily mean efforts to accommodate differences in economic status; the egalitarianism of the disenfranchised, which may ordinarily mean efforts to accommodate differences in social status; the equality of the homosexual, which may ordinarily mean efforts to accommodate differences in sexual orientation, and the avoidance of conflict, which connects all the foregoing.

The speech in Cairo was a speech directed to the Muslim population, and a communicative effort to foster interreligious tolerance; the speech in Ghana was directed to the third world in general, and can be viewed as a communicative effort to accommodate populations that differ on the basis of economics; the speech to the LGBT community was a communicative effort to foster the movement for equality among gay, lesbian and transgender populations with their heterosexual siblings; the speech in Chicago was a communicative effort to accommodate a previously disenfranchised population, the African American population, here

in the United States, and the speech to the United Nations can be viewed as a communicative effort to lend support to the global, institutional drive to avoid international conflict among populations.

In applying the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism to each of the five speeches, the steps prescribed by the method, especially as itemized by Foss (2008), shall be strictly adhered to. These steps are: firstly, selecting the artifact, which has already been done. The second is analyzing the artifact, which includes coding the artifact for setting, character and action themes, and then constructing the rhetorical vision from the fantasy themes. This will subsequently be done. The third is formulating research questions. This has been done previously, and the questions will guide the analysis process, and the fourth is writing the essay.

#### BARACK OBAMA'S CAIRO SPEECH TO THE MUSLIM WORLD

One of the five operational definitions of peace with regard to this thesis is the tolerance of the obscure, which can be taken to mean communicative efforts aimed at tolerating populations with different religious views, notably Islam. Islam has been seen by diverse scholars as the world's fastest growing religion, and is one of the five most populous religions, with a significant global population. Islam has earned the respect as well as the dread of many, especially in view of the many recent occurrences that have been attributed to its fanatic followers, notable among which is the September 11 attacks in 2001 on the USA.

In keeping with his campaign promise, Barack Obama visited Cairo, Egypt, earlier this year and delivered a speech from there to the Muslim world. The full text of this speech is rendered in the first appendix. This chapter is partly concerned with criticizing this speech, following the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism, which involves coding for fantasy

themes regarding global peace, as operationalized herein, and constructing a possibly emergent rhetorical vision based on those themes.

The themes to be coded are character, setting and action themes. Major themes are those that occur relatively frequently throughout the speech. These themes are linked together to form a fantasy chain, which then spirals ultimately to the emergent rhetorical vision. This same practice will be conducted for all the other speeches as well. For the Cairo speech to the Muslim world, these themes are drawn by a careful appraisal of the full text of the speech, and a faithful application of the procedures of the fantasy method, as itemized by Foss (2008).

Character themes as contained in the Cairo speech are as follows: Islam, Colonialism, extremism, minority, Thomas Jefferson, stereotype, Barack Hussein Obama, mosque, God, humanity, religion, economy, people, law, security, history, two states, Hamas, Israel, Children of Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, peace, tension, controversy, war, freedom, Sunni, Shia, women's rights, tradition, father, Jews, Muslims, Christians, diplomacy, Qur'an, Bible, sons of God, mutual respect, discord, suspicion, relationship, belief, torture, prayer, differences, military power, globalization and violence, among others.

Action themes include, inter alia: progress, subjugating, invest, share, believe, agree, attack, deny, kill, close, bomb, torture, enslave, aspire and teach. Setting themes include, inter alia: Cairo, country, Kenya, Indonesia, Chicago, America, Bosnia, Afghanistan, Taliban, Iraq, Guantanamo Bay, Israel, Palestine, Arabia, Jerusalem, Iran and Africa.

Among the foregoing themes, the relatively major ones, those repeated more often than others, include: peace, tension, violence, human rights, truth, sharing, Israel, Palestine, Muslim, America, Islam and tolerance. These terms were each repeated more than five times throughout the speech, especially the term peace, or peaceful, or variations of the word, which was repeated

at least fourteen times.

The next step in applying the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism is to link the three categories of themes to draw out the fantasy chains and ultimately the rhetorical vision. Some of the major linkages of fantasy themes derivable from the speech are: avoidance of Islamic stereotypes; investment in economic progress; equality of women; freedom of religious practice; America's friendship with Islam; the isolation of extremists; the creation of two states; the closure of Guantanamo Bay; putting an end to torture; the rule of law, and the teachings of the Qur'an.

Others include: partnership in progress; establishing common ground; choosing diplomacy over aggression; realizing that extremists kill Muslims more than others; avoiding massive scale killings; realizing that Afghanistan was not a war of choice as Iraq was; denying continued Israeli settlements; pushing for democracy and the rule of law, and so on. Ultimately, the speech reiterated the express need to overcome tension, move for commonality in the attainment of economic and social progress, and advance the rule of law.

It is curious to note in any regard that the term mentioned the most throughout the speech was peace, used at least fourteen times, and up to twenty-seven times, if near synonyms of the word are counted, like "common ground," "tolerance," and so on. The merging of fantasy themes as seen above clearly draws out fantasy chains that border on the accommodation of differences among populations, which was our operational definition of peace. But let us examine at least ten of these fantasy chains one after another, as listed above.

Firstly, avoidance of Islamic stereotypes. In the speech, President Obama repeatedly stated that he would work hard to ensure that the West did not adopt stereotypes of Islam, as a violent and vicious religion. Since the September 11 attacks, and in view of other terrorist attacks

around the world, there have been occasions of stereotyping Islam. President Obama said that Islam, unlike the stereotypes portrayed, is actually a religion of peace, and should be viewed as such. He also said that, just as Islam was not to be viewed stereotypically, America was also not to be viewed as a mercurial, mercenary nation, but as a partner in progress with Islam in the collective search for peace.

Secondly, investment in economic progress. Throughout the speech, President Obama expressed the willingness of his administration to work with the Muslim world to foster economic progress and advancement in education and infrastructure. He promised to invest billions of dollars in programs that would mutually benefit America and the Muslim world, so as to foster peace and security, and promote the interests of both parties.

Furthermore, concerning the equality of women, President Obama said he realized that it was an ongoing debate in the Muslim world. He said that he personally believed that a Muslim woman choosing to cover her head was not a sign of inequality with her male counterpart, but the denial of education to women, he said, was a denial of such equality. He however noted in the defense of the Islamic world that nations that were majorly Islam had elected women heads of state, while some supposedly progressive countries, in the issue of women's rights, like the USA, had not.

Not only that, President Obama said with regard to religious freedom and America's friendship with Islam that there was no state in America where there was no mosque. He went further to state that there were over seven million Muslims in America, whose average per capita income, he declared, was higher than the general average. The President said that these Muslims enjoyed religious freedom, and were part and parcel of American life, finding employment in various areas of human endeavor, without being discriminated against.

President Obama also talked about the need to isolate extremists, since they ultimately killed more Muslims than they did Christians. He said that it was immoral to support the actions of extremists that “target children and blow up old women in buses,” as in his words, “this is not how moral authority is gained, but how it is surrendered.” He tried to identify the extremists as the mutual enemies both of Islam, in that they not only painted the religion in a bad light, but that they killed Muslims more than any other population; and of the West in that they were antagonistic to Christian and American ideals, and sought to perennially engage the rest of the world in conflict.

One issue that the President stressed was the issue of Israel and Palestine. He used the word, Israel, more than eleven times during the speech, and variants like Israeli, Jews, Israeli settlements, and Holocaust collectively more than twenty times. He also used the word Palestine, and its variants collectively more than twelve times. The historic importance of the Israeli-Palestinian dispute cannot be overemphasized. Various US Presidents, notably Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, have tried to broker peace between the two peoples, without conclusive success.

Barack Obama's stand on the issue is a two-state solution. According to President Obama, the two nations of Israel and Palestine, in view of their historic struggles and sufferings, each need to have its own state existing peacefully side-by-side. He reiterated the commitment of his administration to ensure that this happens, because it would bring a lasting resolution to the historic conflict, which is a major aspect of Middle-East peace as a whole.

President Obama also spoke about the efforts his administration had begun to take in closing the maximum facility prison at Guantanamo Bay. He said that America was a nation built on sound principles and values. He said that if America was to remain an example to the world,

she had to live up to these principles and values, especially as it relates to torture, the so-called enhanced interrogation methods. He said he was consequently committed to the closure of the prison at Guantanamo Bay and had already shown this commitment by the steps he had taken in the regard.

More so, he spoke about choosing diplomacy over military aggression. He condemned the war in Iraq as “a war of choice,” and said the war demonstrated why it was important to choose diplomacy over military aggression. He said he was also ready to sit with Iran “without preconditions” in order to find a lasting solution to the threat of nuclear proliferation. He said he looked forward to a world where no nation had any nuclear weapons, and a world where “any attempt of one nation or race or religion to subdue another was bound to fail.”

He spoke of the need for nations to cooperate, and to work as partners, rather than one or a few nations lording it over the others. He said as well that within nations governments should rule by consent and not coercion, so that democracy can be preserved. He stated that it was only in the observance of democracy and its concomitant human rights and freedom of opportunity for all that genuine progress could be had. He expressed optimism that true democracy was attainable by responsible governments that operated within the confines of legitimate institutions interested in serving the needs of the people.

He quoted copiously from the Qur'an, as well as the Bible and the Talmud. He tried to tie the three religions to a common ancestry, Abraham. He tried to encourage the major religions of the world to work together for the social and economic good of the people. Recall in this regard that he had earlier spoken in this way as a community organizer in Chicago, as we reviewed from *The Audacity of Hope* in Chapter Two. He expressly stated as much again, in his Cairo speech – this ideal of interreligious collaboration in the interest of socioeconomic progress of the people

of the world. It is no doubt a clear demonstration of his commitment to the ratification and resolution of differences among populations based on religion.

In short, as we have demonstrated above, throughout his speech, by his copious use of fantasy themes relevant to peace, and by his extensive use of the term, peace, itself, in addition to other themes, and the fantasy chains derivable from linking the character, action and setting themes previously itemized, we can see clearly that a rhetorical vision of peace concerning specifically the tolerance of populations that differ on the basis of religion can be seen to emerge from Barack Obama's speech to the Muslim world in Cairo.

The subsequent section will approach peace from the point of view of the emancipation of the indigent, by criticizing President Obama's speech in Accra, Ghana, a third world nation with the majority of its citizens living below the global poverty level

#### BARACK OBAMA'S SPEECH IN GHANA

Another operational definition of peace as it pertains here is emancipation of the indigent, seen in other words to mean the communicative efforts aimed at uplifting the poorer populations of the world in the quest for peace. It is generally known in this regard that the poorest of nations are in Sub Saharan Africa, one of which is Ghana, a nation in West Africa, predominantly black, and predominantly impoverished.

Sub Saharan Africa has historically been a source of global concern. Darfur, Zimbabwe, Congo, Liberia and Rwanda have in the last century literally been mass graves for suffering masses: destitution, hunger, disease and conflict – these have been, as Barack Obama himself has said, “stains on our collective conscience.” Because Africa is part of the world, especially in the current level of globalization, in view of the shared destinies and problems of the world, like

trade, climate change and diplomacy, the world has tried in various ways to pay attention to Africa, in the hope of lifting the continent out of perpetual poverty.

Earlier this year, President Obama visited the African nation of Ghana, and gave a speech in its capital city of Accra. This section is concerned with criticizing that speech. It shall proceed by coding and writing out fantasy themes based on character, setting and action. It shall then merge the major themes into fantasy chains, and explain them, with the purpose of ultimately drawing out a possible rhetorical vision.

The character themes in this speech include: Obama, President Mills, Kufur, Rawlings, economists, twenty-first century, connections, prosperity, health, security, democracy, human rights, partners, mutual respect, colonialism, trade, British, father, nations, per capita income, disease, conflict, resources, tragedy and charity.

Others include: nationalism, future, talent, energy, hope, life, development, potential, commitment, tradition, elections, repression, poverty, corruption, private sector, Ghanaians, autocracy, journalists, independence of the press, destiny, post-election violence, apartheid, constitution, opportunities, wealth, energy, biofuels, geothermals, natural resources, education, HIV/AIDS, diseases, strategy, conscience, challenges, nepotism, tribalism, corruption, caricature, sun, land, tribes, identity, diversity, strength, children, women, culture, diplomacy, society, heritage, institutions, Martin Luther King, young people, freedom and justice.

Action themes include: imprison, asserting, move, progress, ravage, despair, point fingers, control, build, promise, take giant strides, represent, depends, good governance, taking responsibility, spend, pledge, scrape by, change, govern, stable, succeed, constitutional, taking control, impose, determines, assist, support, participate, automating, advance, bribe, trade, invest, export, efforts, fight, pursue, eradicate, promote, rape, bear witness, help, point the way forward,

keep the peace, strengthen, hold politicians accountable, confront challenges, resolve conflict, thrive and triumph.

Setting themes include: Ghana, Accra, America, Africa, Kenya, Zimbabwe, South Africa, Nigeria, Liberia, Congo, Lebanon, African Union, ECOWAS, Somalia, Lagos, Kigali and Nairobi. Overall, major themes include: justice, progress, Africa, promise, peace, future, democracy, good governance, elections, economy, corruption, twenty-first century, rule of law, support, prosperity, investment, public health, human rights, responsibility, partner, opportunity and hope.

Next, linking major character, setting and action themes, we draw out the following fantasy chains: conducting transparent elections to ensure good governance; holding politicians accountable throughout Africa; eradicating disease to ensure prosperity; investing in the economy and the youth; positioning Africa to take responsibility for her future; working to end climate change through the harnessing of clean energy; ensuring the rule of law and the protection of human rights in places like Darfur, Liberia, the Congo and Zimbabwe; putting an end to prevalent corruption, and preventing the perennial occasions of conflict among tribes.

Firstly, the issue of conducting free and fair elections to ensure good governance. Barack Obama spoke about the need for Africans to be fair in their conduct of elections. He stated the importance of truly representing the will and aspirations of the people through periodic elections that are transparent. Africa has been known to be prone to election malpractice. In fact, a story was once told of an African community wherein election results were announced even before the elections had been concluded. There have also been diverse occasions when international observers have been attacked for trying to encourage peaceful elections. Barack Obama told the people of Ghana, and indeed Sub Saharan Africa as a whole to legitimize their election

processes.

Furthermore, President Obama spoke of the need for Africans to hold their leaders accountable once elected to office. He explained that it was atrocious for public servants to swindle the people for personal gain or to change constitutions simply to perpetuate themselves in power. He spoke of the need for African leaders to build strong institutions that serve the people, rather than use political power to enrich themselves and their cronies.

In this regard, he talked about the need for an independent press with vibrant journalists who are unafraid to speak the truth and to call out corrupt leaders. He even mentioned one journalist by name, who exhibited this manner of courage. He also spoke of a police force that is courageous enough to hold criminals accountable, and also mentioned a certain Mr. Kwame, who fought hard to do so. He spoke as well of the need for an independent judiciary, where criminals could be brought to justice in the interest of society.

Barack Obama went further to talk about public health concerns. He stressed his administration's commitment to the eradication of HIV/ AIDS, polio, malaria, and other diseases plaguing the continent of Africa. He spoke about the billions of dollars his administration was investing in building on the past administration's efforts to improve public health in Africa. He spoke of the contributions that improved public health would make to the overall progress of Africa, and how he wanted to partner with the continent to make it a reality.

Also, the President talked about investing in the people and natural resources of Africa. He gave examples of African Americans that were doing well, including recent migrants from Africa. He expressed concern however that the same success Africans were having in America was not happening in their own native Africa. He expressed hope that with increased investment, there would be more jobs for the youth of Africa, who would then be able to thrive, raise

families, and contribute to the overall well being of the continent.

Not only that, Barack Obama talked about the need for Africa to take responsibility for its “tragedies.” He said that Africa was wont to “point fingers” at other nations for its troubles, perennially blaming her woes on colonialism and global forces, and so on. Barack Obama stressed that even though the West had done certain things to impede Africa's growth, the bulk of Africa's problems are within her power to solve. He stated that Africans must rise to meet their challenges squarely, and not shift blame. They must realize that in the twenty-first century, they have to keep pace with the rapidly growing economies of the world, like South Korea which, according to Barack Obama, had a lower per capita income than Africa in the sixties, but which has now far out paced the continent.

President Obama also talked about climate change. He said that even though Africa was the least producer of greenhouse gases, she was the worst hit by the warming climate. He encouraged Africa to take the initiative in harnessing her solar, wind and biological fuels, and begin a vast industry of clean energy, thus frog-leaping the industrial age, and leading the world in the new age of clean energy revolution, seeing that Africa has abundant clean energy resources, more than most other regions of the world.

More so, Barack Obama talked about the need to preserve human rights. He spoke of the grave necessity of overcoming the occasions of injustice and autocracy, the need for African leaders to rule with authority and not brute force; legitimacy and not coercion. (Recall in this regard that he said the same thing in Cairo.) He talked as well of the need to end tribal conflict, and nepotism, as in his words, it was tribal conflict and nepotism that cut his own father's career as a Kenyan civil servant short.

A recurrent fantasy theme was the popular “yes you can” slogan he kept using during the

Ghana speech. Notice that this is a near relative of “yes we can,” which he used during the campaign. It is easy to imagine that he used “we” while referring to African Americans, because he sees himself as one, and “you” when referring to Africans, which he does not see himself as being. Scholars are agreed with regard to the foregoing that there is a clear identity distinction between Africans and African Americans, especially for historical and cultural reasons. This identity distinction is observable in speech, culture and even to an extent, complexion.

In addressing his African audience nonetheless, Barack Obama expediently exploited the fact that his own father was African, a native of Kenya, and President Obama told stories of his father's and grandfather's experiences growing up in Kenya. He said, “My father herded goats as a young man in Kenya.” President Obama also said that his paternal grandfather was a cook, and was called “boy” even when he was a full-grown man, by his masters. President Obama also said that his grandfather was incarcerated during the Kenyan liberation struggles and was instrumental in shaping the destiny of his son, the same son that became President Obama's own father.

In establishing this commonness with his audience, he was able to garner credibility to discuss the important issues above, and create a resonant rhetorical vision, a vision of emancipation for the indigent. He was able to buy into the shared consciousness of his audience, in order to inspire them to seek an ideal society, built on the principles he enunciated in the course of his speech, in view of their concomitant benefits. In doing so, he was able to show them how they could, by converging around his message, responsibly bring about positive change and progress for the third world, without succumbing to defeatism and blame shifting.

In short, Barack Obama talked about an Africa with good governance, achieved by transparent periodic elections, where leaders are held accountable, and where there is investment

in the natural resources and people; where there is good health for the masses; where human rights are preserved, and where conflict, tribalism and climate change are checked, and where true wealth and prosperity are attained by leap frogging the industrial age and leading the world in a new clean energy revolution, in peace and security in the twenty-first century.

#### BARACK OBAMA'S SPEECH TO THE LGBT COMMUNITY

A third conceptual definition of peace for our purposes is the equality of the homosexual, which refers to communicative efforts to attain equality for the populations that differ on the basis of sexual orientation, viz: the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender communities. Historically, homosexuality has been a source of popular concern. In the Book of Genesis, we are confronted with the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, twin cities that God intended to destroy for their gross sinfulness. We are told of how God's Angels arrived to destroy the place, disguised as handsome men, only to be sexually accosted by the men of Sodom and Gomorrah. The story narrates how angry the angels became at this, and how they subsequently destroyed the cities with fire and brimstone.

In classic times, homosexuality was frowned upon and sometimes juxtaposed with witchcraft. As a matter of fact, scholars declare that one of reasons for which St Joan of Arc, a maid that was largely responsible for crowning French King Charles VII, was burned at stake was in part due to her perceived homosexuality, as she was known to dress in men's clothes most of the time. Even in modern times, societies still frown upon homosexuality. In Uganda recently, for example, there were legislative efforts to procure the death penalty for those convicted of homosexuality or cross-dressing.

Here in the USA, homosexuals are denied the right to marry in some states of the Union

and are sometimes discriminated against in vocational and social issues, such as the “Don't-ask-don't-tell” Policy, which makes it impossible for openly gay people to serve in the Military. Not only that, openly gay people are sometimes treated with hate and opprobrium, and are made to suffer emotionally because of social stigmatization, and isolation. Homosexuals that cannot bear to be ostracized in such a manner refuse to openly reveal their homosexuality, and are forced to lead their lives like the heterosexual majority.

However, as we have shown, efforts to subdue populations on account of demographic differences do not make for true peace. Rather, these differences must be ratified, reconciled and accommodated. The organizations and individuals that endeavor to bring about this reconciliation of differences often do so by their communicative efforts inter alia. In this section, one such communicative effort by Barack Obama is appraised. His speech to the gay community at the Human Rights Campaign dinner delivered earlier this year is criticized.

Firstly, character themes derivable from the speech include: Joe Salmonese, Terry Bean, Rep Patrick Kennedy, John Berry, Nancy Sutley, Tipper Gore, Lady Gaga, the HRC, equality, families, gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, decent people, old attitudes, force of argument, power of example, movement for equality, rights of citizenship, opportunities, progress, Stonewall protest, message, challenges, friends, African Americans, LGBT Community, healthcare, sexual orientation and gender identity.

Others include: Americans, future, jobs, discrimination, relationships, Matthew Sheppard, violence, Hate-crimes Bill, opposition, activists, organizers, Senator Ted Kennedy, legislation, Employee-non-discrimination Bill, HIV/AIDS, Ryan White Program, public health, Jeffrey Crowley, national strategy, Don't-ask-don't-tell, integrity, emotion, human rights, benefits, capacity to love, commitment, common humanity, spouse, Michelle Obama, hope, activism,

cause, young person and promise.

Action themes include: speak out, advocate, change, open hearts, denying rights, lead, make a difference, stood up against discrimination, support, fight, demonstrated, love, hate, help, stand against, be honest, petition, make progress, care deeply, struggle, attack, instill fear, breaking spirits, holding hands, punishing patriotic Americans, living a lie, transcend old attitudes, uphold democratic ideals, agitate and march. Setting themes include America and Washington, D.C.

Next, linking character, action and setting themes in order to draw out fantasy chains, we derive the following: ending the Don't-ask-don't-tell Policy; upholding democratic ideals; procuring benefits for minority populations, legislation dealing with the LGBT Community; love and hate; mobilizing to make a difference; important people associated with the LGBT community; achieving equality for individuals that differ on the basis of sexual orientation.

Firstly, President Obama talked about ending the Don't-ask-don't-tell Policy of the military. This Policy, as has earlier been stated, makes it impossible for people that are openly gay to serve in the military. President Obama said that this policy “punishes patriotic Americans,” and was not economical in view of the fact that we are currently fighting two wars: Iraq and Afghanistan. He said it was not very expedient to turn away highly qualified individuals, who could do very well on the battlefield, simple because of who they are. He said that in his own administration, he would stand against the dismissal of any official simply on the grounds of sexual orientation, because according to him, this dismissal is “not fair,” and “not right,” and “nobody should be afraid of being gay in America.”

Furthermore, President Obama said that he would work to secure equal rights and benefits for the gay and lesbian community in the workplace. He would make sure that all

populations, different on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, are open to the same opportunities because, according to him, people should not be defined simply on the basis of sexual orientation, which is just a part of who people are. But people should be seen as: parents, workers, friends, spouses, and ultimately Americans that are entitled to all the accoutrements of citizenship.

Not only that, the President said that the movement for equality among populations that differ on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity is a way to uphold our national ideals, the ideals that declare that all people are equal, and are endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, inter alia. He said that these rights are what make America great. He said that these rights were what inspired African Americans to push for equality, a push that ultimately made him the first African American President.

Also, the President spoke about the many legislations that have been made to protect minority populations, including the LGBT community. He spoke about the Hate-crimes Bill, the Employee-non-discrimination Bill; the Ryan White Act, and other legislation that has been enacted, or is being enacted, to provide relief and support to gays and lesbians, and those living with HIV/AIDS. Barack Obama also talked in this regard of healthcare as well as moral support in order to enable gays and lesbians to lead fulfilling lives like their heterosexual counterparts.

More so, Barack Obama talked about the fantasy themes of love and hate. He said it was normal for love to be expressed not only by heterosexual couples but also by homosexual couples. He told a story of a gay individual who had protested during the Stonewall protests, and who had been apprehended by the police. The police told the individual's mother that he was gay, thinking that the mother would be appalled by the revelation. Obama reported that the woman simply said, "Yes I know; why are you bothering him?"

Mr. Obama said that it was acts like this, of defiance and advocacy that would make the world more responsive to gays and lesbians. In other words, he was inspiring the LGBT community to continue to stand up for what they are and not to compromise or back down in the face of opposition. He said that, in caring deeply about their sexual orientation and their gender identities, gays and lesbians would draw strength from one another and from the President, their “friend,” to always defend their rights and freedoms. He promised them that he was moving more swiftly to provide them all the necessary security that would enable them to lead lives the way they choose in a free and democratic America.

Something that Barack Obama inadvertently accomplished in his speech was to link important people to the cause of the LGBT community. At the start of his speech, he mentioned a handful of names, important people like senators, representatives, ambassadors, directors of organizations, and men of commerce and industry, including politicians and statesmen that were in one way or another connected with the gay and lesbian community, and who were interested in the rights and freedoms of the LGBT community.

This connection is expedient, and is of its own a fantasy chain, in that it is an indirect message to his audience that they have the support of well-meaning individuals in their struggle, and also to the rest of the world that, if people that respect the cause for equality for those that differ on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity could be so important in society, the cause should then be viewed as a noble one. In other words, he was lending credibility to the cause of the LGBT community, by linking it with names of important people in society, *inter alia*.

In short, Barack Obama was able to inspire his audience with a rhetorical vision of equality for populations that differ as to gender identity and sexual orientation. He was able to do

this by conjuring fantasy chains dealing with, among other things: ending the Don't-ask-don't tell Policy, that “punishes patriotic Americans”; encouraging his audience to uphold our democratic ideals and perennially push for equal opportunities and benefits in the workplace and in society at large; revealing, by way of the numerous legislations that his administration was enacting to support and protect gays and lesbians, his support for their cause, and lending credibility to the cause of the LGBT community.

#### BARACK OBAMA'S PRESIDENTIAL ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

A fourth operational definition of peace as it relates to this thesis is egalitarianism of the disenfranchised. This derives from the notion of conquered or subjugated populations. Hitherto, we have examined the issue of historical and dialectical hegemony, to wit that conquered populations are disenfranchised, and perennially struggle for equal rights of representation with the conquering population. We also expressed scholastic views regarding legitimacy of governance, and the issue of social contracts and referendum. In short, democracy with its concomitants was appraised with a view to expatiating on the occasions, precipitations and necessities of true democracy, and universal enfranchisement within federations.

With particular reference to the United States of America, the African American population has historically been the conquered population, having endured centuries of slavery and segregation at the hands of the majority white population. Repression, lynching and disenfranchisement were familiar issues within the Negro community. The 1960's saw, however, a radical change in the fortunes of African Americans, with the Civil Rights Movement, and the ascendancy of Martin Luther King, who prognosticated concerning the attainment of equal rights among white and non-white populations in the United States.

African Americans were inspired to work to achieve such egalitarianism, and ventured into politics and mainstream American civil society with admirable vigor. The climax of this effort could be seen to be the election of Barack Obama to the United States Presidency. The historic election of an African American as President of the United States both shocked and excited the world. Newspapers and other contemporary media broadcast the story to a vast global audience. It was universally perceived to be a turning point, not only in US history, but also in global history as a whole. It was similar to the freedom and ascendancy to the South African Presidency of Nelson Mandela.

Ordinarily speaking, one can state that when Black politicians rise to prominence like Barack Obama and Nelson Mandela in hitherto white-controlled societies, the world perceives this rise as a radical global turning point, and with good reason. Words like progress, change, freedom and so on are used to describe the event, and populations are supposedly inspired to seek a more egalitarian world. This clearly ratifies our earlier conceptualization of peace as the resolution of inequality, and the universal accommodation of minority populations.

Barack Obama was elected the forty-fourth President of the United States of America on November 4, 2008. He is the first African American to be thus elected. On the night of his election, he delivered an Acceptance speech in Chicago. This speech is criticized subsequently, and its full text is rendered in the fourth appendix. Character, setting and action themes are knit to ferret fantasy chains that form the basis of a possibly emergent rhetorical vision, as follows:

Firstly, character themes include: dream, founders, democracy, power, young, old, rich, poor, Democrats, Republicans, Black, White, gay, straight, collection of individuals, Red states, Blue states, United States of America, election, Senator McCain, Governor Palin, Senator Joe Biden, Michelle Obama, family, David Plouffe, political campaign, David Axelrod, politics,

young people, apathy, jobs, challenge, brave Americans, the road ahead, one people, government, patriotism, responsibility, partisanship, humility, determination, progress, Lincoln, bonds of affection, president, new dawn of American leadership, power of ideals, liberty, unyielding hope, Anne Nixon Cooper, slavery, struggle, progress, New Deal and common purpose.

Action themes include: told to be cynical, put hands on arc of history, change come to America, fight for beloved country, render service, renew nation's promise, celebrate, solve problems, remake America, look out for one another, rise and fall as one nation, heal the divides, support agents of peace, reach for the ballot, witness a generation rise to greatness, open doors of opportunity, and put people back to work.

Setting themes include: Chicago, America, schools, churches, first time, defining moment, Delaware, Charleston, Des Moines, depths of winter, Autumn night, Republican Party, Democratic Party, parliaments, palaces, forgotten parts of the world, Selma, Birmingham and Atlanta. Then, knitting character, setting and action themes together, we derive the following fantasy chains: Change coming to America; election victory belonging to all the people of America; fulfilling America's promise; demonstrating the power of American ideals; the perfection of America's Union; overcoming America's divisions; repositioning America in the world; making America's future prosperous.

To begin with, change coming to America. At the onset of his speech, Barack Obama said: "... because of what we did in this election, at this defining moment, change has come to America." The word "change" occurred relatively frequently throughout the speech. Change, as it pertains to the speech, can mean that the seeming exclusivity of white presidents in America had ended. It could also mean that the era of George W Bush policies had ended. It could mean

both. As a candidate, this theme of change resonated throughout Barack Obama's campaigns. It was a central ingredient in his positioning throughout the primaries, and even when he faced off with Senator McCain in the main election. One of his primary slogans was: "Change we can believe in."

Another fantasy chain derivable from the themes earlier enumerated is the election victory belonging to all the people of America. In Chapter two of this thesis, we showed how Barack Obama was perceived by the Democratic Party as being the candidate that would avail Americans of a much-needed come-together feeling, which was perceived to be of high importance in the years following the September 11 attacks, and the two wars that were concomitants of that attack.

We also demonstrated how different demographic populations saw Obama as a slate on which they could write their worldviews. In the course of his speech, Barack Obama said that his victory belonged to the people, and not necessarily to David Axelrod, or David Plouffe, or his family, or Michelle Obama, even though these individuals had supported him a lot throughout the campaign. He said his election was an answer to those who questioned whether America's promise of universal egalitarianism was still "alive in our times."

He went further to state that his election proved that there was no White or Black, or Gay or Straight, or Disabled America; no Red or Blue or Hispanic, or Native America, but only the United States of America. He said that Americans were to "rise and fall as one nation and one people." He cited the example of the financial distress the country was in with the bailouts that had happened during 2008, and the general economic stagnation of that year. He said the crisis thought the nation that no sector could stand alone. He showed how the private sector needed the government, how Wall Street needed Main Street to survive and vice versa.

This issue of the perfection of America's Union has been an issue of universal importance, especially in view of the fact that America is a veritable kaleidoscope of cultures and peoples from across the world. Scholars are agreed in that there is no part of the world that is not significantly represented in the United States of America. Hence, if the various populations of the world can coexist in peace and harmony in the United States of America, it is a signal that they can exist in peace throughout the world.

Barack Obama also spoke of America's ideals and promises. He talked about the founding fathers that declared all Americans to be equal and possessed of inalienable rights. Notice in this regard that human rights are a fantasy chain that we have seen to run through all four of Barack Obama's speeches examined thus far. In all the four speeches, he talks about the need for the rights of all peoples to be preserved, and for the institutions charged with such preservation to live up to their responsibilities. Notice as well that he points out how these rights are universal, and enshrined not only in the various constitutions of the countries of the world, but in our "collective conscience."

Furthermore, Barack Obama talks about the perfection of racial union, evidenced by the triumph of the African American population in seeing one of their own ascend to the highest office in the land. He mentioned the Civil Rights actions in Selma, Birmingham-Alabama, and Atlanta, and so on. He showed how the historic struggle of ex-slaves had not been in vain. He specifically told the story of a certain Anne Nixon Cooper, a 106-year-old woman "born a generation past slavery," who once upon a time could not vote for being black and a woman at the same time.

He showed how the times have changed, how Anne Nixon Cooper voted in the election that saw the first African American President. He meditated on her triumph, and the pride all

African Americans deservedly felt because of the election, when viewed against the background of slavery and segregation, how a previously disenfranchised people had become equally represented in a country founded on the ideals of freedom, opportunity and social justice.

Barack Obama said the perfection of America's Union was, however, an ongoing struggle that must be pursued vigorously. He said that generations to come were going to look back on what had been achieved by his historic election and measure subsequent progress against its antecedent. He said that if his daughters, Sasha and Malia, were to live to be as old as Anne Nixon Cooper, it would be desirable for them to see the progress made accelerated and not undone.

He inspired his audience to see America's Union as becoming more perfect with each succeeding generation, to get past the cynicism of the nay-sayers, refuse doubt and despair, and continue to push for the perfection of racial union in the United States, with all its attendant economic, social, cultural and political benefits.

In short, Barack Obama spoke of change having come to America, through a combined and concerted popular effort, a change that in his view belonged rightfully to the people that fought to bring it about selflessly, through a belief in the power of America's ideals of democracy and social justice; a change that further perfected America's Union, positioned it more securely in the world, and was a beacon of hope not only to the nation as a forerunner of progress, but also as a definite message of peace among populations of the world significantly represented in the United States of America.

#### BARACK OBAMA'S SPEECH TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

A fifth operationalization of the term peace, as it pertains to this thesis is the avoidance of

conflict. This section is dedicated to criticizing President Obama's speech to the United Nations General Assembly. The United Nations was founded in 1945 to replace the League of Nations, for the purpose of bringing countries together in the interest of avoiding world wars and multilateral conflict.

The United Nations consists of many component councils, including a General Assembly, made up of all the participant sovereign states that convene annually to deliberate and vote on matters of global importance. In short, the United Nations is a confederation of nation states charged with keeping the world safer and more secure for the harmonious coexistence of all peoples, through the efforts of its councils and institutions, notably including the International Court of Justice at the Hague; the Economic and Social Council; the Human Rights Council, and the UNICEF.

In September 2009, Barack Obama addressed the United Nations General Assembly for the first time as the forty-fourth President of the United States. In his speech, he laid out plans, resolutions and strategies for meeting international problems and opportunities, as well as declaring his administration's support for the crucial issues that the world concerns itself with in the current state of globalization that has characterized the century.

Character themes identified by way of fantasy-theme criticism of the speech include: forty-fourth president of the United States, challenges, expectations, discontent with status-quo, hope, change, misconception of America, unilateral action, anti-Americanism, responsibility, shared interests, mutual respect, rule of law, Taliban, combat brigade, strategic warheads, nuclear weapons, fissile materials, comprehensive test ban treaty, two states, climate change, clean energy, economic crisis, G20 nations, stimulus, global economy, developing countries and food security initiative.

Others include: extremists, Franklin Roosevelt, cooperative effort of the whole world, peace, prosperity, sovereign states, threat of nuclear proliferation, nuclear non-proliferation treaty, diplomacy, conflict, safe haven for Al Qaeda, peace keeping, Sudanese people, Prime Minister Netanyahu, President Abbas, progress, continued Israeli settlements, negotiations without preconditions, bilateral negotiations, politicians, God's children, the pursuit of peace, UN Secretary General, refugees, future generations, renewable energy, wealthy nations and developing nations.

More character themes include: carbon emitters, air pollution, global recession, Great Depression, poverty, financial regulations, HIV/AIDS, public health, Millennium Development Goals, international institutions, universal availability of opportunity, democratic governance, true leadership, equal rights of men and women, equality of the races, confidence in administration of justice, African American, pursuit of more perfect union, selectivity in promotion of democracy, self evident truths, citizenship of the world and international cooperation.

Action themes include: defining people on basis of difference, not apologizing for America's ideals, tear people apart, light the path to peace, enrich or impoverish the world, share a common future, embrace a new era of engagement, prohibit use of torture, close Guantanamo Bay, responsibly ending Iraq war, help Iraqis transition peacefully, lay groundwork for future progress, sowing terror in pockets of the world, and sowing discord.

Others include: blame others for troubles, attempting to dominate other nations, build coalitions for peace, reduce strategic war heads, reduce role of nuclear weapons, end production of fissile materials, combat nuclear smuggling, escalating nuclear arms races, universal yearning for peace, breaking cycle of insecurity, fortify our future, help peoples feed themselves,

harnessing technology for peaceful purposes and siding with justice.

Next, linking major setting, action and character themes, the following fantasy chains emerge: prevention of one population from dominating others; building coalitions in the interest of peace; furthering multilateral engagement; curbing violent extremism in various parts of the world; pushing for disarmament and ending nuclear non proliferation; mobilizing for peace and security in the Middle east and the securing of a two-state solution with regard to Israel and Palestine; advancing the rights and responsibilities of independent populations around the world; combating climate change; ratifying financial regulations and advancing universal economic opportunities, and harnessing technological advancements in the blitz at promoting harmonious coexistence among diverse populations.

To begin with, President Obama spoke about the need for nations to work together to prevent certain populations from trying to dominate other populations. He quotes Franklin Roosevelt as saying that the task of global peace was not the prerogative of individual nations or parties, but a collective effort of the whole world. President Obama also said that no nation had the authority to act unilaterally in trying to solve global issues, and conjectured in this regard at the start of his speech that America's perceived unilateralism during the Bush Administration inspired a level of anti-Americanism adopted by the rest of the world.

The President went further to state that nations were to build coalitions in the interest of peace as an alternative to acting unilaterally on the global front, as multilateral engagements justify the existence and utility of the United Nations. He bemoaned the situation where sovereign states sometimes used the United Nations as an avenue to “sow discord,” and to “play politics,” instead of coming together to work at attaining mutual interests. President Obama said that the efforts at attaining peace did not at present measure up to its need.

In view of the foregoing, the President talked about the need for the fundamental principles of equality and the demands of mutual responsibility in a globalized world where destinies are shared to be the guiding parameters that underpin the necessity of working multilaterally for the procurement of peace. He stressed that nations were to engage with one another with mutual respect, realizing that the world consisted of partnerships of people with common aspirations, rather than fragments of antagonistic populations.

Furthermore, President Obama talked about the need to combat violent extremism in all its forms. He said that nations were to work together to fight Al Qaeda and the Taliban, and all the agents of division and violence, who were perennially seeking to murder innocents around the world. President Obama also talked about the need to prevent Iran and North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons, weapons that might ultimately reach terrorist networks. Barack Obama talked about living up to the treaties of non-proliferation, and the policies that sanctioned disarmament, and the strategic reduction of warheads.

President Obama persuaded the world to enforce sanctions against nations that failed to live up to their responsibilities under the treaties, while at the same time reiterating his commitment to diplomacy without preconditions with nations that were ready to act responsibly in effectively preventing a nuclear arms race in any of the regions of the world, cognizant of their rights under international law and diplomacy, notably Iran and North Korea.

The President enjoined all nations to work together as well to protect the planet, by harnessing clean and renewable forms of energy, reduce carbon emissions, and avoid unhealthy climate change and global warming. He said that subsequent generations would hold this generation accountable for the state of the planet and wonder why we refused to act responsibly, if unhealthy climate change went unchecked, and led to global disaster.

With regard to international peacekeeping, the President commended the efforts of the United Nations and its allies in helping the poor, sick and afflicted, and trying to avoid conflict and hostility among belligerent nations. He spoke of the need for the United Nations General Assembly to continue to support the peace keeping efforts with regard to the people of Sudan, the Congo and East Timor, and other nations plagued with ethnic and other manner of internal strife and violence. He stated as well in this regard that just as nations were to avoid occasions of aggression with one another, individuals were to be spared from being oppressed by their own people.

He expanded on this notion of individuals being protected from violence within their own countries, by talking about his own African American identity, ultimately praising the effectiveness of standing up for justice and equality in the face of oppression. He further pledged the support of his administration for all peoples who were committed to the struggle for dignity and self determination as, according to him, nations must be free to pilot themselves and plan their destinies in keeping with their own cultural aspirations, and bemoaned what he deemed as America's historic selectivity in the pursuit of democracy around the world.

The president went further to discuss the global economy, and the need for financial regulations to checkmate greed and irresponsibility among business owners and wealthy nations, in their relations with developing nations and the global poor. He talked about billions of dollars his administration was investing in trying to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS and other pandemic diseases, as well as his administration's efforts at ending extreme poverty around the world.

He talked about the impact of an unstable world on the lives of ordinary citizens of the world, and gave an example of a girl in Israel that goes to bed afraid that a bomb might end her life, or a boy in Gaza that has no nation to call his own. He talked about the “injustice” of

maternal and infant mortality; of the pain of a hungry stomach, of thirst and of deprivation. He said that the inability of one child in whatever part of the world to live his dream had multiplier effects that touched on the collective conscience of the entire world.

He said that there was a need for urgency in rising to the demands of international cooperation and the quest for global peace, stability and security of the world. He affirmed that America was ready to play its part in working as a partner with other sovereign states to curb extremism, push for the end of nuclear proliferation; advance the cause of international peace and security; mobilize for the protection of the climate, and work to harness technology in peaceful ways, inter alia. He sought the support of the rest of the world in doing all the foregoing in the interest of peace.

Having criticized the five purposely selected speeches, we shall now discuss the conclusions derivable therefrom, in response to the research questions asked at the beginning of this research activity, as well as providing hermeneutic material for further research, inter alia.

## CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

In applying the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism to the five speeches selected, as conducted in the foregoing chapter, we proceeded largely from the point of view of textual analysis, ferreting out the fantasy themes and chains from the speeches themselves, as recommended *inter alia* by Foss (2008). However, the Fantasy-theme method is not limited to textual analysis as has been done, but also a situational appraisal of the nature and extent of the participation of groups in the fantasy themes, chains and types so ferreted.

In other words, the fantasy method is concerned with not only identifying the fantasy types embodied in artifacts, but also unveiling the nature, level and extent of participation by the group members that supposedly share such fantasy types. Groups share fantasy themes and types, and through such sharing also known as symbolic convergence, a core tenet of the fantasy method, they are able to make sense of the world, and create reality for themselves. In the merging of composite individual worlds, group members become participants, through symbolic convergence, around fantasy types, in a unique rhetorical vision that guides their social behavior.

According to Bormann (1982, p 51), a fantasy theme is a dramatizing message in which characters engage symbolically, in their social situations, in order to obtain a way to make their shared experiences a reality, and shape such experiences into social knowledge, through a creative rhetorical vision. This means that a rhetorical vision, proceeding as it does from fantasy themes, chains and types, in that order, becomes the paradigm for group behavior, and the prism from which such behavior may be studied and made sense of.

Foss (2008, p 100) expands on the foregoing by stating that “fantasy types encourage groups to fit new events or experiences into familiar patterns.” Hence, in trying to make sense of the social behavior of the participants of a rhetorical vision, one has to evaluate the fantasy types

that they supposedly share. Thus far, we have drawn out fantasy chains from a cross section of Barack Obama's Presidential speeches in the foregoing chapter. Subsequently, we shall epistemologically deduce fantasy types, which are recurrent fantasy chains, and explain them. These fantasy types will be seen to run through most, if not all, the speeches criticized in chapter four, and it is these fantasy types that we will merge into a rhetorical vision.

Hence, in this chapter we shall identify the rhetorical vision contained in Barack Obama's Presidential speeches, and discuss its possible resonance with his audience – recall in this regard that Foss (2008, p 101) stated *inter alia* that “an artifact produced by a major public figure, such as a US President's speech typically constitutes evidence of symbolic convergence because it incorporates themes that the rhetor knows will resonate with the audience.” Even though the video renditions of all five speeches showed successful audience participation, this thesis also has to argue as to the overall, overarching symbolic convergence displayed by other related audiences, and indeed the global audience, for whom the blitz for peace is supposedly undertaken.

Concomitant with discussing the extent of popular participation in Mr. Obama's rhetorical vision so as to faithfully adhere to the demands of the fantasy method, we shall show the concrete contributions this thesis makes to rhetorical theory, as well as provide suggestions for further research. We shall also answer the research questions posed in the first chapter, concerning Mr. Obama's rhetorical vision, his possible appellation of global peace icon, and his possible merit of the Nobel Peace prize, and situate the entire research endeavor in the pool of research in rhetorical criticism, in the subsequent sub-sections. This is done in keeping with procedural demands for the proper application of the fantasy method as itemized in Foss (2008), and also with a view to rendering the entire research effort valid, replicable and scientific.

## BARACK OBAMA'S RHETORICAL VISION

In applying the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism to prison rhetoric, Foss (2008) first analyzed the express content of such rhetoric, identified fantasy themes and chains, and categorized them all into sixteen fantasy types, including: spirituality, general interest, programming, prison life, self-help, critique of society, medical issues, family issues, confession, meta-coverage, legal issues, domestic violence, staff profile, critique of the facility, entertainment and inmate profile. Foss (2008) blended these fantasy types into a rhetorical vision of inmate adaptability to prison life, operationalized in three ways, which Foss called Heaven, Hell and Here.

In ordinary parlance, Foss (2008) was able to discover a rhetorical vision of inmate adaptability to prison life and circumstances, in three ways: heaven, which means that, according to Foss, some prisoners saw the entire prison experience as good and valuable. These were the prisoners whose rhetoric revealed them to be accepting of the prison experience. They saw themselves as deserving of having been put in prison and viewed their stay in prison as an opportunity to mend their ways and become better people. They hence adapted to prison life and situations by submitting themselves to its rules, strictures and privations.

On the other hand, there were the inmates who saw their entire prison experience as wicked and punitive. These were prisoners whose rhetoric revealed them to be distrustful of the prison experience. They saw themselves as victims of incarceration and suffering. They did not see themselves as necessarily deserving of having been put in prison, and were disgruntled by their fate. They adapted to prison life by reactionary behavior.

Thirdly, there were the inmates whose rhetoric revealed them as neither accepting nor distrustful of the prison experience. They simply saw it as an inchoate experiential stage in their

lives, a passing phase they were condemned to live through day by day till it was over. They were sometimes accepting of the prison experience, and sometimes they were distrustful of it, and some times too they were simply going through the motions in a more or less humdrum fashion. In any case, nonetheless, Foss (2008) was able to identify this shared rhetorical vision of adaptability albeit conceivable in three forms.

Bormann (1982) affords the following steps in the making of a rhetorical vision, through symbolic convergence: fantasy themes, fantasy chains, fantasy types, and rhetorical vision, in that order. Just as Foss (2008) did with prison rhetoric, we have already analyzed Barack Obama's rhetoric, and have ferreted out several fantasy themes. We have as well merged the different fantasy themes into fantasy chains. These fantasy chains are further blended into fantasy types.

We can identify twenty fantasy types, running through all five selected speeches, as follows: mutual responsibility, mutual interest, human rights and democracy, fatherhood of God, partnership of nations and peoples, the need for peacekeeping, rule of law, collective consciousness, security of populations, women's rights, the promise of youth, no one nation being allowed to subdue another, disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, intercultural and interreligious dialog, climate change, eradication of poverty, curbing extremism, integrity of international communication, public health and HIV/AIDS, and fighting global corruption.

Having already explained the foregoing fantasy types, there is no need to rehash them here. All the foregoing fantasy types relate directly to peace, and the ways by which it may be attained. If all the fantasy types listed above, as collected from Barack Obama's speeches, are lived out, that is, if the populations of the world lived with mutual responsibility and respect

toward one another; if they realized that we all had mutual interests in a shared world; if they all preserved human rights, recognized the universal fatherhood of God, formed partnerships and strove to keep the peace; if all populations observed the rule of law, collective consciousness and the security of all nations, there would most probably be peace.

If nations as well respected women's rights; if they respected and invested in the promise of youth; if no one nation tried to subdue another, and rather moved for disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; if they engaged in intercultural and interreligious dialog, became wary of climate change; moved for the eradication of global poverty, curbed extremism, observed integrity in international communication, mobilized for improved universal public health, and fought global corruption, there would very likely be peace.

Nonetheless, the foregoing are all fantasy types. The world as it is does not show all the aforementioned twenty attributes of peace. The world at best is moving toward this state of peace. The participants in the fantasy types aforementioned are the ones to socially construct this state of peace. By paying attention to Barack Obama's rhetorical vision, and by symbolically converging on the themes derivable therefrom, the audiences of President Obama's speeches are charged to socially conceive of a peaceful world, and possibly work to practically bring it about.

As we have seen in Chapter Four, these fantasy types relate directly to areas of concern in the quest for global peace. These areas of concern form the operational foundation for the conceptualization of peace: the indigent, the obscure, the homosexual, the disenfranchised and aggression. The fantasy types ultimately rely on the premise that: if the indigent are emancipated, the obscure are tolerated; the homosexual are considered equal, the disenfranchised are given full rights, and aggression is prevented in all its forms, there will be peace.

Hence, Barack Obama's rhetorical vision is global peace, global peace obtained by the

emancipation of the indigent, the egalitarianism of the disenfranchised, the tolerance of the obscure, the equality of the homosexual, and the avoidance of conflict. This rhetorical vision of peace is what runs through all his speeches, and influences the way he carries on as leader of the free world. This rhetorical vision is the one he encourages his audience members to tap into during his speeches, when he used slogans like: “Yes, we can.” “We are the *United States of America*.” “Let us take responsibility for our future.” “We are the change we seek.” “No one nation should dominate another,” “our collective consciousness,” and “We are all God's children,” to mention but a few.

This is the rhetorical vision at play during his speeches when the audiences cheer and clap profusely as they did in Cairo, Egypt; at the Gay Rights Campaign; in Chicago, and at the United Nations General Assembly. Watching these speeches on television or on the Internet, I was able to see the connection Mr. Obama had with his audiences, how he was able to prompt shouts of “I love you,” and “Yes we did,” and “Obama,” to mention but a few. As Foss (2008) stated, Presidents are able to inspire convergence because they know what themes resonate with what audiences, and from the videos I watched of the speeches, I conclude that this is true. Apparently, Mr. Obama knew exactly what to say to what audience, how to communicate astutely his rhetorical vision of global peace.

Hence, Mr. Obama was not simply able to inscribe a rhetorical vision of global peace in his speeches, but he was also able to communicate it effectively to his audiences. He was able to create an atmosphere where the individual consciousnesses of his audience members symbolically converged upon the fantasy themes contained in his message, supposedly enabling them to begin to socially construct a reality that was inchoate, a world in which peace was obtainable through universal emancipation, equality, egalitarianism, tolerance and the avoidance

of conflict, and hence they cheered, and shouted and clapped.

Conquergood (1995) describes such an atmosphere aptly thus: “The tempo of the conversation would pick up. People would grow excited, interrupt one another, blush, laugh, forget their self-consciousness. The tone of the meeting, often quiet and tense immediately prior to the [speech], would become lively, animated, and boisterous, indicating participation in the drama.” As previously stated, symbolic convergence is evidenced in the resonance of the fantasy themes and ultimately the rhetorical vision of the speaker with his audience members, as has been seen to be the case in Mr. Obama's speeches in Cairo, Egypt, Chicago; the United Nations and the Gay community.

In all these settings, he was able to speak in fantasy themes that caught the imagination of his listeners. He was able to communicate effectively a rhetorical vision of world peace, achievable through universal emancipation, egalitarianism, tolerance, equality and the avoidance of conflict. He was able to inspire his audience members – as can be observed when the videos of all five speeches are watched – to emotionally respond to what Conquergood (1995) calls the “drama” of his speaking. He was able to get them to cheer, to clap, and to display overt expressions of collaboration and support for his message.

His rhetorical vision of global peace, finding acceptance with his audience, as evidenced by the dramatic participation therein, supposedly served as stimulant for a possible appellation of icon of peace and a subsequent concomitant award of the Nobel Peace Prize. These arguments will be made in the following sub-sections. In these arguments, possible intellectual prisms and syllogistic expatiation shall serve to respond to the remaining two research questions posed *inter alia* in the first chapter.

## BARACK OBAMA AS AN ICON OF GLOBAL PEACE

In the Chapter One of this thesis, we gave an example with the Prince of Peace, as told by the Prophet Isaiah. This Prince was so called, because he was sent by the Holy Spirit to bring a message of liberation to prisoners, sight to the blind, and the universality of salvation to all peoples. We also explained how champions of peace have been known over the ages as people or organizations that aim at healing the divides that exist among disparate populations through their communicative efforts. We showed how they subsequently became known as champions of peace.

In Chapter Two, we examined the life of Barack Obama, especially as it relates to global peace. We saw how his grandmother testified that Barack as a young lad perceived his mission as being to leave the world a better place than he met it. This is probably not altogether such a unique mission. It is permissible to think that millions of individuals desire to do as much. However, large communities of people see a few people as especially devoted, by their unique capacity and position in society, as champions of peace. These are the few individuals who, through their communicative efforts, are able to capture the imagination of the larger community in such a way that they are perceived as synonymous with peace.

The theory of symbolic interactionism expatiates on the situation by which members of a community, such as the global community, interpret the roles and situations of individuals and artifacts or symbols by associating them with certain ideas, or ideals. In this way, they are able to socially define these objects, artifacts or individuals and the reality that they live in and help create. Symbolic interactionism as used here leads us to argue as to whether or not Barack Obama is associated with global peace in the minds of a significant portion of a global audience.

Even though this is not survey research, there are parameters we can adduce in the blitz at

making a credible argument as to a possible appellation of icon of peace for Barack Obama. To begin with, we already showed how Mendell (2008) testified that one of the reasons that Barack Obama got nominated as the Democratic candidate for the presidency was because the party was looking for someone who could inspire the country to be united, at a time when the nation was searching for a “come together” feeling.

We also portrayed Barack Obama as being a person that various individuals from various demographic circles could relate to. The fact that he was biracial, and had spent significant time in Africa, Asia, America, and had ties with most of the world in one form or another, made it easy for all peoples to see a slice of themselves in him. We showed how Barack Obama himself was wont to testify that a meeting of his extended family resembles a United Nations General Assemble meeting.

Not only his background, but also his work justifies a possible appellation of icon of peace for Barack Obama. He showed his great interest in working on behalf of the underprivileged and was willing to leave a well-paying corporate job in order to do so. His message of hope was described by his biographers as a distinguishing quality. Mendell (2008) said that Barack Obama's optimism in the face of despair was always a morale boost for those he catered to.

In discussing his background in the Chapter Two, we showed how Barack learned to appreciate diverse cultures by emulating his mother's acceptance of diversity. We showed how his mother cared deeply for the less privileged, and advocated for social justice in her work and in her academic writing. We showed how she was able to imbue in the young Barack a spirit of creative idealism, and encourage him to take an active part in improving the lives of others, regardless of their demographic distinctions.

Even though Barack Obama's speech to the Democratic National Convention was not criticized here, a review of that speech, a speech which Mendell (2008) declared was the one that fetched Obama national, if not global, fame, shows how unity-centered Barack can be perceived as being. His persistent declaration that America was not a collection of distinct demographics, but the *United States of America*, a message he reiterated in his Presidential Acceptance speech in Chicago, was a clear revelation of his belief in the commonality of the human race.

Hence, the greatest premise for a possible appellation of icon of peace for Barack Obama is his rhetorical vision of global peace, as earlier explicated. Indeed, a possible conception of Barack Obama as an icon of peace is a necessary overflow of his being perceived as having a rhetorical vision of peace. It is common sense to state that a person who is seen to have a global message of peace that resonates with a global audience is very likely to be viewed as an icon of peace. An allegory in this regard is Oprah Winfrey, the personality behind the "O" factor, which has now become an American pop culture icon.

The Sunday Independent defines the "O" factor as the power to make or break, to change lives, to sell millions of books, and to exercise a magnetic pull on the hearts, minds and wallets of Middle America. Just as Oprah's personality and work led to her becoming viewed as a cultural icon, it is arguable that President Obama, through his rhetorical vision of global peace achievable by emancipation, equality, tolerance, egalitarianism and the avoidance of conflict, is possibly an icon of global peace.

An icon of peace is someone who inspires the populations of the world to work together in bridging the divides that create occasions of conflict in the world. Martin Luther King was arguably an icon of peace. He was able to inspire a generation of African Americans to rise and reach for equality, through his rhetorical vision of peace, obtained primarily by egalitarianism of

the disenfranchised. In his famous “I Have a Dream” speech, he talked about the need for colored people to be given the right to vote, and to be properly represented in other ways in society.

He talked about the devotees of Civil Rights not being satisfied until Justice had rained down like a “mighty stream.” By his profound rhetorical vision, Martin Luther King was able to capture the imaginations of audiences around the world, audiences who, through symbolic interactionism were able to link Dr. King with egalitarianism; through symbolic convergence were able to buy into his rhetorical vision, and through social constructionism were persuaded to push for the Civil Rights Act that was signed into law in 1964, not long after the speech was delivered before the Lincoln Memorial.

Nelson Mandela was arguably an icon of global peace as well, by his rhetorical vision of global peace also by egalitarianism. To a nation hamstrung by apartheid, Nelson Mandela was able to preach a message of liberation, a message of freedom and equality, which paved the way for the first democratic elections, and the rule of the majority in South Africa. Like was the case with Dr. King, Nelson Mandela's audiences were able to respond to his message, associate his personality with his cause, and work with him to bring it about.

Another icon of global peace is arguably Mother Teresa, with her rhetorical vision of global peace through the emancipation of the indigent and the tolerance of the obscure. As a nun in Calcutta, she was able to transcend religious barriers and bring succor to those in need. A story has been told in this regard of Mother Teresa's ability to inspire people across religious lines. The story has it that once when Mother Teresa was attending to a very sick individual whose family had abandoned him to die, she asked him if he believed in God. The sick man looked at Mother Teresa and asked her if God looked and behaved like she did. Mother Teresa

said God was exceedingly far better than she. The sick man then said that he believed in God.

Other arguable icons of global peace are: Mahatma Gandhi who fought for freedom for his people of India through a movement of nonviolence. Bill Clinton may also be viewed as an icon of global peace, for working tirelessly during his time as President of the United States to solve the crisis in the Middle East, and fostering cooperation among nations, and who even now as an ex-President is working to emancipate indigent populations around the world, affording them healthcare and food, and so on. Others include Desmond Tutu, Jimmy Carter, Theodore Roosevelt and Pope John Paul II.

Just as these individuals are arguably icons of global peace because they were able to capture the imagination of a global audience with their unique rhetorical visions of peace, Barack Obama is also arguably an icon of global peace by his rhetorical vision of global peace through emancipation, egalitarianism, tolerance, equality and avoidance of conflict. Having argued that Barack Obama is an icon of global peace, the subsequent sub-section will respond to the third and last research question, concerning a possible justification for Mr. Obama's receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize.

#### JUSTIFICATION OF OBAMA'S NOBEL PRIZE RECEIPT

Historically, the world has often found itself in conflict by harping on the differences of its constituent populations. Most of the most dreadful of wars and genocides have been underpinned by highlighting the differences among populations and adducing propaganda to breed hate consequent on such differences. The Holocaust of the early 1940s was a clear dramatization of the demographic distinctions among peoples within a continent, persuaded by underhand rhetoric to kill in large numbers individuals presumably enemies simply for being different.

The murder of over six million Jews by Nazis; the murder of over a million Rwandans in ethnic clashes; the Cambodian genocides; the Chinese massacres by Japanese invaders – all these were carried on based on the harping on popular distinctions and sowing propaganda based thereon. Barack Obama has stated in this regard that the world has historically highlighted her differences, without being cognizant of the fact that there is more that unites us than tears us apart.

Over the years, nations, faiths and races have sought to establish hegemony over one another. William the conqueror in the eleventh century tried to establish a Normandy hegemony over the Saxons; Egypt enslaved the immigrant Israelites in Biblical times; Caucasian Americans bought slaves from Africa and subdued them for hundreds of years; the Catholic Church and Islam clashed in crusades and inquisitions for centuries; nations quarrel over dominance and land and status in the committee of nations. This is supposedly a natural law, the desire to dominate.

A cursory look at history would lend credibility to our earlier position that social behavior, especially as conceived by Albert Einstein (1949) in his historic essay on Socialism, is based on historical hegemony, a situation in which a conquering hegemonistic population lords it over another, imposes its will on the conquered population, and strives to establish institutionalized methods for the perpetuation of this hegemony. This of course, Einstein has argued, leads to dialectic hegemony, a situation in which the conquered protest their being conquered and strive to attain equality of social status with members of the conquering population.

This strife to attain equality with the conquering population by the conquered one is based on the ensuing conflict of social interests, in which the disenfranchised seek to have rights and privileges hitherto denied them, and to be able to live their lives with some measure of

human dignity and self esteem, inter alia. This strife ultimately should lead, in Einstein's view, to enfranchisement for members of the conquered population, as was the case in South Africa, and the African American community, via the efforts of Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King respectively, inter alia.

Marx and Engels perceived the origin of human conflict in a different way. Engels (1975) saw the origin of social behavior as founded on historical materialism, in which case the structures of society, viz: culture, polity and society were all dependent on the economic infrastructure, a situation in which there were owners of wealth and means of production, and the have-nots, who worked for the owners of wealth and the means of production. This also led to a dialectic struggle between the rich and the poor.

This dialectic struggle was for the transfer of the means of production from the haves, also known as the bourgeois, to the have-nots, also known as the proletariat. The proletariat would, by means of revolution, Engels taught, secure the means of production, and establish a socialist state wherein there would be equality of ownership, and a commonality of material possession. In short, the state would have absolute power over all individuals, so as to prevent those who would from being able to acquire such wealth as would make them capable of lording it over others.

Hence, whether one looks at the underpinnings of social behavior from the point of view of Marx or Engels, one needfully agrees that there is inherent conflict in the human situation. We have stated in this regard in Chapter One that Thomas Hobbes described the natural state of humans as “nasty, brutish and short.” We have also shown how various attempts at transcending this natural state have been used historically, including the enactment of law and social contract, as well as the use of referendum and constitution, and international diplomacy in relatively more

recent times.

In a world as interconnected as ours, there is even greater need to preserve humans from living a “nasty, brutish and short” life, seeing that events and experiences happening to individuals in one part of the world, no matter how remote, are bound to affect individuals in other parts of this world, which scholars have called a global village. We have already stated that international conflict arises as a result of propaganda that plays ill on the differences existing among coexistent populations. We have also stated that there have historically been efforts made by nations and organizations to end this conflict.

Individuals have also, through their communicative efforts, sought to procure world peace. We have already mentioned and discussed some of these individuals, otherwise called icons of global peace, one of whom, as we discussed, is Barack Obama, whose rhetorical vision of global peace through equality, tolerance, egalitarianism, emancipation and the avoidance of conflict has been able to capture the imaginations of the audiences that have converged symbolically on his message and have begun to socially construct a world that relates to their perception of Mr. Obama as an icon of peace, and their participation in the fantasy types that make up Mr. Obama's enduring rhetorical vision of global peace, as hitherto described.

Some of these individuals, whose communicative efforts have helped push for global peace, have been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. We have already discussed a succinct history of the Prize, and the committee charged with the responsibility of awarding it each year to its appointed recipient, and need not rehash here. Suffice it to say that the Prize is a special award given to an icon or champion of international peace.

In other words, the Nobel Peace Prize is established to reward the communicative efforts of individuals that try to inspire people to accommodate and ratify, resolve and celebrate the

differences that exist among populations, instead of fighting and creating division. The Nobel Peace Prize, like the United Nations, is an agent for global peace, a situation in which all countries and organizations of the world can live in peace and harmony, without terror attacks, nuclear arms races and other international calamities.

The Second World War was a moment of realization of how evil war could be. Europe saw how nations and organizations in their bid to conquer and subdue one another could become so apathetic to the wellbeing of the human race that an incident such as the Holocaust could occur. Scholars have written extensively of the horrors of the second world war, especially the Nazi massacre of Jews, but it was not until well after the killings had taken place, and after several attempts to repress the truth concerning them, coupled with a reluctance by the rest of the world to believe that they had actually taken place, that the realization of the cost of war started to dawn on Europe and the rest of the world.

In modern times, the proliferation of information and other technologies have made the threat of war even more pending. Current technological sophistication can empower antagonistic entities to unleash mayhem on the world. The attacks of September 11, 2001 in the United States was a reminder that populations still seek to harp on their differences, helped by divisive politics. The United Nations strives to give the option of dialog as a way to resolving global issues and conflicts, while securing mutual interest and respect.

Champions of global peace, like Barack Obama, through their communicative efforts have been able to inspire people across the world to strive for peace. Through his rhetorical vision of global peace, as seen from a cross section of his speeches, and through his being viewed as an icon of global peace, Barack Obama joins the United Nations in serving as an agent of peace in a warring world. Since his work and speeches show the rhetorical vision of peace,

and since he is arguably an icon of global peace in the minds of the vast global population, he is justified in having received the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize.

Hence, even though his being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize generated some level of controversy in view of the fact that he was less than a year in office, Barack Obama in such small time was able to spell out a rhetorical vision of peace through universal equality, tolerance, egalitarianism and the avoidance of conflict. He also became viewed, as a result of his rhetorical vision, as an icon of global peace, and now has been said to justifiably have received the Nobel Peace prize. In this way, through the two previous sub-chapters and this, the three research questions have been answered. Suggestions for further research are subsequently afforded.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In conclusion, we have operationalized peace for the purposes of this thesis to mean the egalitarianism of the disenfranchised, the tolerance of the obscure, the emancipation of the indigent, the equality of the homosexual, and the avoidance of conflict. In other words, for our purposes, we have conceived of peace as a situation wherein conquered and humiliated populations are given similar rights as their conquerors, especially the rights to vote and be voted for, a situation where populations that differ on the basis of creed are able to find common ground and coexist harmoniously, a situation where poor populations of the world are empowered to enrich themselves and own wealth and means of production, and a situation where the universal differences existing among people are accommodated and resolved, in the interest of avoiding conflict and keeping the peace.

We have shown how historically agents and champions of peace have worked assiduously to bring about this situation, especially in a world that scholars declare is getting

smaller, by the continued proliferation of technology and the intermarriage of cultures that were hitherto relatively dispersed. We have shown how some of these champions have been individuals that, through communicative efforts, have charged governments and peoples to work for peace, mobilizing and encouraging them to buy into their rhetorical vision and help construct an ideal world where all peoples can live in harmony.

We have argued in this regard that Barack Obama, the forty-fourth President of the United States is one such icon of global peace. We have reviewed relevant literature regarding his background and the influences of significant others in the shaping of his character, aspirations and life's work. We have also criticized his speeches using the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism, by which we were able to find fantasy themes, chains, types, and ultimately a rhetorical vision of global peace, in that order. This rhetorical vision, we have found was one of global peace brought about through emancipation, tolerance, equality, egalitarianism and the avoidance of conflict.

We have argued that Barack Obama was able to inspire his audiences to symbolically converge on his message and begin to socially construct a world in which peace was the order of the day. We have shown how he was able to relate with his audience, and how they were able to see in him an icon of global peace, and to share his vision for a harmoniously progressive world. We have similarly argued that he was justified to have received the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize, as a consequence of his possession of a rhetorical vision of peace, and his resultant appellation as icon of peace, *inter alia*.

In short, we have used the Fantasy-theme method, and qualitative research to address the three research questions posed in Chapter One of this thesis. We have done this cognizant of the prescriptions of valid research, and the procedures particular to the application and utility of the

Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism as developed by Bormann (1982), and explicated by Foss (2008). In Chapter Three, we explained what qualitative research entails, and its limitations. We also described the delimitations of the entire research endeavor. We exposed the facility of triangulation, albeit refrained from making it a part of the actual research process, *per se*.

In discussing the extent of symbolic convergence with Mr. Obama's speeches, we used observation, that is video observation of the speeches themselves, to be able to argue about physical and emotional participation during the actual speech making processes. This observation in addition to the actual analysis of a cross section of his speeches, helped to further argumentation in the blitz to answer the first research question concerning his possible rhetorical vision.

This does not necessarily suggest in any case that observation was done to triangulate with the thematic evaluation, but simply as a complement to it. Nor can we categorically argue that the video observation could stand alone as a significant and sufficient means of method triangulation. In discussing the merits of triangulation in Chapter Three, we did say that triangulation helps to ensure the validity as well as replicability of any research endeavor. Validity and replicability are two tenets of scientific writing, as opposed to fiction. We also talked about the various forms of triangulation, such as method, subject and topic.

We argued as well that knowledge does not exist in a vacuum, that new knowledge is adduced in the context of existing intelligence, and that it informs further knowledge, in a veritable continuum, in which case research was contiguous and familial, as scholars like Aristotle have historically argued *inter alia*. It is for all the foregoing that knowledge is never complete and research only opens the door to further research, and research questions supposedly

answered only leave room for asking even more questions, or asking the same questions in a different way.

We have asked three questions in this thesis: Do Barack Obama's speeches contain a rhetorical vision of global peace? Is Mr. Obama arguably an icon of global peace? Did Mr. Obama arguably merit having received the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize? We answered all these questions in the affirmative, using the qualitative method of rhetorical criticism. However, there are peripheral questions that a thesis of this kind may inspire.

It may call to question the extent of controversy that surrounded Mr. Obama's receipt of the Prize; it may question the nature of contemporary race relations in the US and indeed the world as a result of the receipt. It may seek to evaluate actual achievements in the interest of peace by the young President, in which case events and not speeches would serve as artifacts for research. These new questions would necessarily be approached in different ways, and be researched upon by different methods, and yield unique results, depending on what methods are used, and what kinds of interpretations are given to independent events by the researchers, especially when they use qualitative as opposed to quantitative methods of research.

For example, a researcher might decide to conduct a qualitative research project by means of content analysis into newspaper coverage of the efforts and achievements of the Obama Administration with respect to peace efforts, and document these for analysis and discussion. Other qualitative methods of conducting similar research may include focus groups, in which case the researcher might want to discover the means by which the reality of the Obama Presidency may be expediently utilized in the blitz at improving race relations in the United States, or participant observations at future Obama speeches, to encounter first hand the observable behavior of his audiences in order to hypothesize about the extent of symbolic

convergence on his fantasy themes.

In addition to the foregoing qualitative methods, quantitative methods could also be used, such as polls, obtained via surveys in which respondents reply to questionnaires about their perception of the Obama Presidency and its influence on global peace. There could also be experiments as to what impressionable constituents think about the foregoing. The research may be differently named, and the researchers could be different, and use different tools, and may or may not triangulate.

These suggestions for further research build and ratify the contiguous nature of veritable research and offer ways by which research that is purposeful may be conducted in order to expand human knowledge in areas of endeavor, and also for social and other utility. Many of these justifications for the conduct of research have already been discussed in Chapter One albeit, and need not be here rehashed.

All in all, we have, through qualitative research in communication, been able to situate this thesis in a contiguous rhetorical research effort, by using the Fantasy-theme method of rhetorical criticism on a cross section of Mr. Obama's speeches, with the result that Mr. Obama has a rhetorical vision of global peace that has led to his being viewed as an icon of global peace, and a deserving recipient of the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aguledo-Suarez et al. (May 2009). Discrimination, work and health in immigrant populations in Spain. *Social Science and Medicine*. 68.10, p 1866 (9).
- Andrews, J. R., Leff, M. C. & Terrill, R. (1998). *Reading Rhetorical Texts: An Introduction to Criticism*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Antecol, H., Barcus, V. E. & Cobb-Clark, D. (Oct 2009). Gender-biased behavior at work: Exploring the relationship between sexual harassment and sex discrimination. *Journal of Economic Psychology*. 11, p 782.
- Armstrong, R. N. (1993). *The Rhetoric of David O. McKay: Mormon Prophet*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F. & Wilson, D.C. (March 2008). What are the odds? How demographic similarity affects the prevalence of perceived employment discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 93.2, p 235 (15).
- Banerjee, R. (Fall 2008). An examination of factors affecting perception of workplace discrimination. *Journal of Labor Research*. 29.4, p 380 (22).
- Black, E. (1978). *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). USA: University of Wisconsin.
- Black, S. (2006). *Public Relations: Critical Debates and Contemporary Practice*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bormann, E. G. (1982). The symbolic convergence theory of communication: Applications and implications for teachers and consultants. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*. 10, 50-61.
- Bormann, E. G. (2001). *The Force of Fantasy: Restoring the American Dream*. USA: Southern Illinois University.
- Broack, B. L., Scott, R. L. & Chesebro, J. W. (1990). *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). USA: Wayne State.
- Clampitt, P. G. (2009). *Communication for Managerial Effectiveness* (4<sup>th</sup> ed). California: Sage.
- Conquergood, D. (1995). Between rigor and relevance: Rethinking applied communication in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In Cissna, K. (Ed.) *Applied Communication in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. NJ: Erlbaum
- Cutlip, S., Center, A & Broom, G. (1996). *Effective Public Relations* (8<sup>th</sup> ed). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

- Darwin, C. (2003). *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. (John Carroll ed.) UK: Broadview.
- De Abreu Dos Reis, C. R., Sastre, M. A. & Dobon, S. R. (Dec 2007). Diversity and business performance: 50 years of research. *Service Business*. 1.4, p 257 (18).
- De Castro, A. B., Gee, G. C. & Takeuchi, D. T. (March 2008). Workplace discrimination and health among Filipinos in the United States. *The American Journal of Public Health*. 98.3, p 520.
- De Fleur, M. L. (1975). *Theories of Mass Communication* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). New York: Longman.
- De Hoogh, A. B. & Den Hartog, D. N. (2009). Neuroticism and locus of control as moderators of the relationships of charismatic and autocratic leadership without burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 94.4. p 1058 (10).
- De Luque, M. S., Washburn, N. T., Waldman, D. A. & House, R. J. (2008). Unrequited profit: How stakeholder and economic values relate to subordinate's perceptions of leadership and firm performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 53.4. p 629 (29).
- De Vliert, E. V. (2006). Autocratic leadership around the globe: Do climate and wealth drive leadership culture? *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*. 37.1. p 42 (18).
- Dooley, P. (2004). *The Early Republic: Primary Documents on Events From 1799 to 1820*. USA: Greenwood.
- Dooley, P. (2007). *The Technology of Journalism: Cultural Agents, Cultural Icons*. Illinois: Northwestern University.
- Dougherty, S. (2009). *Hopes and Dreams: The Story of Barack Obama: The Inaugural Edition*. USA: Blackdog and Leventhal.
- Fearn-Banks, K. (2007). *Crisis Communications: A Casebook Approach*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fine, G. A. (1993). The Sad Demise, Mysterious Disappearance and Glorious Triumph of Symbolic Interactionism." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 19. 61-87.
- Fisher, A. Q. (2001). *Finding Fish*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Foss, S. K. (2008). *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*. USA: Waveland.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The World is Flat*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Grioux.
- Harrison, M. S. & Thomas, K. M. (Jan 2009). The hidden prejudice in selection: A research investigation on skin color bias. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 39.1, p 134 (35).

- Haynes, J. (2008). *The Battle for America: The Story of an Extraordinary Election*. USA: Viking.
- Haynes, J. (Dec 2009). 2008 Throwing prejudice aside: It has been America's challenge to overcome its long, shameful history of racism." *American Heritage*. 92.
- Hillbruner, A. (1966). *Critical Dimensions: The Art of Public Address Criticism*. New York: Random House.
- Hirsh, E. C. & Kornrich, S. (March 2008). The context of discrimination: Workplace conditions, institutional environments, and sex and race discrimination charges. *The American Journal of Sociology*. 113.5, p 1394 (39).
- Hitchens, C. (Oct 2009). "Underqualified for the Overrated." *Newsweek*. 38.
- Johnson, J. N. & Klee, T. (2007). Passive-aggressive behavior and leadership styles in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*. 14.2 p 130 (13).
- Kravitz, D. A. (Spring 2008). The diversity-validity dilemma: Beyond selection – the role of affirmative action. *Personnel Psychology*. 61.1, p 173 (21).
- Lal, B. (1995). "Symbolic Interaction Theories." *American Behavioral Scientist*. 38. 421-441.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (2002). *Theories of Human Communication*. USA: Wadsworth.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (2002). *Theories of Human Communication*. USA: Wadsworth.
- Lowery, S. & De Fleur, M. L. (1983). *Milestones in Mass Communication Research*. New York: Longman.
- Lucas, S. E. (2009). *The Art of Public Speaking* (10<sup>th</sup> ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McKeachie, W. J. & Svinicki, M. (2006). *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research and Theory for College and University Teachers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- McKinley, B. & Valasek, T. (2006). *The Confident Speaker's Handbook: A Practical, Hands-on Approach to Public Speaking*. Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.
- McLuhan, M. & Powers, B. R. (1989). *The Global Village: Transformation in World Life and Media in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. London: Oxford University.
- Meltzer, B. N. & Petras, J. W. (1970). "The Chicago and Iowa Schools of Symbolic Interactionism." *Human Nature and Collective Behavior*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mendell, D. (2007). *Obama: From Promise to Power*. New York: HarperCollins.

- Mendell, D. (2008). *Obama: From Promise to Power*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Meyerowitz, S. A. (Summer 2008). We are Family. *Employee Relations Law Journal*. 341, p 1.
- Millar, D. P. & Heath, R. L. (2004). *Responding to Crisis: A Rhetorical Approach to Crisis Communication*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nichols, M. H. (1972). *Rhetoric and Criticism*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University.
- Noonan, P. (1990). *What I Saw at the Revolution: A Political Life in the Reagan Era*. New York: Random House.
- Obama, B. (2004). *Dreams from My Father: A Story of race and Relations* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New York: Three Rivers.
- Obama, B. (2006). *The Audacity of Hope: Thoughts on Reclaiming the American Dream*. New York: RandomHouse.
- Obama, B. (2008). *Change we can Believe in: Barack Obama's Plan to Renew America's Promise*. New York: Three Rivers.
- Obama, B. (2009). *The Plan: Barack Obama's Promise to America and His Plan for the Economy, Iraq, Healthcare and More*. CA: Pacific.
- Obama, B. (2009). *Words that Changed a Nation: The Most Celebrated and Influential Speeches of Barack Obama*. KC: Beacon Hill.
- Ortiz, S.Y. & Roscigno, V. J. (Spring 2009). Discrimination, women and work: Processes and variations by race and class. *Sociological Quarterly*. 50.2, p 336 (24).
- Papa, M. J., Daniels, T. D. & Spiker, B. K. (2008). *Organizational Communication: Perspectives and Trends*. California: Sage.
- Pelzer, D. (1993). *A Child Called It*. USA: Omaha Press.
- Rogers, P. & Tierny, T. (2004). Leadership without control. *European Business Journal*. 16.2. p 78 (5).
- Roscigno, V. J., Mong, S., Byron, R. & Tester, G. (Sept 2007). Age discrimination, social closure and employment. *Social Forces*. 86.1, p 313 (22).
- Rubin, R. B., Rubin, A. M. & Piele, L. J. (1996). *Communication Research: Strategies and Sources* (4<sup>th</sup> ed). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Scott, J. (March 2008). The Long Run: A Free-Spirited Wonder Who Set Obama's Path." *New*

*York Times*. A1.

Smith, T. (1990). *The Logic of Marx's Capital: Replies to Hegelian Criticism*. NY: State University.

Trible, P. (1994). *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method and the Book of Jonah*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.

Uhlmann, E. L. & Cohen, G. L. (Nov 2007). "I think it, therefore it's true": Effects of self-perceived objectivity on hiring discrimination. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*. 104.2, p 207 (17).

Wilcox, D. L., Ault, P. H. & Agee, W. K. (1998). *Public Relations: Strategies and Tactics*. New York: Longman.

York, K. M., Tyler, C. L., Tyler, J. M. & Gugel, P. E. (Nov 2008). The ever changing face of sex stereotyping and sex discrimination in the workplace. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*. 15.2, p 123.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: MR OBAMA'S SPEECH TO THE MUSLIM WORLD IN EGYPT

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.

## APPENDIX B: BARACK OBAMA'S SPEECH TO THE PEOPLE OF GHANA

Good morning. It is an honor for me to be in Accra, and to speak to the representatives of the people of Ghana. I am deeply grateful for the welcome that I've received, as are Michelle, Malia, and Sasha Obama. Ghana's history is rich, the ties between our two countries are strong, and I am proud that this is my first visit to sub-Saharan Africa as President of the United States.

I am speaking to you at the end of a long trip. I began in Russia, for a Summit between two great powers. I traveled to Italy, for a meeting of the world's leading economies. And I have come here, to Ghana, for a simple reason: the 21st century will be shaped by what happens not just in Rome or Moscow or Washington, but by what happens in Accra as well.

This is the simple truth of a time when the boundaries between people are overwhelmed by our connections. Your prosperity can expand America's. Your health and security can contribute to the world's. And the strength of your democracy can help advance human rights for people everywhere. So I do not see the countries and peoples of Africa as a world apart; I see Africa as a fundamental part of our interconnected world – as partners with America on behalf of the future that we want for all our children. That partnership must be grounded in mutual responsibility, and that is what I want to speak with you about today.

We must start from the simple premise that Africa's future is up to Africans. I say this knowing full well the tragic past that has sometimes haunted this part of the world. I have the blood of Africa within me, and my family's own story encompasses both the tragedies and triumphs of the larger African story. My grandfather was a cook for the British in Kenya, and though he was a respected elder in his village, his employers called him "boy" for much of his life. He was on the periphery of Kenya's liberation struggles, but he was still imprisoned briefly during repressive times. In his life, colonialism wasn't simply the creation of unnatural borders or

unfair terms of trade – it was something experienced personally, day after day, year after year.

My father grew up herding goats in a tiny village, an impossible distance away from the American universities where he would come to get an education. He came of age at an extraordinary moment of promise for Africa. The struggles of his own father's generation were giving birth to new nations, beginning right here in Ghana. Africans were educating and asserting themselves in new ways. History was on the move.

But despite the progress that has been made – and there has been considerable progress in parts of Africa – we also know that much of that promise has yet to be fulfilled. Countries like Kenya, which had a per capita economy larger than South Korea's when I was born, have been badly outpaced. Disease and conflict have ravaged parts of the African continent. In many places, the hope of my father's generation gave way to cynicism, even despair.

It is easy to point fingers, and to pin the blame for these problems on others. Yes, a colonial map that made little sense bred conflict, and the West has often approached Africa as a patron, rather than a partner. But the West is not responsible for the destruction of the Zimbabwean economy over the last decade, or wars in which children are enlisted as combatants. In my father's life, it was partly tribalism and patronage in an independent Kenya that for a long stretch derailed his career, and we know that this kind of corruption is a daily fact of life for far too many.

Of course, we also know that is not the whole story. Here in Ghana, you show us a face of Africa that is too often overlooked by a world that sees only tragedy or the need for charity. The people of Ghana have worked hard to put democracy on a firmer footing, with peaceful transfers of power even in the wake of closely contested elections. And with improved governance and an emerging civil society, Ghana's economy has shown impressive rates of

growth.

This progress may lack the drama of the 20th century's liberation struggles, but make no mistake: it will ultimately be more significant. For just as it is important to emerge from the control of another nation, it is even more important to build one's own. So I believe that this moment is just as promising for Ghana – and for Africa – as the moment when my father came of age and new nations were being born. This is a new moment of promise. Only this time, we have learned that it will not be giants like Nkrumah and Kenyatta who will determine Africa's future. Instead, it will be you – the men and women in Ghana's Parliament, and the people you represent.

Above all, it will be the young people – brimming with talent and energy and hope – who can claim the future that so many in my father's generation never found. To realize that promise, we must first recognize a fundamental truth that you have given life to in Ghana: development depends upon good governance. That is the ingredient which has been missing in far too many places, for far too long. That is the change that can unlock Africa's potential. And that is a responsibility that can only be met by Africans.

As for America and the West, our commitment must be measured by more than just the dollars we spend. I have pledged substantial increases in our foreign assistance, which is in Africa's interest and America's. But the true sign of success is not whether we are a source of aid that helps people scrape by – it is whether we are partners in building the capacity for transformational change. This mutual responsibility must be the foundation of our partnership. And today, I will focus on four areas that are critical to the future of Africa and the entire developing world: democracy; opportunity; health; and the peaceful resolution of conflict.

First, we must support strong and sustainable democratic governments. As I said in Cairo,

each nation gives life to democracy in its own way, and in line with its own traditions. But history offers a clear verdict: governments that respect the will of their own people are more prosperous, more stable, and more successful than governments that do not. This is about more than holding elections – it's also about what happens between them.

Repression takes many forms, and too many nations are plagued by problems that condemn their people to poverty. No country is going to create wealth if its leaders exploit the economy to enrich themselves, or police can be bought off by drug traffickers. No business wants to invest in a place where the government skims 20 percent off the top, or the head of the Port Authority is corrupt. No person wants to live in a society where the rule of law gives way to the rule of brutality and bribery. That is not democracy, that is tyranny, and now is the time for it to end.

In the 21st century, capable, reliable and transparent institutions are the key to success – strong parliaments and honest police forces; independent judges and journalists; a vibrant private sector and civil society. Those are the things that give life to democracy, because that is what matters in peoples' lives. Time and again, Ghanaians have chosen Constitutional rule over autocracy, and shown a democratic spirit that allows the energy of your people to break through.

We see that in leaders who accept defeat graciously, and victors who resist calls to wield power against the opposition. We see that spirit in courageous journalists like Anas Aremeyaw Anas, who risked his life to report the truth. We see it in police like Patience Quaye, who helped prosecute the first human trafficker in Ghana. We see it in the young people who are speaking up against patronage, and participating in the political process.

Across Africa, we have seen countless examples of people taking control of their destiny, and making change from the bottom up. We saw it in Kenya, where civil society and business

came together to help stop post-election violence. We saw it in South Africa, where over three quarters of the country voted in the recent election – the fourth since the end of Apartheid. We saw it in Zimbabwe, where the Election Support Network braved brutal repression to stand up for the principle that a person's vote is their sacred right.

Make no mistake: history is on the side of these brave Africans, and not with those who use coups or change Constitutions to stay in power. Africa doesn't need strongmen, it needs strong institutions. America will not seek to impose any system of government on any other nation – the essential truth of democracy is that each nation determines its own destiny.

What we will do is increase assistance for responsible individuals and institutions, with a focus on supporting good governance – on parliaments, which check abuses of power and ensure that opposition voices are heard; on the rule of law, which ensures the equal administration of justice; on civic participation, so that young people get involved; and on concrete solutions to corruption like forensic accounting, automating services, strengthening hot lines, and protecting whistle-blowers to advance transparency and accountability.

As we provide this support, I have directed my Administration to give greater attention to corruption in our Human Rights report. People everywhere should have the right to start a business or get an education without paying a bribe. We have a responsibility to support those who act responsibly and to isolate those who don't, and that is exactly what America will do. This leads directly to our second area of partnership – supporting development that provides opportunity for more people.

With better governance, I have no doubt that Africa holds the promise of a broader base for prosperity. The continent is rich in natural resources. And from cell phone entrepreneurs to small farmers, Africans have shown the capacity and commitment to create their own

opportunities. But old habits must also be broken. Dependence on commodities – or on a single export – concentrates wealth in the hands of the few, and leaves people too vulnerable to downturns.

In Ghana, for instance, oil brings great opportunities, and you have been responsible in preparing for new revenue. But as so many Ghanaians know, oil cannot simply become the new cocoa. From South Korea to Singapore, history shows that countries thrive when they invest in their people and infrastructure; when they promote multiple export industries, develop a skilled work force, and create space for small and medium-sized businesses that create jobs.

As Africans reach for this promise, America will be more responsible in extending our hand. By cutting costs that go to Western consultants and administration, we will put more resources in the hands of those who need it, while training people to do more for themselves. That is why our \$3.5 billion food security initiative is focused on new methods and technologies for farmers – not simply sending American producers or goods to Africa. Aid is not an end in itself. The purpose of foreign assistance must be creating the conditions where it is no longer needed.

America can also do more to promote trade and investment. Wealthy nations must open our doors to goods and services from Africa in a meaningful way. And where there is good governance, we can broaden prosperity through public-private partnerships that invest in better roads and electricity; capacity-building that trains people to grow a business; and financial services that reach poor and rural areas. This is also in our own interest – for if people are lifted out of poverty and wealth is created in Africa, new markets will open for our own goods.

One area that holds out both undeniable peril and extraordinary promise is energy. Africa gives off less greenhouse gas than any other part of the world, but it is the most threatened by

climate change. A warming planet will spread disease, shrink water resources, and deplete crops, creating conditions that produce more famine and conflict. All of us – particularly the developed world – have a responsibility to slow these trends – through mitigation, and by changing the way that we use energy. But we can also work with Africans to turn this crisis into opportunity.

Together, we can partner on behalf of our planet and prosperity, and help countries increase access to power while skipping the dirtier phase of development. Across Africa, there is bountiful wind and solar power; geothermal energy and bio-fuels. From the Rift Valley to the North African deserts; from the Western coast to South Africa's crops –Africa's boundless natural gifts can generate its own power, while exporting profitable, clean energy abroad.

These steps are about more than growth numbers on a balance sheet. They're about whether a young person with an education can get a job that supports a family; a farmer can transfer their goods to the market; or an entrepreneur with a good idea can start a business. It's about the dignity of work. It's about the opportunity that must exist for Africans in the 21st century. Just as governance is vital to opportunity, it is also critical to the third area that I will talk about – strengthening public health.

In recent years, enormous progress has been made in parts of Africa. Far more people are living productively with HIV/AIDS, and getting the drugs they need. But too many still die from diseases that shouldn't kill them. When children are being killed because of a mosquito bite, and mothers are dying in childbirth, then we know that more progress must be made.

Yet because of incentives – often provided by donor nations – many African doctors and nurses understandably go overseas, or work for programs that focus on a single disease. This creates gaps in primary care and basic prevention. Meanwhile, individual Africans also have to make responsible choices that prevent the spread of disease, while promoting public health in

their communities and countries. Across Africa, we see examples of people tackling these problems. In Nigeria, an Interfaith effort of Christians and Muslims has set an example of cooperation to confront malaria. Here in Ghana and across Africa, we see innovative ideas for filling gaps in care – for instance, through E-Health initiatives that allow doctors in big cities to support those in small towns.

America will support these efforts through a comprehensive, global health strategy. Because in the 21st century, we are called to act by our conscience and our common interest. When a child dies of a preventable illness in Accra, that diminishes us everywhere. And when disease goes unchecked in any corner of the world, we know that it can spread across oceans and continents. That is why my Administration has committed \$63 billion to meet these challenges. Building on the strong efforts of President Bush, we will carry forward the fight against HIV/AIDS. We will pursue the goal of ending deaths from malaria and tuberculosis, and eradicating polio. We will fight neglected tropical disease. And we won't confront illnesses in isolation – we will invest in public health systems that promote wellness, and focus on the health of mothers and children.

As we partner on behalf of a healthier future, we must also stop the destruction that comes not from illness, but from human beings – and so the final area that I will address is conflict. Now let me be clear: Africa is not the crude caricature of a continent at war. But for far too many Africans, conflict is a part of life, as constant as the sun. There are wars over land and wars over resources. And it is still far too easy for those without conscience to manipulate whole communities into fighting among faiths and tribes.

These conflicts are a millstone around Africa's neck. We all have many identities – of tribe and ethnicity; of religion and nationality. But defining oneself in opposition to someone

who belongs to a different tribe, or who worships a different prophet, has no place in the 21st century. Africa's diversity should be a source of strength, not a cause for division. We are all God's children. We all share common aspirations – to live in peace and security; to access education and opportunity; to love our families, our communities, and our faith. That is our common humanity.

That is why we must stand up to inhumanity in our midst. It is never justifiable to target innocents in the name of ideology. It is the death sentence of a society to force children to kill in wars. It is the ultimate mark of criminality and cowardice to condemn women to relentless and systematic rape. We must bear witness to the value of every child in Darfur and the dignity of every woman in Congo. No faith or culture should condone the outrages against them. All of us must strive for the peace and security necessary for progress.

Africans are standing up for this future. Here, too, Ghana is helping to point the way forward. Ghanaians should take pride in your contributions to peacekeeping from Congo to Liberia to Lebanon, and in your efforts to resist the scourge of the drug trade. We welcome the steps that are being taken by organizations like the African Union and ECOWAS to better resolve conflicts, keep the peace, and support those in need. And we encourage the vision of a strong, regional security architecture that can bring effective, transnational force to bear when needed.

America has a responsibility to advance this vision, not just with words, but with support that strengthens African capacity. When there is genocide in Darfur or terrorists in Somalia, these are not simply African problems – they are global security challenges, and they demand a global response. That is why we stand ready to partner through diplomacy, technical assistance, and logistical support, and will stand behind efforts to hold war criminals accountable. And let

me be clear: our Africa Command is focused not on establishing a foothold in the continent, but on confronting these common challenges to advance the security of America, Africa and the world.

In Moscow, I spoke of the need for an international system where the universal rights of human beings are respected, and violations of those rights are opposed. That must include a commitment to support those who resolve conflicts peacefully, to sanction and stop those who don't, and to help those who have suffered. But ultimately, it will be vibrant democracies like Botswana and Ghana which roll back the causes of conflict, and advance the frontiers of peace and prosperity.

As I said earlier, Africa's future is up to Africans. The people of Africa are ready to claim that future. In my country, African-Americans – including so many recent immigrants – have thrived in every sector of society. We have done so despite a difficult past, and we have drawn strength from our African heritage. With strong institutions and a strong will, I know that Africans can live their dreams in Nairobi and Lagos; in Kigali and Kinshasa; in Harare and right here in Accra.

Fifty-two years ago, the eyes of the world were on Ghana. And a young preacher named Martin Luther King traveled here, to Accra, to watch the Union Jack come down and the Ghanaian flag go up. This was before the march on Washington or the success of the civil rights movement in my country. Dr. King was asked how he felt while watching the birth of a nation. And he said: "It renews my conviction in the ultimate triumph of justice."

Now, that triumph must be won once more, and it must be won by you. And I am particularly speaking to the young people. In places like Ghana, you make up over half of the population. Here is what you must know: the world will be what you make of it. You have the

power to hold your leaders accountable, and to build institutions that serve the people. You can serve in your communities, and harness your energy and education to create new wealth and build new connections to the world. You can conquer disease, end conflicts, and make change from the bottom up. You can do that. Yes you can. Because in this moment, history is on the move.

But these things can only be done if you take responsibility for your future. It won't be easy. It will take time and effort. There will be suffering and setbacks. But I can promise you this: America will be with you. As a partner. As a friend. Opportunity won't come from any other place, though – it must come from the decisions that you make, the things that you do, and the hope that you hold in your hearts. Freedom is your inheritance. Now, it is your responsibility to build upon freedom's foundation. And if you do, we will look back years from now to places like Accra and say that this was the time when the promise was realized – this was the moment when prosperity was forged; pain was overcome; and a new era of progress began. This can be the time when we witness the triumph of justice once more. Thank you.

## APPENDIX C: BARACK OBAMA'S SPEECH TO THE LGBT COMMUNITY

To Joe Solmonese, who's doing an outstanding job on behalf of HRC. (Applause.) To my great friend and supporter, Terry Bean, co-founder of HRC. (Applause.) Representative Patrick Kennedy. (Applause.) David Huebner, the Ambassador-designee to New Zealand and Samoa. (Applause.) John Berry, our Director of OPM, who's doing a great job. (Applause.) Nancy Sutley, Chairman of Council on Environmental Quality. (Applause.) Fred Hochberg, Chairman of Export-Import Bank. (Applause.) And my dear friend, Tipper Gore, who's in the house. (Applause.)

Thank you so much, all of you. It is a privilege to be here tonight to open for Lady GaGa. (Applause.) I've made it. (Laughter.) I want to thank the Human Rights Campaign for inviting me to speak and for the work you do every day in pursuit of equality on behalf of the millions of people in this country who work hard in their jobs and care deeply about their families -- and who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. (Applause.)

For nearly 30 years, you've advocated on behalf of those without a voice. That's not easy. For despite the real gains that we've made, there's still laws to change and there's still hearts to open. There are still fellow citizens, perhaps neighbors, even loved ones -- good and decent people -- who hold fast to outworn arguments and old attitudes; who fail to see your families like their families; who would deny you the rights most Americans take for granted. And that's painful and it's heartbreaking. (Applause.) And yet you continue, leading by the force of the arguments you make, and by the power of the example that you set in your own lives -- as parents and friends, as PTA members and church members, as advocates and leaders in your communities. And you're making a difference.

That's the story of the movement for fairness and equality, and not just for those who are

gay, but for all those in our history who've been denied the rights and responsibilities of citizenship -- (applause) -- for all who've been told that the full blessings and opportunities of this country were closed to them. It's the story of progress sought by those with little influence or power; by men and women who brought about change through quiet, personal acts of compassion -- and defiance -- wherever and whenever they could.

It's the story of the Stonewall protests, when a group of citizens -- (applause) -- when a group of citizens with few options, and fewer supporters stood up against discrimination and helped to inspire a movement. It's the story of an epidemic that decimated a community -- and the gay men and women who came to support one another and save one another; who continue to fight this scourge; and who have demonstrated before the world that different kinds of families can show the same compassion in a time of need. (Applause.) And it's the story of the Human Rights Campaign and the fights you've fought for nearly 30 years: helping to elect candidates who share your values; standing against those who would enshrine discrimination into our Constitution; advocating on behalf of those living with HIV/AIDS; and fighting for progress in our capital and across America. (Applause.)

This story, this fight continue now. And I'm here with a simple message: I'm here with you in that fight. (Applause.) For even as we face extraordinary challenges as a nation, we cannot -- and we will not -- put aside issues of basic equality. I greatly appreciate the support I've received from many in this room. I also appreciate that many of you don't believe progress has come fast enough. I want to be honest about that, because it's important to be honest among friends.

Now, I've said this before, I'll repeat it again -- it's not for me to tell you to be patient, any more than it was for others to counsel patience to African Americans petitioning for equal rights

half a century ago. (Applause.) But I will say this: We have made progress and we will make more. And I think it's important to remember that there is not a single issue that my administration deals with on a daily basis that does not touch on the lives of the LGBT community. (Applause.) We all have a stake in reviving this economy. We all have a stake in putting people back to work. We all have a stake in improving our schools and achieving quality, affordable health care. We all have a stake in meeting the difficult challenges we face in Iraq and Afghanistan. (Applause.)

For while some may wish to define you solely by your sexual orientation or gender identity alone, you know -- and I know -- that none of us wants to be defined by just one part of what makes us whole. (Applause.) You're also parents worried about your children's futures. You're spouses who fear that you or the person you love will lose a job. You're workers worried about the rising cost of health insurance. You're soldiers. You are neighbors. You are friends. And, most importantly, you are Americans who care deeply about this country and its future. (Applause.)

So I know you want me working on jobs and the economy and all the other issues that we're dealing with. But my commitment to you is unwavering even as we wrestle with these enormous problems. And while progress may be taking longer than you'd like as a result of all that we face -- and that's the truth -- do not doubt the direction we are heading and the destination we will reach. (Applause.)

My expectation is that when you look back on these years, you will see a time in which we put a stop to discrimination against gays and lesbians -- whether in the office or on the battlefield. (Applause.) You will see a time in which we as a nation finally recognize relationships between two men or two women as just as real and admirable as relationships

between a man and a woman. (Applause.) You will see a nation that's valuing and cherishing these families as we build a more perfect union -- a union in which gay Americans are an important part. I am committed to these goals. And my administration will continue fighting to achieve them.

And there's no more poignant or painful reminder of how important it is that we do so than the loss experienced by Dennis and Judy Sheppard, whose son Matthew was stolen in a terrible act of violence 11 years ago. In May, I met with Judy -- who's here tonight with her husband -- I met her in the Oval Office, and I promised her that we were going to pass an inclusive hate crimes bill -- a bill named for her son. (Applause.)

This struggle has been long. Time and again we faced opposition. Time and again, the measure was defeated or delayed. But the Sheppard's never gave up. (Applause.) They turned tragedy into an unshakeable commitment. (Applause.) Countless activists and organizers never gave up. You held vigils, you spoke out, year after year, Congress after Congress. The House passed the bill again this week. (Applause.) And I can announce that after more than a decade, this bill is set to pass and I will sign it into law. (Applause.)

It's a testament to the decade-long struggle of Judy and Dennis, who tonight will receive a tribute named for somebody who inspired so many of us -- named for Senator Ted Kennedy, who fought tirelessly for this legislation. (Applause.) And it's a testament to the Human Rights Campaign and those who organized and advocated. And it's a testament to Matthew and to others who've been the victims of attacks not just meant to break bones, but to break spirits -- not meant just to inflict harm, but to instill fear. Together, we will have moved closer to that day when no one has to be afraid to be gay in America. (Applause.) When no one has to fear walking down the street holding the hand of the person they love. (Applause.)

But we know there's far more work to do. We're pushing hard to pass an inclusive employee non-discrimination bill. (Applause.) For the first time ever, an administration official testified in Congress in favor of this law. Nobody in America should be fired because they're gay, despite doing a great job and meeting their responsibilities. It's not fair. It's not right. We're going to put a stop to it. (Applause.) And it's for this reason that if any of my nominees are attacked not for what they believe but for who they are, I will not waver in my support, because I will not waver in my commitment to ending discrimination in all its forms. (Applause.)

We are reinvigorating our response to HIV/AIDS here at home and around the world. (Applause.) We're working closely with the Congress to renew the Ryan White program and I look forward to signing it into law in the very near future. (Applause.) We are rescinding the discriminatory ban on entry to the United States based on HIV status. (Applause.)

The regulatory process to enact this important change is already underway. And we also know that HIV/AIDS continues to be a public health threat in many communities, including right here in the District of Columbia. Jeffrey Crowley, the Director of the Office of National AIDS Policy, recently held a forum in Washington, D.C., and is holding forums across the country, to seek input as we craft a national strategy to address this crisis.

We are moving ahead on Don't Ask Don't Tell. (Applause.) We should not be punishing patriotic Americans who have stepped forward to serve this country. We should be celebrating their willingness to show such courage and selflessness on behalf of their fellow citizens, especially when we're fighting two wars. (Applause.) We cannot afford to cut from our ranks people with the critical skills we need to fight any more than we can afford -- for our military's integrity -- to force those willing to do so into careers encumbered and compromised by having to live a lie. So I'm working with the Pentagon, its leadership, and the members of the House and

Senate on ending this policy. Legislation has been introduced in the House to make this happen. I will end Don't Ask, Don't Tell. That's my commitment to you. (Applause.)

It is no secret that issues of great concern to gays and lesbians are ones that raise a great deal of emotion in this country. And it's no secret that progress has been incredibly difficult -- we can see that with the time and dedication it took to pass hate crimes legislation. But these issues also go to the heart of who we are as a people. Are we a nation that can transcend old attitudes and worn divides? Can we embrace our differences and look to the hopes and dreams that we share? Will we uphold the ideals on which this nation was founded: that all of us are equal, that all of us deserve the same opportunity to live our lives freely and pursue our chance at happiness? I believe we can; I believe we will. (Applause.)

And that is why -- that's why I support ensuring that committed gay couples have the same rights and responsibilities afforded to any married couple in this country. (Applause.) I believe strongly in stopping laws designed to take rights away and passing laws that extend equal rights to gay couples. I've required all agencies in the federal government to extend as many federal benefits as possible to LGBT families as the current law allows. And I've called on Congress to repeal the so-called Defense of Marriage Act and to pass the Domestic Partners Benefits and Obligations Act. (Applause.) And we must all stand together against divisive and deceptive efforts to feed people's lingering fears for political and ideological gain.

For the struggle waged by the Human Rights Campaign is about more than any policy we can enshrine into law. It's about our capacity to love and commit to one another. It's about whether or not we value as a society that love and commitment. It's about our common humanity and our willingness to walk in someone else's shoes: to imagine losing a job not because of your performance at work but because of your relationship at home; to imagine worrying about a

spouse in the hospital, with the added fear that you'll have to produce a legal document just to comfort the person you love -- (applause) -- to imagine the pain of losing a partner of decades and then discovering that the law treats you like a stranger. (Applause.)

If we are honest with ourselves we'll admit that there are too many who do not yet know in their lives or feel in their hearts the urgency of this struggle. That's why I continue to speak about the importance of equality for LGBT families -- and not just in front of gay audiences. That's why Michelle and I have invited LGBT families to the White House to participate in events like the Easter Egg Roll -- because we want to send a message. (Applause.) And that's why it's so important that you continue to speak out, that you continue to set an example, that you continue to pressure leaders -- including me -- and to make the case all across America. (Applause.)

So, tonight I'm hopeful -- because of the activism I see in this room, because of the compassion I've seen all across America, and because of the progress we have made throughout our history, including the history of the movement for LGBT equality. Soon after the protests at Stonewall 40 years ago, the phone rang in the home of a soft-spoken elementary school teacher named Jeanne Manford. It was 1:00 in the morning, and it was the police. Now, her son, Morty, had been at the Stonewall the night of the raids. Ever since, he had felt within him a new sense of purpose.

So when the officer told Jeanne that her son had been arrested, which was happening often to gay protesters, she was not entirely caught off guard. And then the officer added one more thing, "And you know, he's homosexual." (Laughter.) Well, that police officer sure was surprised when Jeanne responded, "Yes, I know. Why are you bothering him?" (Applause.)

And not long after, Jeanne would be marching side-by-side with her son through the

streets of New York. She carried a sign that stated her support. People cheered. Young men and women ran up to her, kissed her, and asked her to talk to their parents. And this gave Jeanne and Morty an idea. And so, after that march on the anniversary of the Stonewall protests, amidst the violence and the vitriol of a difficult time for our nation, Jeanne and her husband Jules -- two parents who loved their son deeply -- formed a group to support other parents and, in turn, to support their children, as well. At the first meeting Jeanne held, in 1973, about 20 people showed up.

But slowly, interest grew. Morty's life, tragically, was cut short by AIDS. But the cause endured. Today, the organization they founded for parents, families, and friends of lesbians and gays -- (applause) -- has more than 200,000 members and supporters, and has made a difference for countless families across America. And Jeanne would later say, "I considered myself such a traditional person. I didn't even cross the street against the light." (Laughter.) "But I wasn't going to let anybody walk over Morty." (Applause.)

That's the story of America: of ordinary citizens organizing, agitating and advocating for change; of hope stronger than hate; of love more powerful than any insult or injury; of Americans fighting to build for themselves and their families a nation in which no one is a second-class citizen, in which no one is denied their basic rights, in which all of us are free to live and love as we see fit. (Applause.) Tonight, somewhere in America, a young person, let's say a young man, will struggle to fall to sleep, wrestling alone with a secret he's held as long as he can remember. Soon, perhaps, he will decide it's time to let that secret out. What happens next depends on him, his family, as well as his friends and his teachers and his community. But it also depends on us -- on the kind of society we engender, the kind of future we build.

I believe the future is bright for that young person. For while there will be setbacks and

bumps along the road, the truth is that our common ideals are a force far stronger than any division that some might sow. These ideals, when voiced by generations of citizens, are what made it possible for me to stand here today. (Applause.) These ideals are what made it possible for the people in this room to live freely and openly when for most of history that would have been inconceivable. That's the promise of America, HRC. That's the promise we're called to fulfill. (Applause.) Day by day, law by law, changing mind by mind, that is the promise we are fulfilling. Thank you for the work you're doing. God bless you. God bless America. (Applause.)

#### APPENDIX D: BARACK OBAMA'S PRESIDENTIAL ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

If there is anyone out there who still doubts that America is a place where all things are possible; who still wonders if the dream of our founders is alive in our time; who still questions the power of our democracy, tonight is your answer. Its the answer told by lines that stretched around schools and churches in numbers this nation has never seen; by people who waited three hours and four hours, many for the very first time in their lives, because they believed that this time must be different; that their voice could be that difference.

Its the answer spoken by young and old, rich and poor, Democrat and Republican, black, white, Latino, Asian, Native American, gay, straight, disabled and not disabled - Americans who sent a message to the world that we have never been a collection of Red States and Blue States: we are, and always will be, the United States of America. Its the answer that led those who have been told for so long by so many to be cynical, and fearful, and doubtful of what we can achieve to put their hands on the arc of history and bend it once more toward the hope of a better day.

Its been a long time coming, but tonight, because of what we did on this day, in this election, at this defining moment, change has come to America. I just received a very gracious call from Senator McCain. He fought long and hard in this campaign, and hes fought even longer and harder for the country he loves. He has endured sacrifices for America that most of us cannot begin to imagine, and we are better off for the service rendered by this brave and selfless leader. I congratulate him and Governor Palin for all they have achieved, and I look forward to working with them to renew this nations promise in the months ahead.

I want to thank my partner in this journey, a man who campaigned from his heart and spoke for the men and women he grew up with on the streets of Scranton and rode with on that train home to Delaware, the Vice President-elect of the United States, Joe Biden. I would not be

standing here tonight without the unyielding support of my best friend for the last sixteen years, the rock of our family and the love of my life, our nations next First Lady, Michelle Obama. Sasha and Malia, I love you both so much, and you have earned the new puppy that's coming with us to the White House. And while shes no longer with us, I know my grandmother is watching, along with the family that made me who I am. I miss them tonight, and know that my debt to them is beyond measure.

To my campaign manager David Plouffe, my chief strategist David Axelrod, and the best campaign team ever assembled in the history of politics - you made this happen, and I am forever grateful for what you've sacrificed to get it done. But above all, I will never forget who this victory truly belongs to - it belongs to you. I was never the likeliest candidate for this office. We didn't start with much money or many endorsements. Our campaign was not hatched in the halls of Washington - it began in the backyards of Des Moines and the living rooms of Concord and the front porches of Charleston.

It was built by working men and women who dug into what little savings they had to give five dollars and ten dollars and twenty dollars to this cause. It grew strength from the young people who rejected the myth of their generations apathy; who left their homes and their families for jobs that offered little pay and less sleep; from the not-so-young people who braved the bitter cold and scorching heat to knock on the doors of perfect strangers; from the millions of Americans who volunteered, and organized, and proved that more than two centuries later, a government of the people, by the people and for the people has not perished from this Earth. This is your victory.

I know you didn't do this just to win an election and I know you didn't do it for me. You did it because you understand the enormity of the task that lies ahead. For even as we celebrate

tonight, we know the challenges that tomorrow will bring are the greatest of our lifetime - two wars, a planet in peril, the worst financial crisis in a century. Even as we stand here tonight, we know there are brave Americans waking up in the deserts of Iraq and the mountains of Afghanistan to risk their lives for us. There are mothers and fathers who will lie awake after their children fall asleep and wonder how they'll make the mortgage, or pay their doctors bills, or save enough for college. There is new energy to harness and new jobs to be created; new schools to build and threats to meet and alliances to repair.

The road ahead will be long. Our climb will be steep. We may not get there in one year or even one term, but America - I have never been more hopeful than I am tonight that we will get there. I promise you - we as a people will get there. There will be setbacks and false starts. There are many who won't agree with every decision or policy I make as President, and we know that government can't solve every problem. But I will always be honest with you about the challenges we face. I will listen to you, especially when we disagree. And above all, I will ask you join in the work of remaking this nation the only way it's been done in America for two-hundred and twenty-one years - block by block, brick by brick, calloused hand by calloused hand.

What began twenty-one months ago in the depths of winter must not end on this autumn night. This victory alone is not the change we seek - it is only the chance for us to make that change. And that cannot happen if we go back to the way things were. It cannot happen without you. So let us summon a new spirit of patriotism; of service and responsibility where each of us resolves to pitch in and work harder and look after not only ourselves, but each other. Let us remember that if this financial crisis taught us anything, it's that we cannot have a thriving Wall Street while Main Street suffers - in this country, we rise or fall as one nation; as one people.

Let us resist the temptation to fall back on the same partisanship and pettiness and

immaturity that has poisoned our politics for so long. Let us remember that it was a man from this state who first carried the banner of the Republican Party to the White House - a party founded on the values of self-reliance, individual liberty, and national unity. Those are values we all share, and while the Democratic Party has won a great victory tonight, we do so with a measure of humility and determination to heal the divides that have held back our progress. As Lincoln said to a nation far more divided than ours, We are not enemies, but friends...though passion may have strained it must not break our bonds of affection. And to those Americans whose support I have yet to earn - I may not have won your vote, but I hear your voices, I need your help, and I will be your President too.

And to all those watching tonight from beyond our shores, from parliaments and palaces to those who are huddled around radios in the forgotten corners of our world - our stories are singular, but our destiny is shared, and a new dawn of American leadership is at hand. To those who would tear this world down - we will defeat you. To those who seek peace and security - we support you. And to all those who have wondered if Americas beacon still burns as bright - tonight we proved once more that the true strength of our nation comes not from our the might of our arms or the scale of our wealth, but from the enduring power of our ideals: democracy, liberty, opportunity, and unyielding hope.

For that is the true genius of America - that America can change. Our union can be perfected. And what we have already achieved gives us hope for what we can and must achieve tomorrow. This election had many firsts and many stories that will be told for generations. But one that's on my mind tonight is about a woman who cast her ballot in Atlanta. She's a lot like the millions of others who stood in line to make their voice heard in this election except for one thing - Ann Nixon Cooper is 106 years old. She was born just a generation past slavery; a time

when there were no cars on the road or planes in the sky; when someone like her couldn't vote for two reasons - because she was a woman and because of the color of her skin. And tonight, I think about all that shes seen throughout her century in America - the heartache and the hope; the struggle and the progress; the times we were told that we cant, and the people who pressed on with that American creed: Yes we can. At a time when women's voices were silenced and their hopes dismissed, she lived to see them stand up and speak out and reach for the ballot. Yes we can.

When there was despair in the dust bowl and depression across the land, she saw a nation conquer fear itself with a New Deal, new jobs and a new sense of common purpose. Yes we can. When the bombs fell on our harbor and tyranny threatened the world, she was there to witness a generation rise to greatness and a democracy was saved. Yes we can. She was there for the buses in Montgomery, the hoses in Birmingham, a bridge in Selma, and a preacher from Atlanta who told a people that We Shall Overcome. Yes we can.

A man touched down on the moon, a wall came down in Berlin, a world was connected by our own science and imagination. And this year, in this election, she touched her finger to a screen, and cast her vote, because after 106 years in America, through the best of times and the darkest of hours, she knows how America can change. Yes we can. America, we have come so far. We have seen so much. But there is so much more to do. So tonight, let us ask ourselves - if our children should live to see the next century; if my daughters should be so lucky to live as long as Ann Nixon Cooper, what change will they see? What progress will we have made?

This is our chance to answer that call. This is our moment. This is our time - to put our people back to work and open doors of opportunity for our kids; to restore prosperity and promote the cause of peace; to reclaim the American Dream and reaffirm that fundamental truth

- that out of many, we are one; that while we breathe, we hope, and where we are met with cynicism, and doubt, and those who tell us that we cant, we will respond with that timeless creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes We Can. Thank you, God bless you, and may God Bless the United States of America.

## APPENDIX E: BARACK OBAMA'S SPEECH TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Good morning. Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor to address you for the first time as the 44th President of the United States. (Applause.) I come before you humbled by the responsibility that the American people have placed upon me, mindful of the enormous challenges of our moment in history, and determined to act boldly and collectively on behalf of justice and prosperity at home and abroad.

I have been in office for just nine months -- though some days it seems a lot longer. I am well aware of the expectations that accompany my presidency around the world. These expectations are not about me. Rather, they are rooted, I believe, in a discontent with a status quo that has allowed us to be increasingly defined by our differences, and outpaced by our problems. But they are also rooted in hope -- the hope that real change is possible, and the hope that America will be a leader in bringing about such change.

I took office at a time when many around the world had come to view America with skepticism and distrust. Part of this was due to misperceptions and misinformation about my country. Part of this was due to opposition to specific policies, and a belief that on certain critical issues, America has acted unilaterally, without regard for the interests of others. And this has fed an almost reflexive anti-Americanism, which too often has served as an excuse for collective inaction.

Now, like all of you, my responsibility is to act in the interest of my nation and my people, and I will never apologize for defending those interests. But it is my deeply held belief that in the year 2009 -- more than at any point in human history -- the interests of nations and peoples are shared. The religious convictions that we hold in our hearts can forge new bonds among people, or they can tear us apart. The technology we harness can light the path to peace,

or forever darken it. The energy we use can sustain our planet, or destroy it. What happens to the hope of a single child -- anywhere -- can enrich our world, or impoverish it.

In this hall, we come from many places, but we share a common future. No longer do we have the luxury of indulging our differences to the exclusion of the work that we must do together. I have carried this message from London to Ankara; from Port of Spain to Moscow; from Accra to Cairo; and it is what I will speak about today -- because the time has come for the world to move in a new direction. We must embrace a new era of engagement based on mutual interest and mutual respect, and our work must begin now.

We know the future will be forged by deeds and not simply words. Speeches alone will not solve our problems -- it will take persistent action. For those who question the character and cause of my nation, I ask you to look at the concrete actions we have taken in just nine months. On my first day in office, I prohibited -- without exception or equivocation -- the use of torture by the United States of America. (Applause.) I ordered the prison at Guantanamo Bay closed, and we are doing the hard work of forging a framework to combat extremism within the rule of law. Every nation must know: America will live its values, and we will lead by example.

We have set a clear and focused goal: to work with all members of this body to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al Qaeda and its extremist allies -- a network that has killed thousands of people of many faiths and nations, and that plotted to blow up this very building. In Afghanistan and Pakistan, we and many nations here are helping these governments develop the capacity to take the lead in this effort, while working to advance opportunity and security for their people. In Iraq, we are responsibly ending a war. We have removed American combat brigades from Iraqi cities, and set a deadline of next August to remove all our combat brigades from Iraqi territory. And I have made clear that we will help Iraqis transition to full responsibility for their future, and

keep our commitment to remove all American troops by the end of 2011.

I have outlined a comprehensive agenda to seek the goal of a world without nuclear weapons. In Moscow, the United States and Russia announced that we would pursue substantial reductions in our strategic warheads and launchers. At the Conference on Disarmament, we agreed on a work plan to negotiate an end to the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons. And this week, my Secretary of State will become the first senior American representative to the annual Members Conference of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Upon taking office, I appointed a Special Envoy for Middle East Peace, and America has worked steadily and aggressively to advance the cause of two states -- Israel and Palestine -- in which peace and security take root, and the rights of both Israelis and Palestinians are respected. To confront climate change, we have invested \$80 billion in clean energy. We have substantially increased our fuel-efficiency standards. We have provided new incentives for conservation, launched an energy partnership across the Americas, and moved from a bystander to a leader in international climate negotiations.

To overcome an economic crisis that touches every corner of the world, we worked with the G20 nations to forge a coordinated international response of over \$2 trillion in stimulus to bring the global economy back from the brink. We mobilized resources that helped prevent the crisis from spreading further to developing countries. And we joined with others to launch a \$20 billion global food security initiative that will lend a hand to those who need it most, and help them build their own capacity. We've also re-engaged the United Nations. We have paid our bills. We have joined the Human Rights Council. (Applause.) We have signed the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. We have fully embraced the Millennium Development Goals. And we address our priorities here, in this institution -- for instance, through the Security

Council meeting that I will chair tomorrow on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, and through the issues that I will discuss today.

This is what we have already done. But this is just a beginning. Some of our actions have yielded progress. Some have laid the groundwork for progress in the future. But make no mistake: This cannot solely be America's endeavor. Those who used to chastise America for acting alone in the world cannot now stand by and wait for America to solve the world's problems alone. We have sought -- in word and deed -- a new era of engagement with the world. And now is the time for all of us to take our share of responsibility for a global response to global challenges.

Now, if we are honest with ourselves, we need to admit that we are not living up to that responsibility. Consider the course that we're on if we fail to confront the status quo: Extremists sowing terror in pockets of the world; protracted conflicts that grind on and on; genocide; mass atrocities; more nations with nuclear weapons; melting ice caps and ravaged populations; persistent poverty and pandemic disease. I say this not to sow fear, but to state a fact: The magnitude of our challenges has yet to be met by the measure of our actions.

This body was founded on the belief that the nations of the world could solve their problems together. Franklin Roosevelt, who died before he could see his vision for this institution become a reality, put it this way -- and I quote: "The structure of world peace cannot be the work of one man, or one party, or one nation.... It cannot be a peace of large nations -- or of small nations. It must be a peace which rests on the cooperative effort of the whole world."

The cooperative effort of the whole world. Those words ring even more true today, when it is not simply peace, but our very health and prosperity that we hold in common. Yet we also know that this body is made up of sovereign states. And sadly, but not surprisingly, this body has

often become a forum for sowing discord instead of forging common ground; a venue for playing politics and exploiting grievances rather than solving problems. After all, it is easy to walk up to this podium and point figures -- point fingers and stoke divisions. Nothing is easier than blaming others for our troubles, and absolving ourselves of responsibility for our choices and our actions. Anybody can do that. Responsibility and leadership in the 21st century demand more.

In an era when our destiny is shared, power is no longer a zero-sum game. No one nation can or should try to dominate another nation. No world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will succeed. No balance of power among nations will hold. The traditional divisions between nations of the South and the North make no sense in an interconnected world; nor do alignments of nations rooted in the cleavages of a long-gone Cold War. The time has come to realize that the old habits, the old arguments, are irrelevant to the challenges faced by our people. They lead nations to act in opposition to the very goals that they claim to pursue -- and to vote, often in this body, against the interests of their own people. They build up walls between us and the future that our people seek, and the time has come for those walls to come down.

Together, we must build new coalitions that bridge old divides -- coalitions of different faiths and creeds; of north and south, east, west, black, white, and brown. The choice is ours. We can be remembered as a generation that chose to drag the arguments of the 20th century into the 21st; that put off hard choices, refused to look ahead, failed to keep pace because we defined ourselves by what we were against instead of what we were for. Or we can be a generation that chooses to see the shoreline beyond the rough waters ahead; that comes together to serve the common interests of human beings, and finally gives meaning to the promise embedded in the

name given to this institution: the United Nations. That is the future America wants -- a future of peace and prosperity that we can only reach if we recognize that all nations have rights, but all nations have responsibilities as well. That is the bargain that makes this work. That must be the guiding principle of international cooperation.

Today, let me put forward four pillars that I believe are fundamental to the future that we want for our children: non-proliferation and disarmament; the promotion of peace and security; the preservation of our planet; and a global economy that advances opportunity for all people. First, we must stop the spread of nuclear weapons, and seek the goal of a world without them.

This institution was founded at the dawn of the atomic age, in part because man's capacity to kill had to be contained. For decades, we averted disaster, even under the shadow of a superpower stand-off. But today, the threat of proliferation is growing in scope and complexity. If we fail to act, we will invite nuclear arms races in every region, and the prospect of wars and acts of terror on a scale that we can hardly imagine.

A fragile consensus stands in the way of this frightening outcome, and that is the basic bargain that shapes the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It says that all nations have the right to peaceful nuclear energy; that nations with nuclear weapons have a responsibility to move toward disarmament; and those without them have the responsibility to forsake them. The next 12 months could be pivotal in determining whether this compact will be strengthened or will slowly dissolve.

America intends to keep our end of the bargain. We will pursue a new agreement with Russia to substantially reduce our strategic warheads and launchers. We will move forward with ratification of the Test Ban Treaty, and work with others to bring the treaty into force so that nuclear testing is permanently prohibited. We will complete a Nuclear Posture Review that opens

the door to deeper cuts and reduces the role of nuclear weapons. And we will call upon countries to begin negotiations in January on a treaty to end the production of fissile material for weapons.

I will also host a summit next April that reaffirms each nation's responsibility to secure nuclear material on its territory, and to help those who can't -- because we must never allow a single nuclear device to fall into the hands of a violent extremist. And we will work to strengthen the institutions and initiatives that combat nuclear smuggling and theft.

All of this must support efforts to strengthen the NPT. Those nations that refuse to live up to their obligations must face consequences. Let me be clear, this is not about singling out individual nations -- it is about standing up for the rights of all nations that do live up to their responsibilities. Because a world in which IAEA inspections are avoided and the United Nation's demands are ignored will leave all people less safe, and all nations less secure. In their actions to date, the governments of North Korea and Iran threaten to take us down this dangerous slope.

We respect their rights as members of the community of nations. I've said before and I will repeat, I am committed to diplomacy that opens a path to greater prosperity and more secure peace for both nations if they live up to their obligations. But if the governments of Iran and North Korea choose to ignore international standards; if they put the pursuit of nuclear weapons ahead of regional stability and the security and opportunity of their own people; if they are oblivious to the dangers of escalating nuclear arms races in both East Asia and the Middle East -- then they must be held accountable. The world must stand together to demonstrate that international law is not an empty promise, and that treaties will be enforced. We must insist that the future does not belong to fear.

That brings me to the second pillar for our future: the pursuit of peace. The United Nations was born of the belief that the people of the world can live their lives, raise their

families, and resolve their differences peacefully. And yet we know that in too many parts of the world, this ideal remains an abstraction -- a distant dream. We can either accept that outcome as inevitable, and tolerate constant and crippling conflict, or we can recognize that the yearning for peace is universal, and reassert our resolve to end conflicts around the world.

That effort must begin with an unshakeable determination that the murder of innocent men, women and children will never be tolerated. On this, no one can be -- there can be no dispute. The violent extremists who promote conflict by distorting faith have discredited and isolated themselves. They offer nothing but hatred and destruction. In confronting them, America will forge lasting partnerships to target terrorists, share intelligence, and coordinate law enforcement and protect our people. We will permit no safe haven for al Qaeda to launch attacks from Afghanistan or any other nation. We will stand by our friends on the front lines, as we and many nations will do in pledging support for the Pakistani people tomorrow. And we will pursue positive engagement that builds bridges among faiths, and new partnerships for opportunity.

Our efforts to promote peace, however, cannot be limited to defeating violent extremists. For the most powerful weapon in our arsenal is the hope of human beings -- the belief that the future belongs to those who would build and not destroy; the confidence that conflicts can end and a new day can begin. And that is why we will support -- we will strengthen our support for effective peacekeeping, while energizing our efforts to prevent conflicts before they take hold. We will pursue a lasting peace in Sudan through support for the people of Darfur and the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, so that we secure the peace that the Sudanese people deserve. (Applause.) And in countries ravaged by violence -- from Haiti to Congo to East Timor -- we will work with the U.N. and other partners to support an enduring peace.

I will also continue to seek a just and lasting peace between Israel, Palestine, and the Arab world. (Applause.) We will continue to work on that issue. Yesterday, I had a constructive meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Abbas. We have made some progress. Palestinians have strengthened their efforts on security. Israelis have facilitated greater freedom of movement for the Palestinians. As a result of these efforts on both sides, the economy in the West Bank has begun to grow. But more progress is needed. We continue to call on Palestinians to end incitement against Israel, and we continue to emphasize that America does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements. (Applause.)

The time has come -- the time has come to re-launch negotiations without preconditions that address the permanent status issues: security for Israelis and Palestinians, borders, refugees, and Jerusalem. And the goal is clear: Two states living side by side in peace and security -- a Jewish state of Israel, with true security for all Israelis; and a viable, independent Palestinian state with contiguous territory that ends the occupation that began in 1967, and realizes the potential of the Palestinian people. (Applause.) As we pursue this goal, we will also pursue peace between Israel and Lebanon, Israel and Syria, and a broader peace between Israel and its many neighbors. In pursuit of that goal, we will develop regional initiatives with multilateral participation, alongside bilateral negotiations.

Now, I am not naïve. I know this will be difficult. But all of us -- not just the Israelis and the Palestinians, but all of us -- must decide whether we are serious about peace, or whether we will only lend it lip service. To break the old patterns, to break the cycle of insecurity and despair, all of us must say publicly what we would acknowledge in private. The United States does Israel no favors when we fail to couple an unwavering commitment to its security with an insistence that Israel respect the legitimate claims and rights of the Palestinians. (Applause.) And

-- and nations within this body do the Palestinians no favors when they choose vitriolic attacks against Israel over constructive willingness to recognize Israel's legitimacy and its right to exist in peace and security. (Applause.)

We must remember that the greatest price of this conflict is not paid by us. It's not paid by politicians. It's paid by the Israeli girl in Sderot who closes her eyes in fear that a rocket will take her life in the middle of the night. It's paid for by the Palestinian boy in Gaza who has no clean water and no country to call his own. These are all God's children. And after all the politics and all the posturing, this is about the right of every human being to live with dignity and security. That is a lesson embedded in the three great faiths that call one small slice of Earth the Holy Land. And that is why, even though there will be setbacks and false starts and tough days, I will not waver in my pursuit of peace. (Applause.)

Third, we must recognize that in the 21st century, there will be no peace unless we take responsibility for the preservation of our planet. And I thank the Secretary General for hosting the subject of climate change yesterday. The danger posed by climate change cannot be denied. Our responsibility to meet it must not be deferred. If we continue down our current course, every member of this Assembly will see irreversible changes within their borders. Our efforts to end conflicts will be eclipsed by wars over refugees and resources. Development will be devastated by drought and famine. Land that human beings have lived on for millennia will disappear. Future generations will look back and wonder why we refused to act; why we failed to pass on -- why we failed to pass on an environment that was worthy of our inheritance.

And that is why the days when America dragged its feet on this issue are over. We will move forward with investments to transform our energy economy, while providing incentives to make clean energy the profitable kind of energy. We will press ahead with deep cuts in

emissions to reach the goals that we set for 2020, and eventually 2050. We will continue to promote renewable energy and efficiency, and share new technologies with countries around the world. And we will seize every opportunity for progress to address this threat in a cooperative effort with the entire world.

And those wealthy nations that did so much damage to the environment in the 20th century must accept our obligation to lead. But responsibility does not end there. While we must acknowledge the need for differentiated responses, any effort to curb carbon emissions must include the fast-growing carbon emitters who can do more to reduce their air pollution without inhibiting growth. And any effort that fails to help the poorest nations both adapt to the problems that climate change have already wrought and help them travel a path of clean development simply will not work.

It's hard to change something as fundamental as how we use energy. I know that. It's even harder to do so in the midst of a global recession. Certainly, it will be tempting to sit back and wait for others to move first. But we cannot make this journey unless we all move forward together. As we head into Copenhagen, let us resolve to focus on what each of us can do for the sake of our common future. And this leads me to the final pillar that must fortify our future: a global economy that advances opportunity for all people.

The world is still recovering from the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. In America, we see the engine of growth beginning to churn, and yet many still struggle to find a job or pay their bills. Across the globe, we find promising signs, but little certainty about what lies ahead. And far too many people in far too many places live through the daily crises that challenge our humanity -- the despair of an empty stomach; the thirst brought on by dwindling water supplies; the injustice of a child dying from a treatable disease; or a mother losing her life

as she gives birth.

In Pittsburgh, we will work with the world's largest economies to chart a course for growth that is balanced and sustained. That means vigilance to ensure that we do not let up until our people are back to work. That means taking steps to rekindle demand so that global recovery can be sustained. And that means setting new rules of the road and strengthening regulation for all financial centers, so that we put an end to the greed and the excess and the abuse that led us into this disaster, and prevent a crisis like this from ever happening again.

At a time of such interdependence, we have a moral and pragmatic interest, however, in broader questions of development -- the questions of development that existed even before this crisis happened. And so America will continue our historic effort to help people feed themselves. We have set aside \$63 billion to carry forward the fight against HIV/AIDS, to end deaths from tuberculosis and malaria, to eradicate polio, and to strengthen public health systems. We are joining with other countries to contribute H1N1 vaccines to the World Health Organization. We will integrate more economies into a system of global trade. We will support the Millennium Development Goals, and approach next year's summit with a global plan to make them a reality. And we will set our sights on the eradication of extreme poverty in our time.

Now is the time for all of us to do our part. Growth will not be sustained or shared unless all nations embrace their responsibilities. And that means that wealthy nations must open their markets to more goods and extend a hand to those with less, while reforming international institutions to give more nations a greater voice. And developing nations must root out the corruption that is an obstacle to progress -- for opportunity cannot thrive where individuals are oppressed and business have to pay bribes. That is why we support honest police and independent judges; civil society and a vibrant private sector. Our goal is simple: a global

economy in which growth is sustained, and opportunity is available to all.

Now, the changes that I've spoken about today will not be easy to make. And they will not be realized simply by leaders like us coming together in forums like this, as useful as that may be. For as in any assembly of members, real change can only come through the people we represent. That is why we must do the hard work to lay the groundwork for progress in our own capitals. That's where we will build the consensus to end conflicts and to harness technology for peaceful purposes, to change the way we use energy, and to promote growth that can be sustained and shared.

I believe that the people of the world want this future for their children. And that is why we must champion those principles which ensure that governments reflect the will of the people. These principles cannot be afterthoughts -- democracy and human rights are essential to achieving each of the goals that I've discussed today, because governments of the people and by the people are more likely to act in the broader interests of their own people, rather than narrow interests of those in power.

The test of our leadership will not be the degree to which we feed the fears and old hatreds of our people. True leadership will not be measured by the ability to muzzle dissent, or to intimidate and harass political opponents at home. The people of the world want change. They will not long tolerate those who are on the wrong side of history.

This Assembly's Charter commits each of us -- and I quote -- "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women." Among those rights is the freedom to speak your mind and worship as you please; the promise of equality of the races, and the opportunity for women and girls to pursue their own potential; the ability of citizens to have a say in how you are governed, and to have

confidence in the administration of justice. For just as no nation should be forced to accept the tyranny of another nation, no individual should be forced to accept the tyranny of their own people. (Applause.)

As an African American, I will never forget that I would not be here today without the steady pursuit of a more perfect union in my country. And that guides my belief that no matter how dark the day may seem, transformative change can be forged by those who choose to side with justice. And I pledge that America will always stand with those who stand up for their dignity and their rights -- for the student who seeks to learn; the voter who demands to be heard; the innocent who longs to be free; the oppressed who yearns to be equal.

Democracy cannot be imposed on any nation from the outside. Each society must search for its own path, and no path is perfect. Each country will pursue a path rooted in the culture of its people and in its past traditions. And I admit that America has too often been selective in its promotion of democracy. But that does not weaken our commitment; it only reinforces it. There are basic principles that are universal; there are certain truths which are self-evident -- and the United States of America will never waver in our efforts to stand up for the right of people everywhere to determine their own destiny. (Applause.)

Sixty-five years ago, a weary Franklin Roosevelt spoke to the American people in his fourth and final inaugural address. After years of war, he sought to sum up the lessons that could be drawn from the terrible suffering, the enormous sacrifice that had taken place. "We have learned," he said, "to be citizens of the world, members of the human community."

The United Nations was built by men and women like Roosevelt from every corner of the world -- from Africa and Asia, from Europe to the Americas. These architects of international cooperation had an idealism that was anything but naïve -- it was rooted in the hard-earned

lessons of war; rooted in the wisdom that nations could advance their interests by acting together instead of splitting apart.

Now it falls to us -- for this institution will be what we make of it. The United Nations does extraordinary good around the world -- feeding the hungry, caring for the sick, mending places that have been broken. But it also struggles to enforce its will, and to live up to the ideals of its founding. I believe that those imperfections are not a reason to walk away from this institution -- they are a calling to redouble our efforts. The United Nations can either be a place where we bicker about outdated grievances, or forge common ground; a place where we focus on what drives us apart, or what brings us together; a place where we indulge tyranny, or a source of moral authority. In short, the United Nations can be an institution that is disconnected from what matters in the lives of our citizens, or it can be an indispensable factor in advancing the interests of the people we serve.

We have reached a pivotal moment. The United States stands ready to begin a new chapter of international cooperation -- one that recognizes the rights and responsibilities of all nations. And so, with confidence in our cause, and with a commitment to our values, we call on all nations to join us in building the future that our people so richly deserve. Thank you very much, everybody.