

Sudan University of Science and Technology

College of Graduate Studies

College of Languages



**Metaphors in State of the Union Speeches
Made by the Former American President
Barack Obama**

الإستعارات التي إستخدمها الرئيس الأمريكي الأسبق باراك أوباما
في خطابات حالة الاتحاد

*A Thesis Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for PhD.
Degree in English Language (Linguistics)*

Submitted By: Mustafa Mohamed Mohamed Ahmed Mohamed

Supervised By: Prof. Mahmoud Ali Ahmed

2018

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my family. I am really and truly thankful and appreciative for their unconditional support and encouragement.

Acknowledgements

I would like to convey my sincere gratitude and heartfelt thanks to my supervisor, Prof. Mahmoud Ali Ahmed for his support, encouragement and guidance throughout the preparation of this dissertation. I truly appreciate his valuable input and efforts.

My sincere thanks are due to my internal and external examiners, Prof. Abdullah Yasin, and Dr. Ahmed Mukhtar for their efforts in reviewing, assessing and improving this dissertation.

Abstract

This study aimed at investigating and analyzing metaphors made by Obama in his State of the Union Addresses. Moreover, it explored the functions of applying these metaphors as one of the most common used rhetorical devices in the American political discourse. Only three types of metaphors were discussed with regard to their applications and effects in State of the Union Speeches. These metaphors were: War metaphors, creation and construction metaphors, and journey metaphors. This study investigated the functions of these metaphors in specific contexts to uncover the hidden meanings beyond the Obama's usage of these metaphors; and to provide those English learners and students who are not well informed of metaphors and figurative language with special techniques used in political discourse to make speeches more powerful. Finally, Through the detailed study and analysis, it can be concluded that metaphors are widely used in Obama's political discourse. However, the study provided some suggestions for further studies on analyzing other types of metaphors in state of the union speeches not included in this study.

مستخلص

هدف البحث إلى دراسة وتحليل الاستعارات التي استخدمها أوباما في خطابه عن حالة الاتحاد، بالإضافة إلى تفصي وظائف تطبيق الاستعارات كواحدة من أكثر الصور البلاغية استخداماً في الخطابات السياسية الأمريكية. اقتصرَت الدراسة على مناقشة ثلاثة أنواع فقط من الاستعارات فيما يتعلق بتطبيقاتها وآثارها في خطابات حالة الاتحاد. وهذه الاستعارات هي: استعارات الحرب واستعارات الإنشاء والبناء واستعارات الرحلة. كما بحثت الدراسة وظائف هذه الاستعارات في سياقات محددة وذلك للكشف عن المعاني الخفية وراء استخدام أوباما لهذه الاستعارات؛ وللمساهمة في تزويد دارسي الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية والذين ليسوا على دراية جيدة بالاستعارات والبلاغة بتقنيات خاصة تُستخدم في الخطاب السياسي لإضفاء مزيد من القوة عليه. ومن خلال الدراسة والتحليل، يمكن الاستنتاج أن أوباما استخدم الاستعارات على نطاق واسع في خطابه السياسية. واختتمت الدراسة بتقديم مقترحات حول إمكانية إجراء مزيد من الدراسات حول تحليل أنواع أخرى من استعارات خطابات حالة الاتحاد التي لم يتسع المجال لذكرها ضمن هذه الدراسة.

Table of Contents

Title	Page
Dedication	li
Acknowledgements	lii
Abstract (English)	iv
Abstract (Arabic)	v
Table of contents	vi
Chapter One: introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Aims and objective of the Study	10
1.3 The limitation of the Study	10
1.4 Methodology of the Research	10
1.5 Collecting the Data	11
1.6 Research Questions	11
1.7 Organization of the Research	12
Chapter Two: Literature Review & Previous Studies	13
2.1 Background	14
2.2 Metaphors: From Aristotle to Lakoff	15
2.3 The Conceptual Metaphor Theory	19
2.4 Metaphorical Mapping	24
2.5 Creative and Conventional Metaphors	27
2.6 New Theories About Metaphor	27
2.7 Metaphors as Communication Devices	29
2.8 Metaphor in Political Discourse	30
2.9 Utilization of Metaphor in Presidential Speeches	38
2.10 Obama's Style of Speeches	44

2.11 Barack Obama's Rhetoric and Style	45
Chapter Three: Methods and Procedures	49
3.1 Reality of the Metaphor	50
3.2 Views on Metaphor	51
3.3 The Similarity-Based View	51
3.4 The Interaction View	54
3.5 The use of Metaphor in political Discourse	56
3.6 persuasiveness and Agenda-Setting Theory	57
3.7 Analyzing Metaphors in Political Discourse	59
3.8 The Corpus	64
3.9 Methodology and Procedures of Metaphor Identification	65
Chapter Four: Data Analysis & Discussion	67
4.1 First: War Metaphors	71
4.2 Second: Construction Metaphors	79
4.3 Third: Journey Metaphors	84
Chapter Five: Conclusion and recommendations	94
Bibliography	98
Appendices	115

Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 Overview:

1.1 Background of the study:

Language is a vital part in human life, because people can't avoid using it during their activities. They use it to communicate with each other. People can interact and express their feeling through language. Leech (1981: 40) states that in addition to having an informal purpose which everyone assumes that it is most important, language also has expressive characteristics can be used to express the speaker's thoughts and feelings.

The term "metaphor" has comprehensive meanings and many definitions. Spencer (2012) indicates that since metaphor has many meaning and various definitions, there is no human expression that would not be metaphoric in somebody's definition (p. 395). The dictionary depicts metaphor as "a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to an object or action to which it is not literally applicable". This focal central idea of conveying meanings is also embedded in its etymological sense: the term metaphor is derived comes from the Greek word "meta" which means beyond or above and "pherein" which means conveying or bearing (Spencer, 2012, p.395). Generally, we can say that metaphor can be described as a

device through which a thing is viewed as a representative of another thing.

There are two distinct methods for understanding metaphors: (a) the first classifies metaphors as mere rhetorical devices that have a nominal purpose which is making speech seem to be nice (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 25); (b) the method sees metaphors from the cognitive perspective, as devices for comprehending and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 5). The first view of metaphor as purely artistic trope was prevalent until the leading-edge publication "Metaphors we live by" by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, in which they managed to export this cognitive understanding of metaphor (Spencer, 2012, p. 396). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) clarify that the metaphor structures the way people think and act, and that the human conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical (p. 3). The conceptual metaphors presented by Lakoff and Johnson are cognitive processes that are ordinary, unavoidable and rooted deep into our unconscious, but unlike the traditional understanding of metaphors, conceptual metaphors are cognitive, not linguistic (Sabbah, 2011, p. 155).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) pinpoint, in their book "*Metaphors we live by*", three overlapping types of conceptual metaphors: Orientational metaphors, involving spatial orientation and emerging from our physical experience (p. 14); ontological

metaphors that depict experiences in terms of subjects and substances and therefore are necessary for dealing rationally with them (p. 25-26); and the last one which is the most complex type, the structural metaphors, where one basic domain of experience (usually more abstract) is conceptualized and shaped according to another basic domain of experience (usually more concrete) (p. 117). Drulák clarifies that the conceptual metaphor basically makes us apply what we know about one area of our experience, so called "source domain", to another area of our experience called "target domain" (Spencer, 2012, p. 397). In general, we can say that the source domains provide frameworks for target domains and accordingly determine the methods in which the entities to which target domains refer are understood.

There are two types of metaphors in the cognitive approach: the conceptual metaphors and metaphorical expressions. As Spencer (2012) explains, the conceptual metaphor does not have to be explicitly visible in discourse and represents the conceptual basis, idea or image that underlies a set of metaphorical expressions. Metaphorical expressions on the other hand are directly visible and represent the specific statements found in the discourse which the conceptual metaphor draws on (p. 396-397). The typical example of the difference between the conceptual metaphors and the metaphorical expressions is the conceptual metaphor "ARGUMENT IS WAR" and its realized metaphorical expressions such as "He

attacked every weak point in my argument". (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 4). Spencer (2012) claims that the metaphorical formula A IS B (...) is a bit deceptive and not quite precise because it suggests that the entire target domain is understood in terms of the entire source domain|| (p. 397). One concept cannot be precisely the same as the other one, the similarity between the two domains is only partial.

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), it is the very systematicity of the conceptual metaphors that enables us to comprehend one aspect of the concept in terms of another that leads to necessary hiding of other aspects of that concept (p. 10). In addition, Fabiszak (2007) suggests that this ability to manipulate the image of the globe by intentionally displaying or hiding certain sides of the phenomena makes metaphors a powerful rhetoric tool used to influence the public opinion (p. 102).

The systematic organization can be seen in the reality that each conceptual metaphor dominates a system of correspondences between the source domain and target domain and that the individual conceptual metaphors may also systematically relate to each other to shape a hierarchical or parallel structure (Xue et al., 2013, p. 678). In general, metaphorical expressions under a conceptual metaphor and various conceptual metaphors with the same underlying concept can shape a symmetric system and work consistently. Analyzing the metaphorical expressions and their

conceptual metaphors allows unveiling the underlying principles and motives of the speaker, as the metaphors reflect and constitute the fundamental constructions of a discourse of a certain subject (Hülse& Spencer, 2008, p. 578).

The language in politics is a practice of communication of how to use language efficiently to reach all of the social classes. Politics is inevitably connected to power. "Politics is concerned with power to make decision, to control resources, to control other people's behavior and often to control their values". (Thomas. et. al, 2004: 38). Politics can be described as the activities of seizing and protecting power. The power of political discourse is established and maintained by the powerful function of language.

One of the politicians' objectives is to stimulate their audience. Language can be utilized to impact people's political and ideological perspectives through investigating in detail the methods in which politicians can utilize language for their own advantage. Persuasive political expressions should essentially be inventive by the ability to adjust the rhetorical techniques to compete for attention.

Politicians use rhetorical language in their speeches. Rhetoric means the persuasive speech of someone to attract people to follow and to agree with his opinions. It's a technique used for persuading and influencing others; therefore, rhetoric and

persuasion are correlative since any definitions of rhetoric inevitably include the idea of persuasion. The important difference between them is that rhetoric refers to the act of communication from the audience's perspective, whereas persuasion refers to both the intentions of speaker and successful results (Charterls Black, 2005: 8-9). Therefore audiences will only be persuaded with the speaker's successful rhetoric.

The State of the Union speeches are communications between the President and the Congress. In these speeches the president gives an account on the present conditions of the United States of America and gives policy suggestions for the forthcoming legislative year. State of the union speech is officially known as "Annual Message".

According to the congress' point of view, the State of the Union Address may be considered the most significant address to be delivered by the U.S president annually.

United States of America's president is the most important political character in the US political sphere. He speaks, according to the American political system, on behalf of all American's interests and values as the only nationally elected representative of the democratic system. In that system, the president holds various positions such as: commander in chief, chief of state, chief executive, chief diplomat, legislator-in-chief, pastor-in-chief, and

chief administrator (Pika, 2002). In the domain of foreign policy, the president is required, as per the American constitution, to be “commander-in-chief.” In this position, he is the essential face and voice of the American foreign affairs. He will regularly communicate the principles, policies, and positions of the US through using language. Edwards (2008) argued that, in foreign policy, presidents utilize figurative language to form the audience perception on issues and endeavor to gain support for different principles, policies, and positions” (p. 2). Studying and investigating the presidential figurative language is a vital issue in the field of political communication because: presidents remain in the public’s minds mainly through their language. Therefore, communicating with the public is one of the vital functions of the contemporary presidency. The main purpose of investigating such moments is to obtain insight into the confluence of such powers during a specific historical period. This insight of the specific period provides those not living within the time frame to better comprehend the reasoning for a decision or a statement (Coe & Neumann, 2011). Keeping that in mind, the presidential rhetoric works in a variety of methods, two of them are the most essential to the American international ties.

Through conducting this study, the researcher intends to analyze metaphors used in State of by Barack Obama's State of Union Speeches in his Midterm.Four of his speeches were chosen to be

analyzed. Those speeches were chosen because Barack Obama is considered as one of the greatest orators in the American contemporary history. Moreover, he is well known to be a skillful orator, who utilizes rhetorical devices in delivering a great speech to his audience to persuade them. Barack Obama's speeches have attracted the attention of the people not only inside the United States of America, but worldwide as well.

This research examines and analyzes metaphor as one of the rhetorical devices used by Obama in his political discourse. Here the researcher entitles this study “**Rhetorical Devices in State of the Union Speeches Made by the former American President Barack Obama**”.

1.2 Aims and objective of the study:

1.2.1 Aims:

- Studying metaphorical expressions made by Barack Obama in State of the Union Speeches in his midterm.
- Participate in providing the readers more awareness about the function of metaphors used in State of the Union Speeches.

1.2.2 Objectives of the study:

- Determinethe typical metaphors made by Barack Obama in the State of the Union speeches from traditional and contemporary perspectives.
- Determinethe metaphorical images in the used metaphors.
- Offer a cognitive path to understanding the semantics of metaphors utilized in the said four speeches.

1.3 The limitation of the study:

In this study, the researcher makes some limitation:

This dissertation studies only four State of the Union Speeches made by Barack Obama in his midterm (2009-2012). In this dissertation the researcher will focus on the most common types of metaphors in Obama's political discourse: war, creation and construction, and journey metaphors.

To conduct this study, the researcher will focus on two issues:(a) Analyzing metaphors used by Barack Obama in his speeches; and (b) Determining the meaning of these metaphors.

1.4 Methodology of the Research:

The methods adopted to conduct this study are document research and textual analysis methods. In conducting this dissertation, the researcher follows many procedures to process the data:

1.5 Collecting the Data:

The Course of the data is taken from a script of the U. S Presidential speech in website:

<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/briefing-room/speeches-and-remarks>. In collecting the data, the researcher used observational method, which is the method of collecting data by doing an observation of the language that is used in this research directly. The researcher also used note-taking method for all the data (Sudaryanto, 1993: 135).

The Macmillan Dictionary Online was used by the Pragglejazz group as a primary reference to evaluate whether the word is used metaphorically or not.

1.6 Research Questions:

This dissertation aims at studying and examining metaphors used by Barack Obama in his State of the Union Speeches. It addresses the following questions:

- What is the meaning of the metaphors that were used by Barack Obama in his State of the Union Speeches?
- What are the functions of metaphors used by Barack Obama in his State of the Union Speeches?
- What are the typical types of metaphors in State of the Union speeches made by Barack Obama?

- What are the metaphorical images of theses metaphorical usages?

1.7 Organization of the Research:

This thesis is organized into five chapters as follows:

- Chapter one: Introduction.
- Chapter two: Literature review.
- Chapter three: Methods and Procedures.
- Chapter Four: Data Analysis.
- Chapter Five: Conclusion and recommendations.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Literature Review and Previous Studies

3.1 Background:

The focus of this dissertation is pinpointed on attempting to better understand and provide an overview of the metaphors made by the former US President Barack Obama.

A substantial amount of scholarly attention has been directed toward the study of metaphors. Bearing this mind, the volume of literature concentrated on this subject should be expected to be huge.

Metaphor is considered as a distinctive domain in studying a language despite the great progress achieved in studies and researches in this domain (Seitz, 1998; Katz & Mio, 1996). Recent studies have concluded that there is a connection between metaphors and a huge diversity of other non-linguistic cognitive techniques, warranting idioms such as 'scientific metaphors', 'filmic metaphors', 'visual metaphors' and 'spatial metaphors' (Seitz, 1998). However, no doubt that metaphor is still not getting the appropriate scholarly appreciation, despite the numerous convincing studies carried by linguists, psychologists and philosophers on explaining the extent and impact of metaphors over and above their traditional limits. This chapter reviews some of the traditional views, and contrasts those views with ideas from more recent studies.

2.2 Metaphors: From Aristotle to Lakoff

The progression in the view of metaphors could be generally divided into the following: (A) The traditional language view; (B) the synesthetic view and; (C) the cognitive view (Seitz, 1998). Aristotle is one of the pioneer scholars who dealt with metaphors. As indicated by Aristotle, words are essentially signs or characters that express an idea about a thing (O'Callaghan, 1997). Thus, words express ideas. Combining more words together represents and gives meaning to more complex ideas (O'Callaghan, 1997). This conviction held much domination till challenged by late scholars in this domain.

According to the Aristotelian viewpoint, the traditional view argues that “metaphors do not depend on prior associative relations but actually create relations between concepts” (Seitz, 1998). This theory could be obvious, for example, in the phrase “Time is gold.” This clear sentence merges the time-related ideas and gold to convey that time is a valuable asset, similar to what gold is in commerce. The concept of time and gold may have nothing to do with each other, however, once joined together they could show a powerful and effective meaning. Therefore, the traditional view preserves that metaphors exceed the hard task of disconnecting likeness between two different subjects.

This view has greatly affected the common views of metaphor, and it may still have a great impact on the academic field, especially in literary studies. Later studies, however, have indicated that this oversimplified clarification does not and cannot represent the overall perception of metaphors, generally because it considers metaphors as being the language's exclusive property. In this context, clarifications of metaphors always reduce the linguistic concepts and possibilities for analysis.

The synesthetic view holds that metaphors take into consideration the consistency of similarity over various sensory fields (Seitz, 1998). This capacity created as the result of the maturation of the cross-modal zones in the parietal cortex of the human brain (Seitz, 1998). Medical case studies point to irregularities in the sensory relationships in the brain, such as “colored gustation, shaped audition..., visual pain, textured and colored speech, and audiomotor synesthesia” (Seitz, 1998). Among the scholars who connect synesthesia with metaphor in this method many scholars such as like Ramachandran (2005), who dedicates a chapter to an extended study of the link. This makes for seeing close likenesses amongst vision and hearing, even at an early age (Seitz, 1998). Obviously, not all metaphor includes cross-modal compares; but rather it is argued that the capacity of the mind for forming such linkages is neatly connected to our inclination to express ourselves metaphorically.

The cognitive view, also known as the symbol systems view, provides the most recent and perhaps the most appropriate explanation of metaphor (Seitz, 1998). According to this perspective, a symbol system includes metaphorical meaning transfer. To depict this idea, let us take the sentence 'The CEO went ballistic over the series of strikes that disrupted the company's operations.' In this sentence, the word 'ballistic', which indicates to missiles or similar explosive tools, was utilized to express how angry and frustrated the CEO was over the conditions of the business he/she is running. Ballistic already has its own characteristics (namely, that being connected to missiles), but using the word in the sentence above adds another measure for it altogether.

The cognitive view states that metaphor is a mode of cognition (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Moreover, it perceives the existence of metaphors beyond the traditional confines of linguistics. This perspective holds that metaphors are present in emotions, events and activities. Goodman (1976) states that symbol systems go beyond language, into music, performance and visual arts, and even in ordinary gestures. For instance, pictures can convey emotions and feelings; hence there can be a good case for pictorial or nonverbal metaphors.

Of the three approaches mentioned above, late studies appear to give the great attention to cognitive view. Groundbreaking evidence suggests that the improvement of metaphoric production and understanding may even precede the development of language ability itself among children (Seitz, 1997; Seitz, 1998). It has been shown that infants exhibit an ability to convey metaphors through different means, such as bodily movements and nonliteral pictorial relationships (Seitz, 1997; Seitz, 1998). In an examination of patients with varying degrees of brain damage, the basic role of these body gestures in the organization of metaphoric thought was also shown (Seitz, 1998).

CorradiFiumara (1995) argued that the language of human physical interaction is generally metaphorical. She depicted, in her words, the language of human communication as a “constant weaving and reweaving of metaphorical contexts in which life and language join together in a metabolic process which extends from the extremes of impeding inner life to the enhancement of self-creation” (p. 142). The study carried out by CorradiFiumara is grounded after the scholar findings of Lakoff, Johnson and Turner (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff & Turner, 1989; Turner, 1987), who maintain that the tendency to utilize metaphors is connate among people and can be found in the very articulations we use to express our thoughts. Due to the considerable contribution of the

three, they merit adequate recognition. The cognitive view addresses this aspect.

2.3 The Conceptual Metaphor Theory:

The Conceptual Metaphor Theory was presented In *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson (1980). It asserts that the metaphorical language and thought are systematic and extensive. The basic parts of the theory were subsequently presented in recent works (1987b, 1990, 1990; M. Johnson, 1993; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Sweetser, 1987; Knowles & Moon, 2006; Kövecses, 2010; Lakoff,).

In this view, “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 5). A conceptual metaphor comprises of two conceptual areas (coherent organizations of experience), in which particular components or features of one domain, the source domain, are delineated in another, the target domain. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) portray a field as “a structured whole within our experience that is conceptualized as what we have called an experiential gestalt” (p. 117, italics in the original). So in the conceptual metaphor:

Conceptual metaphors are not only based on likeness, but also on the ontological correspondences or mappings across conceptual areas. These mappings are based on, or stimulated by, our bodily,

physical, and cultural experiences as we live on the planet (Lakoff, 1987b; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Gibbs, 1994; M. Johnson, 1987; Kövecses, 2010;). Lakoff (1987b) assumes that mapping is realized from one 'idealized cognitive model' in one domain to an 'idealized cognitive model' in another domain. The conceptual mappings that give rise to metaphor have been demonstrated psychologically with evidence of the systematicity of the mappings, the gestures stimulated by metaphorical realization in spoken language, and the consistencies in image schemes (see Grady, 2007).

Mapping observes the Invariance Principle (Lakoff, 1990, 1993), one that orders the relevant structure of the source domain to be projected onto the target domain in a way that is consistent with the inherent source domain structure; i.e., the mappings cannot infringe the structure of the target domain. This clarifies why mapping is limited: the selective lineaments of the source domain that are mapped onto the target domain are featured, while the unmapped lineaments are hidden (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, pp. 10–14). In this metaphor TIME IS MONEY, when a person has saved a considerable time or has invested three months in a project, the lineaments of time as a resource to be saved and invested are featured, while other parts do not seem to be activated. The elaborations of the metaphor, however, are open-ended. TIME IS MONEY entails that TIME IS A VALUABLE COMODITY, which entails that TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE. Therefore, we can talk

of have, treasure, lose, give, utilize time, run out of, and have enough time. Distinctive components of the source domain are featured in various metaphors, taking into consideration the probability of multiple mappings. One source concept can apply to various target domains, for example, the concept of Journey can apply to Life, Love, or Relationships. Moreover, it takes many source domains to comprehend an abstract concept target well, because every source can only structure specific parts of a target. For example, the abstract idea of Love can be understood through the concept of Journey, War, or Fire. Each source domain produces a specific mapping focus onto its target domain. Such metaphorical entailments establish, through the metaphorical linguistic terms, coherent systems of the metaphorical networks which effectively shape daily thought and language and rule human reasoning and behaviors. Joseph Grady (1997a, 1997b) indicates that mappings are at times poor, incompatible, short of experiential basis, and inconsistent with linguistic occasions. He proposes the Primary Metaphor, which arises from independent experiential stimulation and exists independently of linguistic evidence. Primary metaphors appear in straightforward patterns and source from simple concepts like, hot, cold, up, down, forward, backward. All metaphors are either primary metaphors or formed of primary metaphors. Primary metaphors have assisted in refining the mapping system, disentangling the many overlapped mappings of

the conceptual metaphor and introducing the logic in creative metaphors. The conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY, for instance, is derived from a substantially more essential and the general primary metaphor CHANGE OF STATE IS CHANGE OF PLACE (Lakoff, 1993). Primary metaphors are also noticed as input providers for conceptual integration (Grady, Todd, & Coulson, 1999; Grady, 2005) and grass-root embodied representations in the human mind (Bergen, 2005; Gibbs, 2006a; Gibbs & Matlock, 2008; Bergen & Feldman, 2008).

Basically, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory considers metaphor as conceptual and “thoroughly at odds with the view that metaphors are just linguistic expressions” (Lakoff, 1993, p. 209). Most essentially, the theory holds that human minds are metaphorical by nature; moreover, the metaphor is a mechanism to understand abstract concepts through more concrete entities. thus, Conceptual metaphors produce the existing system of conventional metaphors, which serve as the premise for idiomatic expressions (Gibbs & O’Brien, 1990; Gibbs, 1993; Gibbs, Bogdanovich, Sykes, & Barr, 1997), polysemy (Lakoff, 1987b; Sweetser, 1990; Tyler & Evans, 2003), and creative metaphorical language usage (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Gibbs, 1994; Gibbs & Steen, 1999; Lakoff, 1993). Conceptual metaphors are also the basics of abstract concepts. For instance, the concept of time has been consistently found to be conceptualized in terms of space, even in different cultural

communities (Boroditsky, 2001; Núñez& Sweetser, 2006; Tenbrink, 2007; Casasanto&Boroditsky, 2008). In Gibbs' (1994) words, "figuration is not an escape from reality but constitutes the way we commonly comprehend ourselves and the world in which we live" (p. 454).

The Blending Theory, produced by Fauconnier and Turner (1994, 1996, 1998), considers metaphors as products of a cognitive operation of conceptual integration (or blending) which composed of four "mental spaces" – "small conceptual packets constructed as we think and talk, for purposes of local understanding and action" (Fauconnier& Turner, 1996, p. 113). From a cognitive-pragmatic point of view, Tendahl and associates (Gibbs &Tendahl, 2006; Tendahl& Gibbs, 2008; Tendahl, 2009; Gibbs, Tendahl, &Okonski, 2011) develop a hybrid theory of metaphor which connects Sperber and Wilson's (Sperber & Wilson, 1995; Wilson & Sperber, 2006) relevance principle and Lakoff's (1990, 1993) Invariance Principle. Tendahl finds it non-satisfying that theInvariance Principle requires the relevance of structure mappings, but does not define the details of this selective mapping. He maintains that metaphorical utterances assist in communicating not only several implicatures, but also several explicatures (Tendahl, 2009), allowing metaphor users to consciously merge cognitive and linguistic resources to serve different communication purposes in addition to the unconscious use of metaphorical language as driven

by the primary metaphors. Metaphor is, moreover, approached from the complex systems perspective (Cameron & Deignan, 2006; Gibbs & Cameron, 2008; Cameron, 2007, 2008; Cameron et al., 2009). These writers claim that the approach can completely reflect the dynamics of metaphor in use since it affirms metaphor activity rather than metaphor as a tool or an object that is put to use. Finally, Lakoff (2008) calls for a neural version of the Conceptual Metaphor which affirms the physical existence of metaphoric processing in the mind.

2.4 Metaphorical mapping:

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) conceptual metaphors are systematic mappings across conceptual domains. The field which is mapped is the source domain, while the recipient of mapping is called the target domain. The experience from the source domain is mapped onto the target domain is the process called mapping, which makes the relatively abstract target domain more concrete (Kovecses, 2002: 6). However, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) also state that mapping has its own features: (a) it is unidirectional. mappings only go from the source domain to the target domain, not from domain to source domain. (b) mappings are partial, and that means only a part of the source domain is mapped into the target domain. For example, in the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, not all portions of the journey domain can be mapped

onto the love domain, because there is no consistency between the two domains in many aspects.

Mappings occur as a result to the perceived similarity of some elements between the source domain and the target domain. According to Lakoff and Turner (1989), the mapping process may include different aspects, such as the mapping of relation, the mapping of property and the mapping of knowledge. In the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY, the relation in the journey domain can be mapped onto the relation in the life domain (Lakoff & Turner, 1989). When a traveler reaches a destination in the journey, it means a person achieves a goal in his life. Therefore, the relation between a traveler and a destination in the source domain gets mapped onto the relation between a person and his goal in the target domain. Moreover, there might be obstacles and impediments on the way in a journey, which can be mapped onto the trouble and difficulties that might be filled with in the course of life. Thus the property in the source domain is mapped onto the target domain (Lakoff & Turner, 1989). At last, knowledge in the source domain can also get mapped onto the target domain (Lakoff & Turner, 1989). For instance, when people get to a dead end in the journey and cannot move forward in the same direction, they have to find out another way. Metaphorically, when people hit a dead end, in the life, they have to try another way. The mapping of

knowledge might make people draw some deductions about the target domain.

In general, we can say that the conceptual mapping from a source domain into a target domain allows people to know how conceptual metaphor works, and its procedure including both the fact that the entities in the source domain are mapped into the target domain and the fact that knowledge of the source domain gets mapped into the target domain.

2.5 Creative and conventional metaphors

Metaphors enable language users to increase the expressiveness of their messages. Conventional metaphors exist at a specific point between metaphorical and literal usages and mirror a process that was initially metaphorical becomes established in a language. (Ungerer & Schmid, 2001: 117). Furthermore, Lakoff and Turner (1989) also argue that a metaphor is conventionalized to the extent that it is automatic, effortless and generally established as a mode of thought between members of a linguistic society (1989: 55). However, there is not always a clear variance between creative metaphors and conventional metaphors, because there are differences in the people's experience of language. As Lyons (1977: 60) claims that it is hard to draw a clear difference between the natural extension of meanings by individual speakers on specific occasions and their use of the pre-existing meanings of a lexeme

that are to be found in a dictionary. At first, numerous innovative languages utilize presumably constitute metaphors, but once they are established through frequent use in a language community, they become conventionalized. Therefore, active metaphors may progressively be inactive, and even finally become dead (Goatly, 1997: 31-35). As the extent to which a metaphor is active might vary between various individuals of a language, it also likely differs among speakers of various languages, for metaphors which have been lexicalized in one language may not interfere with those that have become lexicalized in another. Therefore, a conventional metaphor in one language may occur to be an innovative one to another language's speaker.

2.6 New theories about metaphor:

Ricoeur (1975) postulated two cardinal theories on metaphors, each one with correspondence to distinct, although widely related, backgrounds: a) substitution theory; and b) tension theory. Basically, both theories explore how metaphors are made and how can they be specified in a specific text. Tension Theory is said to have connection with semantics, whereas the Substitution Theory is said to have connection with semiotics.

Ricoeur defined Tension Theory as concentrating on the "production of metaphor inside the sentence taken in general...," while Substitution Theory is designed to the "meaning impact at

the level of the separated word” (p. 4). An appropriate example supporting the first theory can be found in the common expression ‘You are wasting my time.’ In this expression, time is considered a valuable tangible asset that can be wasted, such as money. The metaphor can be seen when taking the sentence taken as a whole, since we cannot contend that the words ‘wasting’ and ‘time’ alone taken independently in the text can stand as metaphors. And for the second theory, we take the sentence ‘True love never dies’ as an example for the substitution theory. ’ In this sentence, we can observe that the word ‘dies’ takes the part of a metaphor. Death in this example does not mean the actual death which is potential for persons and other living creatures. Since love is an intellectual idea, dying here may mean losing the feeling. ‘Dies’ here works as the metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argued that many of common metaphors utilized today are derived from the physical world and the sense of embodiment in this world. This allegation is upheld by the philosophy of the embodied realism which holds that a human being and the outside elements and powers are two sections of a complete experience (Rakova, 2002, Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). This thinking connects comprehension, human being’s cognition and utterance with environmental factors. This embodiment can be appear in the utilization of words relevant to eating and food, for example “swallow” “digest,” “eat,” and “chew,” in depicting how thoughts and mental constructs are being handled and

comprehended “I need more time to digest this idea,” or “He will never swallow this disgraceful claim”). Furthermore, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) additionally concentrated on the predominance of orientational idioms to prove their theory. Phrases like: ‘He is at the peak of his health’ and ‘He dropped dead’ are only two of numerous metaphorical references to ‘Health and Life’ as ‘up’ and ‘death and sickness’ as ‘down’.

Lakoff and Johnson concluded, in their study, that humans’ skill in expressing themselves metaphorically and to automatically comprehend the same metaphorical expressions is genuine. Moreover, this skill is acquired throughout their daily communication through interacting with each other.

2.7 Metaphors as communication devices:

Metaphor can be used as a communication device between the various systems and their relevant symbols of communities, i.e. metaphors can play a vital part in supporting solidarity in a community and in suggesting social change. Modifications in the root metaphors may promote, as a result of these modifications, extensive change in the soci-cultural fields as well as the political field. According to Luhmann’s social system theory, the techniques of communication between the systems in community remain as doubtful issues (e.g. 1995; 2000). He considers meaning as the quintessence of communication and in so doing debilitates

the aspect of doubt in communication. Alternatively, Leydesdorff (2001) pursues Habermas (1987) and characterizes language as the operating system of community. Neither meaning nor Language enables the elaboration of how these social systems and subsequent discourses communicate with one another in society. Nonetheless, this communication is important for the the community integration.

Luhmann (2002, P.12) recommends topics as tools of communication amongst science and the media. He takes 'AIDS' as an example for a subject that encourage various systems to communicate with each other and to be utilized as "the structural coupling of the media along with other social fields". Moreover, he proclaims, "At the level of topics, then, other-reference and self-reference are permanently being consisted in relation to each one another in the system's communication" (ibid).

2.8 Metaphor in Political Discourse:

Numerous political speeches have been precisely made by gifted people before being delivered to the public, therefore, the vast majority of the contemporary political speeches are motivating, spectacular and asserting the promise of better days ahead, despite the fact that some of these speeches are addressed in the gloomy days. Such sort of common objectives make various state of the

union speeches tends to share some basic characteristics in aspects as the content, style and rhetoric.

Supporters of cognitive linguistics like Lakoff et al. (1980; 1978; 1982) recommended that conceiving or thinking involves influencing unconscious intellectual metaphor in order to let concretely pictured physical items and situations replace the more abstract items and situations we are striving to comprehend. Lakoff et al. (1980; 1978; 1982) concluded that metaphors are imaginary matters, a matter of thinking of one thing in terms of another. So, the conceptual metaphor or cross-domain map, for the supporters of the cognitive linguistics, was a pervading culture-wide tendency to imagine one fixed kind of thing in terms of another fixed kind of thing. Therefore, the review specified a word or a phrase as a metaphor if a word or phrase could be comprehended beyond the literal meaning in the context, the literal meaning stemmed from a cultural experience area (source range), the source range was transferred to a second, often abstract area (target range). Wei (2001) took a solid stand on the significance and pervasiveness of metaphors utilized in election discourse through influencing thoughts and ideas in Taiwan. Data was collected from newspaper and website coverage of Taiwanese elections of 1997. She used all these sources to clarify voters, readers and campaigners' intercommunications. Utilizing a cognitively and culturally based analytic work as proposed by Lakoff (1980, 1996) and Quinn

(1991), she investigated the specific socio-cultural conditions that provided basis for the new and productive metaphors. The study claimed the recent social events and specific cultural contexts gave rise to certain benign metaphors to describe the unique socio-cultural situations of Taiwanese politics. The study provided socio-cultural analysis for certain political metaphors, showing also that the pragmatic functions of metaphors were more than just heuristic or cognitive devices. They were also adopted for strategic reasons.

Moreover, many other scholars established that the metaphor structures our political, social and economic comprehension. The conceptual metaphor "POLITICS IS WAR" for example, structures the way we consider politics as a fight to be won. We would see politics in a different way if the metaphor was "POLITICS IS LOVE." Therefore. It's not peculiar that Wei (2001) established just as much in her study. Other studies specified words like "business" and "war" as the most common source domains for politics. Unlike Wei (2001) who dissected metaphorical expressions used in the news coverage of Taiwanese political rhetoric, Vestermarck (2007) conducted a study of the metaphorical personification of America in political rhetoric. She based her analysis on the Cognitive - Semantic method produced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Her study looked specifically at the personification of America in the first inaugural addresses by Ronald Reagan (1981), George H.W.

Bush (1989), Bill Clinton (1993) and George, W. Bush (2001). She concentrated on how they utilized metaphors and how metaphors could be elucidated and what messages they sent to the receivers. Therefore, her strategy in analyzing metaphors was to find the mentioned conceptual metaphors and to analyze how a non-human entity (US) was determined as being a human entity as well as to account for the speaker's potential intention. Vestermarck (2007) investigated the conceptual metaphors THE WORLD AS A COMMUNITY, NATION AS A PERSON AND NATION ACTING AS HUMAN. She contended that the conceptual metaphors used in political discourse in the inaugural speeches were strongly intentional, yet it's hard to detect them. She found that America is conceptualized as human, and she concluded that the four presidents utilized the metaphor to personify the nation to make the American people identify with and comprehend their beliefs and goals. Despite the fact that she contended that the use of conceptual metaphors in the inaugural speeches was intentional, in many cases linguistic metaphors illustrate sub-conscious decisions on the speaker's role, based partly on the conceptual structures shared by individuals of their community. Vestermarck study (2007), elucidated, clearly, that the features of conceptual sources could be manipulated positively rather than negative rhetorical conclusions. Taiwo (2010) studied metaphors in the Nigerian political discourse. His study mixed the Critical Discourse

Analysis's methods with the Cognitive Linguistics' methods which was developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) to examine metaphoric expressions. Mainly, Taiwo (2010) concentrated on the metaphors' identification and how the discourses conceptually mapped metaphoric expressions of their source and target domains. Guided by Lakoff and Johnson's Theory of Conceptual Metaphor, he specified three target domains as sources of conceptual metaphors in his data: the nation, politics and politicians. In his work, he stated that the NATION was conceptualized as a FAMILY and as a PERSON. He also specified the conceptual mappings of POLITICS AS A BATTLE, POLITICS AS A JOURNEY, and the POLITICIAN AS A BUILDER. Taiwo (2010) contended that the metaphor helps in forming the political categorization and argumentation's structure. Such a conceptual metaphor as POLITICS IS A GAME, for example, forms our political recognition. Moreover, he proclaimed that the targets and domains' mapping principle was utilized by Nigerian politicians to achieve persuasive and rhetoric objectives in their political speech. This can be utilized either negatively, or positively. The major objective of the politicians is not only to present facts, but also to be convincing. Taiwo mentioned Opeibi (2006) who accomplished a study about the negative political advertising and he discovered that many of the political candidates ignored positive advertisement which concentrate on the key issues and engaged in

rhetorical methods of direct attacks on their adversaries. Attacks of political rivals assured that politicians projected both positive and negative presentation. Mensah (2012), studied the "bus metaphor" in Ghanaian political speeches, revealed that politicians can handle the characteristics of conceptual metaphors positively. he demonstrated, utilizing the "Yutong Bus" metaphor, that politicians in Ghana and elsewhere could utilize metaphors to address key political issues without offending their political rivals.

Lakoff (2002) indicated that metaphors are functional in discourses. He brought metaphor into political speeches, and utilized it as an analytical tool to enable people have a superior comprehension of ideology and significant in political addresses. In the article entitled "Metaphor, Morality, and Politics" (<http://www.wwcd.org/issues/Lakoff.html>) in which he censured the US government for advocating the war against Iraq, but withholding the truth that the war was for its advantages, he brought many conceptual metaphors revealing the US' diplomacy to Iraq. Cen (2009) studies various political speeches from the pragmatics' viewpoint. By adopting Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) and Politeness Principle (PP), he assumes that the maxim of quality in Cooperative Principle requires participants in conversation communication to comply with the following two standards: 1- Don't say what you think to be wrong; (2) Don't state that for which you have not appropriate proof, because the political

speech must be true, convincing, encouraging and persuasive. Moreover, Hu (2001) studied the rhetoric in politics. In his article “Rhetoric in Politics and Its Knowledge Spreading”, he studied various political speeches from various backgrounds. He indicates that many common shapes of rhetoric are extensively used, including: metonymy, metaphor, repetition, euphemism, and parallelism in addition to antithesis or contrast parallelism. These shapes, in political speeches, have a powerful impact on spreading political awareness. Moreover, he asserts that according to various environments, the political rhetoric can be categorized into the following five categories: head rhetoric, campaign rhetoric, institution rhetoric, situation rhetoric, and opposite rhetoric. So, we can conclude to that the political discourses can't be accomplished efficiently without rhetoric.

Stenvoll (2008, p. 36) states, “Language use, including the use of metaphor, is analyzed as a tool of power, as something that political actors ‘stand outside’ (to use a conventional metaphor) and may use to address, legitimate and/or cover political interests.”

Charteris-Black’s book *Politicians and Rhetorics* (2006) addresses a huge number of different conceptual metaphors in politicians' speeches. He mentioned four conceptual metaphors, namely:

journey metaphors, heroic myth, construction and creation metaphors and destruction metaphors.

Jonathan Charteris-Black has a huge contribution in the field of corpus studies of metaphor. He inscribes that metaphors are regularly utilized by politicians to create fables/tales that explain the unknown|| (Charteris-Black 2007: 28). What makes fable a very helpful tool for political people is that it gets rid of doubts and fulfils the safety and reassurance's needs of their supporters (ibid.: 28).

Charteris-Black points that capability of recalling an emotional response is another feature of metaphors (ibid. : 43). Additionally, politicians' use of metaphor may influence beliefs and convictions of the audience, since these metaphors activate emotional connections (ibid.: 43). The ability of influencing such emotions is called pathos.

Ringmar (2008, p. 57) states, "in political discourse, metaphors are frequently used by aristocracies to hinder criticism and to keep people in their places." He concurs with Lakoff and Johnson that the metaphor can both shed light and conceal parts of reality. "For political scholars, the comparative study of metaphors offers a new and updated unexplored method of comprehending the uniformity and diversity in the method political systems are conceptualized" (Ringmar, 2008, p. 58). Vertessen and De Landtsheer (2008, p.

273-4) contend that metaphors implore to compassion, logos and ethos. In general, we can say the usage of metaphorical expressions appeal to our feelings, our sense of logic and our morals. They note how Hitler incited fear and hatred by referring to enemies as epidemic infectious diseases.

Mio (1997, p. 118) manifests how metaphors are utilized in political discourse to make complex issues comprehensible, and are particularly effective in awkward situations when people needs to believe that the government is dealing with the troubles. However, he questions the metaphors' efficiency in influencing choices of electors.

Metaphors and other forms of Figurative language are effective devices and tools in political discourse, they allow the audience to comprehend and understand the meaning of speeches delivered by politicians. Many political theorists have extolled the virtue of metaphors as effective persuasive tool, or have demonized metaphors as the politicians' manipulative devices.

2.9 Utilization of metaphor in Presidential Speeches:

Using metaphor as a persuasion device throughout history is well documented. From the Sumerian *Epic of Gilgamesh*, to Greek plays from Sophocles and Euripides, metaphor found a unique home as a literary tool in its earliest days—before being utilized for its

convincing capabilities in argumentation. In modern history, Margaret Thatcher, Winston Churchill, and Martin Luther King, have all been known for their usage of metaphor in their speeches before wide audiences on subjects ranging from World War 2 to the rights of African-Americans amid the Civil Rights Movement.

(Carver and Pikalo, 2008) have discovered that when a nation faces a catastrophic situation (such as times of war, financial deterioration, humanitarian catastrophe...etc.) that the metaphor can be utilized to promote the governmental agenda through communicating with the people in such situation.

While Aristotle perceived the significant of metaphor in the quality of the speech, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) promoted the comprehension of metaphor to recognize the conceptual framing and to figure out how metaphors affecting the people's regular activities.

William C. Gay, in analyzing Ricoeur's effort in metaphors and ideologies, inscribes that: —Metaphor has a remarkable capacity for reshaping realities and —Ideologies are incomparable phenomenon of social existence|| (p. 1). It is necessary to understand the significant of the ideology, because upon using the same metaphors constantly for a political decision those metaphors could become a reality, forcing political issues to stay suspended preventing the achievement of any political gains.

Politicians have often perceived that making emphasis on metaphors can make the audience support whatever agenda they are attempting to create. This could happen because of the emotional appeal of sympathy that is commonly utilized and using the language of “bringing-before-the eyes” in metaphors (Carver and Pikalo, 2008). No person in the political field holds more power in addressing the audience than a country's leader. An attention on presidential speeches then becomes the conspicuous choice:

The president's utilization of metaphor is one of the institutional sources of power, enhanced in the present presidency through the presidents' capabilities to speak when, where, and on whatever issue they decide to their nation (Campbell and Jamieson, p. 3).

Numerous researchers have examined the presidents' utilization of metaphor in assortment of addresses at different points of their presidency. George W. Bush employed metaphors used by Ronald Reagan (in his last State of the Union speech) to strengthen civic virtues (Smith, 2008). He used metaphors in his speech about the Columbia. Not only that, but also Abraham Lincoln's addresses have been examined for metaphors use during major time of crisis in the American history.

The utilization of metaphors in the political rhetoric resulted in the formation of ideologies, which indicate how metaphors can

influence the political ideology and public opinion towards a specific issue. Ideologies can be characterized as: —Sets of thoughts, clarify and justify ends and methods of organized social activity, political activity in particular, regardless whether this activity intends to protect, reform, eliminate or reconstruct a specific social system (Charteris-Black, 2009). For example, in the contemporaneous implementation of using metaphor in healthcare discourse, ideologies can be viewed as a governmental methodology to characterize healthcare and what it should mean for the American nations.

Presidents concentrate on the main and prime subjects that are relevant to their times, because, an efficient public address is the address that meets the needs of the audience (Katula, 2001: 18). People will find it is valuable to listen to the address if they hear the presidents' thoughts and political strategies which contribute to the subject. Besides, they will also recognize the leadership qualities of their president and perceive he is considering his opportunity, his nation and his country as well.

As for the style, the distinctiveness of the presidential inaugural speeches is derived from the fact that these speeches are delivered in public places at special moments determining their styles which share the characteristics of both written and oral discourses (Zheng, 2001: 67-68).

Inaugural speeches, as one of the most important presidential speeches in America, are basically delivered orally by the presidents, so they should have something in common with the oral speeches, such as simple words in the inaugural speeches to comprehend and recall, and using the form of an oral speech as "my fellow citizen" to commence his speech. It is impossible for common people to comprehend the meanings of the presidents' speeches, when adopting profound or complicated words in their speeches. Therefore, they should utilize straightforward and uncomplicated words in their addresses, and make the speeches transient and brief simply as the oral discourses. Although such speeches are delivered orally to the general public, they are not unpremeditated speeches, and they are precisely planned and composed by specialists on the lights of some rules and standards.

The presidential inaugural speeches are outlined not only to express the political visions and missions of the president, but also to gain more support from the audience for the president (Wilson, 1994:5-6). And to achieve this persuasion efficiency, numerous presidential inaugural speeches benefit from the emotional appeals. The president will attempt to evoke his audience's emotions and feelings in order to attract their attention to listen to issues he is talking about, to induce them and to improve their morale. For instance, John F. Kennedy (1961, <http://www.bartleby.com/124/pres56.html>) said, *My fellow*

Americans, ask not what your country can do for you-ask what you can do for your country. Such a straightforward sentence demonstrates its strong persuasiveness with exciting feeling. Moreover, the president will also utilize a variety of rhetoric to make the emotional influence, and to obtain the objective of persuading people to support him, as parallelism, antithesis, and metaphor. The metaphor seems to be used more widely and efficiently in enhancing the power and intensity of the language, as Katz and Jeffery indicate that metaphors in political speeches are applied to carry policies, persuade or influence the public's decision for activity or to criticize opponents (1996: 127). Therefore, it completely asserts the political motivations of the president, as Edelman contends that metaphors are utilized to provide the motivation or justification to contemplate or behave in a specific way (Edelman, 1977: 36). In addition, it empowers people to comprehend the address easily, as Thompson asserts that until and unless an understanding's metaphorical leap is made, there will be no contribution in politics or political discourse (1999: 186)

2.10 Obama's style of speeches:

Obama is one of the most charismatic presidents in the united states. He is capable of arousing and motivating his followers, manipulate their loyalty, allegiance, and boost their self-esteem||

(Mio et al, 2005). These characteristics often applied to President Barack Obama who has been examined and investigated from a rhetorical position on various issues. The media and scholars analyze each speech he delivers. Therefore, Obama is well-known for his powerful speaking skills in addressing the American people on the issues his administration considers are critical and requires more concern by the American nation.

In the recent years, Obama has gained a great amount of political capital to pass his comprehensive healthcare bill through Congress. President Obama addressed the American Medical Association (AMA) on the significance of passing his comprehensive healthcare bill. Earlier, he addressed straightforwardly the Congress, encouraging them to cooperate in passing the proposed bill. Both addresses were delivered to the American people and published in *The New York Times* thereafter to make sure that the message Obama wanted to deliver regarding the healthcare bill is proliferated to the American people. These two addresses have become the center for contemporaneous utilization of metaphor as tool for persuasion of health care in America.

2.11 Barack Obama's Rhetoric and Style:

The language of Barack Obama has been widely known as a magnificent and distinctive approach to political discourse. Leith (2012) depicts Obama as “one of the most consciously and artfully

rhetorical speakers in the recent history of American politics” (p. 218). He has a special style and special capability of delivering political speeches with a tremendous impact on the audience. Political speeches are neatly arranged persuasive messages, and that is why they constitute a legitimate basis for any rhetorical examination. Obama’s speeches have been subject to analysis by numerous linguists. Escudero (2011) examines Obama’s style regarding the metaphorical use from his first Inaugural speech. She asserts that Obama’s rhetorical language is particularly influential, because it creates a very positive connection with American values and reality. Addressing the issues and giving hope for a better future are metaphors that engage the audience's feelings and celebrate Obama’s political success. Gunawan (2010) also analyzes Obama’s style from his first Inaugural Address, nevertheless, the focus of the paper is on the plot structure and stylistic and linguistic categories. The findings of this study show continual utilization of figures of speech, including metaphors. Three-part structural constructions create rhythm, effect of continuity and reinforcement. It shows that Obama elaborates on his ideas by using complex sentences made of relative clauses. Also, he specifically uses cohesive devices like ellipsis and co-reference pronouns.

Mieder (2009) in his analysis, concentrated on Obama’s stylistic choices like proverbs and proverb-like phrases. He claims that his

strategic communication choices inducing emotions and ideas have impact on the audience. This analysis is based on Obama's two books: *Dreams of My Father* (1995); and *Audacity of Hope* (2006). Mieder's aim is to present Obama's style as a powerful device for conviction ending the clashes of civilizations between the American citizens. Cirugeda and Ruiz (2013) analyze Obama's stylistic choices from speeches addressed to Latino American communities from 2012 and 2013. The authors study Obama's figurative language as means for persuasion. The analysis shows Obama's frequent use of metaphors, personifications, many other forms of figurative language. The most dominant source domain for metaphors is the concept of the American Dream and uniqueness of the American people. Obama's figurative language refers to values of patriotism, justice, and joint movement. Moreover, he employs argumentative strategies of polarization that helps him to build a positive image of immigrants.

Moreover, there are many political and business publications such as journals and magazines that comment on Obama's style and rhetoric. Obama's rhetorical choices have been described in the business magazine "Business Insider" (Cambell 2014). The author observes that during Obama's interview with radio NPR in 2014, Obama clarifies international relations of U.S. by using sport metaphors referring to football and baseball terms. In an online magazine "Observer" ("What Makes Obama a Good Speaker?",

2008). Obama has been depicted as one of the best contemporary speakers. His style has been described as “lyrical”, which means that composition of rhythm in his speeches are comparable to songs. Kusnet (2016) portrays Obama’s style as more elevated in contrast comparison to George Bush and less free in form than Hilary Clinton. Obama's style is known for catchy slogans like “Yes, we can”, “Let’s do it” and “Pass the Bill”.

Since Obama is a lawyer, he is familiar with different legal documents, and that is why he derives inspirations for his speech style from the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, and the Bible. Not only that, but he quoted verses from the Holy Quran in his speech in Cairo, 2009. He models himself after the best American speakers like Martin Luther King, John F. Kennedy, Franklin Roosevelt, Theodore Roosevelt and Abraham Lincoln.

The current thesis will study and examine Barak Obama's use of metaphors in addressing internal and external issues through state of the union speeches. Moreover, it will provide a detailed analysis for these metaphors.

Chapter Three

Methods and Procedures

3. Methods and Procedures:

This chapter outlines the methods and procedures of the research. It is divided into two sections (Background & methodology).

The first section, reviews and studies metaphors, the persuasive power of metaphors, metaphor research, and metaphors in political discourse analysis "PDA".

The second section, reviews the method utilized in analyzing the data of this thesis (Four state of the union speeches delivered by Obama in his midterm).

3.1 Reality of the metaphor:

Metaphors are not only expressions utilized to portray fabulous depictions; but also explicate cultures' values and maybe more significantly, they "represent a vital part in the social and political reality's structure" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:159). The writers additionally clarify that "the major part of our metaphors have developed in our culture over a long period of time, however, many metaphors are imposed upon us through ruling classes" (ibid:160). The answer for who retains authorities in a country is simply the political and/or philosophical discourse, therefore, and the political discourse is a most suitable place for examining metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:236) clarify that "Economic and political thoughts are produced in metaphorical terminologies". They do not support the concept that only metaphors form the reality or control

the political power, instead they assure the significant of studying metaphors when investigating political discourse through these two sentences "It is quite rational to believe that only words can't change the reality, instead changes in the conceptual systems can change what is real. These changes can affect the view we see the world and consequently affect our actions" (ibid:146).

3.2 Views on Metaphor

classical theories include two basic views on metaphor: the interaction view and similarity-based view. The latter is represented in the comparison and substitution theories. These two classical views consider the metaphor as a linguistic phenomenon and assume basic distinction between literal and figurative senses in linguistic expressions.

3.3 The Similarity-Based view:

The similarity-based view can be traced back to Aristotle who stated: "metaphor occurs through giving things names that belongs to somethings else" (cited in Johnson, 1981: p. 5). This statement has deeply impacted the metaphor treatment for a considerable period, because of its three implications: Firstly; it implies that the metaphoric transfer is completely linguistic (occurs at the words' level). Secondly, it demonstrates what Johnson (P. 6) calls "the fatal separation" of the literal and the figurative through claiming that metaphors are deflections from literal use. Thirdly, Aristotle's

definition implies that metaphor depends on inherent similarities between two objects. therefore, what forms the basis of metaphor is the process of picking out a metaphor over another. And as a result, similarity-based views inherently consider: (1) metaphor is reducible to a literal reword without losing the cognitive content or prominence; (2) metaphor depends on objective pre-existing similarities between two things. For example, the substitution view holds that metaphors are non-literal expressions utilized as a replacement of some equivalent literal expression. As stated by the supporters of the interaction theory, according to the substitution view, the metaphorical phrase *John is a lion* is an indirect way of conveying an intended literal meaning, i.e., John is fierce. According to the comparison view, the metaphor *John is a lion* is an indirect means in which the listener/reader comprehends the following literal meaning: "John is like a lion in being fierce."

Consequently, the meaning of the metaphor, as per the similarity-based theories, occurs through composing a literal and objective set of relevant similarities selected from the context of the speech (Black, 1981).

The similarity-based views of metaphor simplified metaphors study through making it easily solvable in accordance of the principles of the Western objectivist tradition (Johnson, 1981). Understanding of most metaphors requires familiarity on similarity. For instance, in the following metaphor *the roses on her*

cheeks (Kovecses: 2002, p. 68), both the cheeks and the roses can be explicated as being red, wonderful and young. But, the classical views are limited in scope. As Black (1981) outlines, they "suffer from an ambiguity that borders on vacuity" (p. 284).

Secondly, they minimize the essential side of dissimilarities through overemphasizing the significant of similarities (Richards, 1981).

Thirdly, the decrease of metaphor to literal speech can result in a loss in the cognitive content of metaphor. For example, in the metaphor *Sally is a block of ice*, the literal equivalent "She is irresponsive emotionally" doesn't capture the cognitive entailment of the metaphor that Sally can melt under the fire (Searle, 1981, p. 258).

Fourthly, comprehending a metaphor doesn't necessarily require the existence of two things to make the compression, as in this example *Sara is a dragon* (Searle, 1981), in this example dragon is an imaginary thing and doesn't not exist in real life.

Finally, based on recent psychological experiments, the allegation that individuals comprehend literal language more effortlessly than figurative language turned to be not accurate (Cacciari & Glucksberg, 1994; Gibbs, 1994, 2001). These experiments show that common people find no difficulty in comprehending figurative

language and they manage to comprehend figurative language easier than literal language.

Therefore, similarity may help in understanding some metaphors. As Searle (1981) states "though likeness frequently has a significant in understanding metaphors, the metaphorical assertion is not necessarily an assertion of likeness" (p. 88).

Bearing in mind their inadequacies, the similarity-based views have been widely attacked and alternative theories, as the interaction theory, claiming to capture parts of metaphoric understanding that exceed the recognition of similarity, started to obtain reliance (Johnson, 1981).

3.4 The Interaction View

Interaction theorists (Black, 1981, 1993: Richards, 1981: Ricoeur, 1981: Hausman, 1983), point out the six features of metaphors as follows:

- (a) They can generate new meanings.
- (b) They are irreducible.
- (c) They cannot be paraphrased without losing the cognitive content.
- (d) The elements of metaphors apply a reciprocal impact on one another, resulting in changes in the meanings of these elements.

(e) Metaphors include both similarities and varieties among their elements.

(f) Metaphors include pressure between the two different components engaged in metaphor. Consequently, as per the interaction view, the metaphor in the example *John is a lion* makes a new meaning which is not based on pre-existing similarities between the tenor (the object or the human commented on), John, and the vehicle (belonging to the tenor), lion, but results from the specific interaction between *John* and *lion*. The metaphorical meaning of this expression comes as a result of using the whole System of commonplaces, for example, commonly believed features, connected with John, to "filter" and organize conception of the other System (lion). In this procedure, the connected commonplaces corresponding to lion, which may comprise beliefs, as lions "prey upon other animals, are wild, ravenous, engaged in constant struggles," organize our view of John. According to this view, John and lion exercised a reciprocal impact on one another. Calling John a lion places John in a specific position; it also personify the lion. (Waggoner, 1990, p. 93). In this view, the literal equivalent of John is a lion, such as John is brutal, cannot capture the power of metaphor, and power to enlighten (p. 93). As assured by the supporters of the interaction theory, for John is a lion, the substitution view would tell us that something is being told, indirectly, about John (as: he is brutal). The comparison view

provides comparison between John and the lion. On the other hand, the interaction view would acquaint us that our "thoughts" about John and lion are "active together" and "interact" to generate a meaning resulting from that specific interaction. This means that John gains a new meaning, which is not quite its meaning in the literal uses, not quite the meaning which any of its literal substitutes would have.

3.5 The use of Metaphor in political discourse:

Political discourse is guided by implied conceptual metaphor. Such metaphors are partly entrenched in ideas and cultural patterns. Straightforward cases of such metaphors contain the conceptual dualisms like: left and right, conservative and progressive, and so on. There is an enormous number of different terms from the scope of political discourse. Indeed, every political commentary in any newspaper includes political metaphors. Metaphors are completely vital to the "understanding" of many political ideas, which are generally too abstract, remote, and complex to be understood by common people.

Obviously, the issue of political discourse terms is complicated and has been studied from different viewpoints. Määttä (2007: 168), making utilization of Foucault's (1969) insights, characterized the objective of [political] discourse analysis as "to decide why a specific part of discourse (e.g. statement) and no other has

occurred in a specific place in a specific duration”. This Foucaultian and pragmatic viewpoint makes the reader focus on the hidden variables of contextual meaning, ideology, relations of power and coercion, audience-specificity, and so on. All speech need to be investigated in terms of the part of the huge networks of concept, meanings, and desired goals. Analyzing metaphors could be defined as a specific methodology of discourse analysis, which would be a technique for analyzing either intentions of the players in a given political system (as the case of this study) or a political ideology in general.

3.6 persuasiveness and Agenda-setting theory

In 1946, in his well-known article (Politics and the English Language), George Orwell noted: “we spare more mental effort by using metaphors, similes, and metonymies, at the cost of leaving your meaning vague, not only for the reader but also for yourself.” (Orwell 1968: 134 as referred to by Müller 2005: 54).

The term “stale” was, for Orwell, essentially a style issue. He examined it through ambiguous language and clichés as a sign of English rhetorics' decay, not as rudimental presence of the change of basics of public politics that can be traced back to such periods of time. As Müller interestingly indicates, Orwell's definition contradicts the “traditional” view of metaphors as an absolute

stylistic ornament, for his conception is also linked to the state of the speaker's "morals" and "mental efforts".

Since the Second World War, more consideration has been given to the issues of persuasiveness, methodologies, self-portraying, and targeted utilization of concepts in political discourse. Currently, no one doubts the reality that political discourse is characterized by its predominantly persuasive function and argumentative, often market-oriented method. Under typical conditions of a democratic political system, language used within political discourse is a strategical tool used in a political combat. This has never been so much true as now, in the prosperous era of political marketing. All speakers should be considered as likely strategically selected methods of agenda setting and promotion. Utilization of metaphors in political discourse is mainly "a performance of persuasive discourse" (Charteris-Black 2004: 13 as cited in Candel 2005: 16).

In agenda-setting theory (McCombs 2009) alludes to an intended emphasizing of those components of an issue that are considered as essential by an actor, or those definitions and viewpoints of the issue which are strategically beneficial, particularly using media (e.g. McCombs, 2009: 133). utilization of Metaphors is one of persuasion methods. "By shedding lights on some characteristics, and ignoring others, conceptual metaphors of media discourses are claimed to 'frame cognitive models which regulate ideas and activities'" (Gozzi 1999: 10 as in Chaban et al. 2007 : 88).

Strategic framing generally functions with direct intended relation of source and target concepts, thus generating metaphors which can be used to make a specific socio-political topic critical or, alternatively, to depict the utterance as an agent capable of handling the perceived problem. Theoretical cases include conceptual frames such as Terrorism is a disease and Candidate is cure; or Political rivals are criminals and Candidates are guardians, etc. Metaphor may represent a vital part in addressing a voter since it can be used as a shortcut for conveying a message through utilization of concepts familiar to the voter.

3.7 Analyzing Metaphors in Political Discourse:

Metaphors have significant impact on cognitive perception, and have the power to influence individuals' opinions or thoughts and change their viewpoints. Metaphors share a vital rule in influencing individuals' political views because politics is closely connected to ideology (Lesz 2011: 21).

In metaphor, the relationships between the concentration and the frame can be very explicit and clear, but they can also be very complicated and strong in affecting individuals' views. In organizing our perception of a certain topic, metaphor suggests a viewpoint on this topic and thus creates a context for handling it (Burkholder & Henry 2009: 100). Therefore, using metaphors in political speeches can influence not only the individuals'

convictions, but a nations' convictions (Burkholder & Henry2009: 111).

As metaphor influences the way we think and accordingly act, its cognitive function is of a great significance to political discourse. Politics deals with complex issues that are sometimes hard to handle. In general, metaphor is an essential and a frequently applied figure of speech in political discourse: it assists people in comprehending complex thoughts and ideas, and it functions as a persuasive device as well (Burkholder & Henry 2009: 100).

Therefore, metaphor, as a tool, can be utilized in comprehending politics through comparing difficult political issues in the focus with simple and understandable things in the frame. Additionally, it can sort unessential information or rearrange it in a more accessible method in order to convey only the essence of the message (Burkholder & Henry 2009: 100).

Metaphor can also strengthen a message or make a speech more notable, as well as excite emotional response. The method in which a metaphor conveys an emotional feeling can be illustrated by calling a political leader “a Hitler”. The feelings aroused by this expression have an impact on how the national leader is perceived. The method in which a political leader could influence individuals' feelings is one of the major reasons why they use metaphors in their speeches.

Martin Luther King Jr's "I have a dream"-speech and the speech of "thousand points of light" of George W. Bush, and the speech of Winston Churchill "Iron Curtain" were some of the most tremendous discourses based on inspiring potential supporters through metaphorical use (Mio et al. 2005: 288).

The frequent use of metaphor in political speeches seems to inspire supporters and arouses feelings connected with the issues while at the same time addressing what measures should be taken (Mio et al. 2005: 288). As per an investigation carried by Mio et al. (2005) on the charisma of the American President, the more charismatic presidents were those who used metaphors widely in their inaugural speech. Speeches including a lot of metaphors were more inspirational, from which can be deduced that metaphor functions as an inspirational figure of speech. It is also significant to use body language in expressing feelings and it can strengthen the reliability of political figure as well.

Charteris-Black (2011, p. 28) asserts that metaphors in political discourse are commonly used for ideological tasks since they activate unconscious emotional associations, and therefore, contribute in myth creation and telling the right story. As he proceeds (2011, p. 32), the major purpose of using metaphors in political discourse is to shape our viewpoint of political issues through eliminating alternative views. Consequently, politicians'

usage of metaphors for self-representation positively and for presentation of attacking their political rivals' thoughts.

Numerous political issues are complicated and abstract for voters to comprehend properly; subsequently, metaphors can function in helping them understand abstract and conceptual entities through more concrete ones (Mio, 1997). Moreover, politicians need to demonstrate that besides comprehending complex problems, they can handle them. Through applying experienced and concrete to abstract thoughts, they use metaphors to make persuasive arguments clearly showing their capacity of thinking rationally (Brukholder & Henry, 2009). However, bearing in mind the characteristics of metaphors and numerous possible interpretations, voters may attribute their own meanings to them either positively or negatively. Therefore, the metaphor choice made by politicians may differ in accordance with the context and audience, and which one requires to be focused on while delivering political speeches.

When analyzing and investigating metaphors, one needs to ignore the intentions of a speaker since metaphors can be manipulative (Rozina & Karapetjana, 2009) but are more commonly persuasive. Van Dijk (2006) differentiates between manipulation, persuasiveness and the consequences as follows:

“(. . .) in persuasiveness speakers are free to behave or believe whatever they deem fit, depending on whether or not they accept the arguments of the speaker, whilst in manipulation the audience are typically assigned a more negative side: they are the manipulation's victims. This negative consequence of manipulation appears when the audience are unable to comprehend the real intents or to see the complete consequences of the beliefs or actions advocated by the manipulator. This may be the case especially when the audience lack the knowledge needed to counter manipulation.” (p. 361)

Considering the features of metaphors, a speaker takes advantages of the language's associative power attempting to arouse emotional responses, thus demonstrating the metaphors' persuasive power.

3.8 The Corpus:

The initial step of this thesis was to build appropriate corpus that meet the requirements of the research questions. The aim of this study is to investigate and analyze the usage of metaphors in the President Barack Obama's State of the Union Speeches. The corpus of this study includes the four speeches delivered by Obama in his midterm, during the years 2009-2012. All the four speeches were taken from the internet, as both the video forms and the transcripts are accessible online on the White House's website: <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/briefing-room/speeches->

and-remarks. The analyzed speeches are also available, in both transcripts and video formats, in the DVD disc attached to this dissertation. The speeches are organized and categorized chronologically, but the analysis is arranged in accordance with the source domains of the conceptual metaphors.

In order to present usage of the individual conceptual metaphors and metaphorical expressions in an appropriate way, we have to take into account the different occasions and various circumstances in which these speeches were delivered.

In state of the union speeches president Obama discussed various issues: debt, deficit reduction, economic issues, US foreign policy, healthcare issues, American's efforts in countering terrorism, and terrorist attacks inside and outside the US border, etc.

Once the corpus is shaped, the first objective will be to discover, classify, and then explain and analyze the conceptual metaphors used in the selected speeches through usage of the Charteris-Black (2004) theoretical framework (see clarification in full details below). This dissertation doesn't analyze exhaustively all metaphors produced by Obama in his state of the union speeches during his midterm, but rather it investigates and analyzes the recurrent metaphors used in the said four speeches.

3.9 Methodology and Procedures of Metaphor Identification:

Metaphor identification can be very challenging, because you it is not always easy to spot them in the text. Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) begins with examining words and phrases precisely and then, determining what can represents a metaphor in the context. The Pragglejaz group, has developed “an explicit, authentic, and flexible method for identification of metaphors employed in a spoken or written language” (2007, p. 2). in spite of the fact that the said group realizes that words and phrases can differ in the level of expressing metaphoric language, they propose the strategy, as contended by the researchers, can reliably decide whether the words and phrases in a given context are metaphorical or not. The Pragglejaz group utilized The Online Macmillan Dictionary as a primary reference to assess and determine whether there is a metaphorical use of the word or not. Basically, Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) consists of the following four steps:

1. Examine the whole text/speech to establish an extensive comprehension of the meaning.
2. State the lexical units in the text/speech.
- 3.

A- For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning) with considering what proceeds or follows the lexical unit.

B- For each lexical unit, decide whether it has more basic contemporaneous meaning in other contexts than the meaning within the given context. Basic meanings resort to be: more specific: what they evoke can be imagined, seen, heard, felt, and tasted easily. - More accurate (not ambiguous) - Historically older. The basic meaning must not necessarily be the most recurrent meanings of the lexical unit.

C- Should the lexical unit comes with additional main contemporaneous meaning in other contexts, determine whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the main meaning but can be comprehended in comparison with it.

4. Upon getting "yes" for all the above-mentioned steps, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical (Pragglejaz, 2007, p. 3).

Steen et al., based on Pragglejaz group steps, recommends MIPVU: as manual for the identification of metaphorical words and phrases aiming to “determine all lexical units in the text/speech that could be relevant to cross-domain mappings in conceptual structure, not the metaphorically employed words, like the case in MIP” (2010, p. 102). MIPVU is considered to be an improved form of MIP because it includes extra points in the process of identifying metaphors:

A. Determine the metaphor-related words through studying the text word-by-word.

B. When words are utilized indirectly, and this utilization may potentially be explained by some type of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning of that word, determine the words as "metaphorically used" (MRW: indirect).

C. When words are utilized directly, and this utilization may potentially be explained by some type of cross-domain mapping to a more basic referent or topic in the text, determine the word as "direct metaphor" (MRW: direct).

D. When words are utilized in lexico-grammatical substitutions, as in the case of third-person pronouns, or when ellipsis happens where words may be seen as missing, as in some shapes of coordination, and when direct or indirect meanings are transferred by these substitutions or ellipses that may potentially be explained by some shapes of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning, referent, or subject, mark it as "implicit metaphor" (MRW: implicit).

E. When words work as a signal that a cross-domain mapping may be at play, decide it as a "metaphor flag" (MFlag). (Steen et al., 2010, pp. 103 - 104).

The following example of analyzing one of Barak Obama's speeches , represents a practical clarification for the above-mentioned steps: "And we have shown that our economy doesn't have to be a zero-

sum game. Last year, incomes rose for all races, all age groups, for men and for women”.

1- In the above-mentioned example, Barack Obama portrays America's economy by comparing it to a game/ sports.

2- According to Macmillan Dictionary Online the basic meaning of a zero-sum game is “a situation in which one person can win only what another person loses” and are practiced in both game and economic theory.

3- Contextual meaning and basic meaning are consistent, Obama uses the phrase while mapping it to economy, which is one of the common usages-, “mapped to a more basic referent or topic in the text (MRW: direct)” (Steen et al., 2010).

4- Therefore, the phrase is metaphorical in nature, evoking the metaphor ECONOMY IS A GAME in the audience.

5- As sports/game metaphors in politics are widely recurrent and are also highly utilized in everyday language (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980), the previous metaphor used by Obama is conventional in nature.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis

4. Data Analysis:

This section will study only three types of metaphors used in state of the union speeches delivered by Obama during his midterm. These types are: War, creation and construction, and Journey metaphors.

4.1 First: War Metaphors:

The conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR is deeply rooted in people's minds, which might be the reason for its frequent usage in political speeches especially in countries that led war(s) at some point in the past. If we want to summarize the concept of politics in a single word, the most appropriate word would be power, the same as with the concept of war, hence there is a grounding for the metaphorical mapping. War metaphors are frequently employed by politicians because they want to stress that in addition to achieving social goals, personal sacrifice and struggle are vital. Hence, war metaphors play an important role in evaluating social goals. In addition, politicians, political elections, political strategies and outcomes of politics are frequently conceptualized as soldiers, battles, war strategies and outcomes of war some of which will be elaborated on in the following paragraphs.

In his state of the Union addresses, Obama used many metaphorical expressions show the pattern WAR. He used this type of war metaphor in his speeches to help his audience well

understand how concrete source domain "War" is mapped onto the abstract target domain "Politics". So he used words as: **tactic, win, defeat, fight, battle, battleground**, etc., form a systematic way of talking about the aspects of politics. Winning a political election can be comprehended via the concept of winning a war. Fighting for votes can be understood through the concept of fighting for territory or treasure in a war. This result is supported by Lakoff and Johnson who summarize that metaphorical expressions in our language are tied to metaphorical concepts in a systematic way and people can use metaphorical linguistic expressions to understand the metaphorical concepts (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 7). The following examples are taken from state of the Union Speeches showing this type of metaphor:

Example(1):

"And the lobbyists are trying to kill it. But we cannot let them win this fight."(State of the Union Speech: 2010).

In Example(1), the phrases "kill it" and "win the fight" represent as source domain and the word lobbyists conducts as target domain. Politic is always structured as fight and war. In the concept of fight or war, a person can be a winner or a loser. Many political things in politics are structured by the concept of war.

There is no physical battle, but there is a verbal battle that involves attack and defense.

By using this metaphor, Obama reveals that the strategies he plans to enforce could be killed by the lobbyists, however, he promises that he will overcome the difficulties to carry on these strategies for the economy recovery.

Example (2):

"We have gone from a bystander to a leader in the fight against climate change. We are helping developing countries to feed themselves, and continuing the fight against HIV/AIDS".(State of the Union Speech: 2010)

The war term "fight against" in the previous example conveys such a meaning to us that the struggle between human body and physical disease is like a war. Maintaining a good mental health is a good way to strike or battle against the disease

Below are more examples made by Obama in the same context of making health care reforms using terms such as "fight", re-fighting":

Example(3):

"So instead of re-fighting the battles of the last two years, let's fix what needs fixing and move forward."(State of the Union Speech: 2011).

Example(4):

"Rather than fight the same tired battles that have dominated Washington for decades, it's time to try something new."(State of the Union Speech: 2010).

Once the war starts, there will be inevitably "sacrifice". And in order to win a battle, people may get injured, or even lose their lives. However, in Obama's State of the Union Speeches this type of war metaphor show that as fighters, both – Democrats and Republicans – are required to sacrifice during recession. The following example illustrates this type of metaphor:

Example(5):

"Given these realities, everyone in this chamber – Democrats and Republicans – will have to sacrifice some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars. And that includes me."(State of the Union Speech: 2009).

Being engaged in a war means facing different types of enemies. These enemies can cause disorders to the country, destroy the country's economy and affect the society's stability, peace and freedom, thus affecting the nation's daily life and future. As shown in the following examples, Obama, cleverly, used this type of war metaphors In his state of the Union speeches:

Example(6):

"It [Obama's recovery plan] will launch a new effort to conquer a disease that has touched the life of nearly every American by seeking a cure for cancer in our time."(State of the Union Speech: 2009).

In the previous example, Obama is talking about his recovery plan which includes finding a cure for cancer through (investing in electronic health records and new technology that will reduce errors, bring down costs, ensure privacy, and save lives).

Example(7):

"... and combating the corruption that can rot a society and rob people of opportunity. effort to conquer a disease."(State of the Union Speech: 2011).

By using this type of war metaphor in his speeches, Obama is trying to inform the American people that they are helping and (standing with those who take responsibility – helping farmers grow more food; supporting doctors who care for the sick). He is also attempting to urge them to be united in their fight against "corruption" inform them that because its a great danger on the whole nation.

Example(8):

*"let's at least agree to stop expelling responsible young people who want to staff our labs, start new businesses, and defend this country."
(State of the Union Speech: 2012).*

In the previous example, Obama, during speaking about immigration reforms, used "defend this country" in order to convince the American People and gain their support so to pass his immigration reforms.

Example(9):

"Our freedom endures because of the men and women in uniform who defend it."(State of the Union Speech: 2012).

Example(10):

"To overcome extremism, we must also be vigilant in upholding the values our troops defend."(State of the Union Speech: 2009).

From the previous two examples, we can notice that the concept of a political election can be conceptualized through the concept of a war, which is grounded in people's experience. When preparing a political campaign, both financial and human resources are used as well as when preparing a war as shown in the first example. Additionally, a competition between political parties and politicians in a political election can be conceptualized as a battle between nations and soldiers in a war.

Example(11):

"What is required now is for this country to pull together, confront boldly the challenges we face, and take responsibility for our future once more." (State of the Union Speech: 2009).

Undoubtedly, this is a powerful metaphor for illustrating the need for unity and collaborative effort needed to recover from the economic recession. It also emphasizes the role of the president as

a strong and decisive commander-in-chief and is likely to appeal to more conservative Americans.

Example(12):

"Some of what's broken has to do with the way Congress does its business these days. A simple majority is no longer enough to get anything, even routine business, passed through the Senate. Neither party has been blameless in these tactics." (State of the Union Speech: 2012).

From the previous example, different kinds of strategies are utilized by the parties in order to win a battle. Undoubtedly, the politicians often adopt all the strategies they can think out to win the election.

Example(13):

"Now let's be clear – I did not choose to tackle this issue to get some legislative victory under my belt." (State of the Union Speech: 2010).

In the previous example, Obama, skillfully, used this type of war metaphor "victory in a war" to achieve success in passing his health care reforms.

4.2 Second: Construction metaphors:

Construction metaphors show that something is being created or constructed. Everything that is being planned, turned into or (re)formed signifies a creation. Moreover, this type of metaphor can also denote the economy or society as a building that needs solid foundations, or a framework needs to be stabilized.

This type of metaphor is quite positive, for it makes politicians look as the architects who have good plans or who are intending to build up something new. The concept of "building" is commonly used by political leaders in their discourse, either literally or metaphorically. Construction metaphor mainly aims at oversimplifying complex issues through using explicit verbs like "create", "plan", "form" or "build". These issues are more easily understandable by the public.

In his state of the Union Addresses, Obama, skillfully used construction metaphors. The words '*build*', '*built*', '*re-built*', or '*building*' are used many times in his speeches to refer either to the economy or clean energy as in the following examples:

Example(14):

"A strong, healthy financial market makes it possible for businesses to access credit and create new jobs." (State of the Union Speech: 2010)

Example(15):

"In the last 22 months, businesses have created more than three million jobs."(State of the Union Speech: 2012)

Example(16):

*"And with our friends and allies, we will **forge** a new and comprehensive strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan to defeat al Qaeda and combat extremism."*(State of the Union Speech: 2009)

It is obvious that all of the previous creation and construction metaphors are used while addressing economic issues.

As mentioned before, "building" metaphors involve the process of mapping between the conceptual domain of building a physical entity, e.g. building apartment, onto the conceptual domain of "creating", or building abstract things, e.g. building army, consensus or future. The subjects that follows verbs like "to build" can come in various levels of abstractness, from "building clean energy facilities" to "building partnerships". The following examples emphasize this type of metaphor:

Example(17):

"We should put more Americans to work building clean energy facilities."(State of the Union Speech: 2009).

Example(18):

"They're [China, Germany and India]rebuilding their infrastructure. They are making serious investments in clean energy because they want those jobs."(State of the Union Speech: 2010)

In the first example Obama urged the American people to cooperating in creating and establishing "clean energy facilities". The second example came in the same context "economic issues" and challenges and obstacles that to be faced because of the American political system, while other nations like "India, china, and Germany" are not standing still; instead they are working hard to revamp their economy.

Example(19):

"So much of America needs to be rebuilt."(State of the Union Speech: 2012).

Example(20):

"That's an America built to last."(State of the Union Speech: 2012).

In the last two examples, Obama uses the verbs "build" and "rebuild" to refer to the American nation. Such types of metaphors are quite common in American political discourse; they emphasize

essential theme of American mythology of creation as it is related to the Frontier myth of building a civilization out of the wilderness.

It is also common that politicians talk of governmental progress as building a new structure. The following examples are made by Obama to describe the need to have a strong and solid new foundation for the society:

Example(21):

"Now is the time to act boldly and wisely – to not only revive this economy, but to build a new foundation for lasting prosperity." (State of the Union Speech: 2009)

Example(22):

"That is the foundation on which the American people expect us to build common ground." (State of the Union Speech: 2009).

It is also a brilliant method to explain the need for collaborative work – building requires a hard-working team of people to function under the supervision of an architect (the U.S President) who designs the blueprint. Obama makes this point completely explicit through the following examples:

Example(23):

"No one built this country on their own. This nation is great because we built it together."(State of the Union Speech: 2012).

The previous type of construction metaphor can be opposed to bad constructions:

Example(24):

"On the day I took office, our auto industry was on the verge of collapse."(State of the Union Speech: 2012).

Example(25):

"Nothing will get done this year, or next year, or maybe even the year after that, because Washington is broken."(State of the Union Speech: 2012).

Example(26):

"Rules to prevent financial fraud or toxic dumping or faulty medical devices don't destroy the free market."(State of the Union Speech: 2012).

Another form of construction is to plan properly. In the following example, Obama used the term 'blueprint', while addressing economic issues, he spoke directly to the need to create more high-wage jobs. The following metaphorical usage shows this type of metaphor:

Example(27):

"I want to speak about how we move forward, and lay out a blueprint for an economy that's built to last."(State of the Union Speech: 2012).

In this example, Obama, and through using the phrase " lay out a blueprint", emphasizes the Americans' need to follow certain rules and have plans in order to achieve long-lasting economic growth.

4.3 Third: Journey Metaphors:

According to Charteris-Black (2011, p. 66), JOURNEY metaphors were introduced to cognitive linguistics by Lakoff & Johnson in their book *Metaphors we live by* (1980). Charteris-Black (2004) suggests that social purposes can be regarded as destinations in JOURNEY metaphors. (p. 74). JOURNEY metaphors include required elements and optional ones. According to Charteris-Black, the required elements can be: start, point, path and entities moving along the path (2011, p.66). The optional elements can be: mode of travel, guides, companions, and so on (Charteris-Black, 2011. pp. 66-67).

Thus, journey metaphors are responding to emotions since the presentation of events can function as an encouragement. It also has an oversimplifying purpose, for example when representing the crisis as a deviation from the main road.

In State of the Union Speeches, America is often personalized as a traveler who walks together with its people in achieving their goals. And accordingly, they are unified in their journey in moving forward together. So, in the conceptual metaphor **AMERICA OR AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE TRAVELERS**, the source domain (travelers) is mapped onto the target domain (America or American People).

The following examples reveals Obama's usage of journey metaphors in state of the union speeches:

Example(28):

"As long as we maintain our common resolve, our journeymoves forward, and our future is hopeful, and the state of our Union will always be strong."(State of the Union Speech: 2012)

Example(29):

"Our journey goes forward, and the state of our union is strong."(State of the Union Speech: 2011).

Example(30):

"As long as we're joined in common purpose, as long as we maintain our common resolve, our journey moves forward, our future is hopeful, and the state of our Union will always be strong." (State of the Union Speech: 2012).

In the above-mentioned examples, Obama, skillfully, compares the American life to a journey. This comparison enables his listeners to comprehend the required time for things to change in the United States. This kind of metaphor is one of the most powerful metaphors in political discourse, because it is used for convincing the listeners that this (Journey) requires patience and time.

In a same context, Obama used terms like "turn back", "goes forward", "walk away", and "move forward" as indicated in the following examples:

Example(31):

"The state of our Union is getting stronger, and we've come too far to turn back now." (State of the Union Speech: 2012)

Example(32):

"Our journey goes forward, and the state of our union is strong." (State of the Union Speech: 2011).

Example(33):

"I will not walk away from these Americans, and neither should the people in this chamber." (State of the Union Speech: 2012).

Example(34):

"We are instead called to move forward with the sense of confidence and candor that serious times demand." (State of the Union Speech: 2009).

Example(35):

"America prevailed because we chose to move forward as one nation, and one people." (State of the Union Speech: 2010).

In the previous examples, Obama uses this type of journey metaphors in his state of the Union Speeches and presents America and the America People as travelers. the main purpose of using such kind of metaphor is to call on people to participate actively and effectively in this "journey" to contribute in developing the USA. We can clearly notice that the last two examples were made by Obama to address the American economic recession (2009), in which the American economy was badly weakened: Jobs shed and businesses shuttered. Obama concentrated on this issue and address it many times in his speeches. He used this type of metaphor to attract his audience's attention and to encourage them not to give up and face this challenge.

During this journey, one follows a *course, path* or *takes steps* in a specific *direction*. On such journey, one can *move forward*,

*continuemoving and be on track, but one can also move backward, be held back.*This can be shown in the following examples:

Example(36):

"That is the leadership that we are providing – engagement that advances the common security and prosperity of all people."(State of the Union Speech: 2010).

Example(37):

"And we are on track to add another one and a half million jobs to this total by the end of the year." (State of the Union Speech: 2010).

Example(38):

"With the bipartisan trade agreementsI signed into law, we are on track to meet that goal ahead of schedule."(State of the Union Speech: 2012).

Similarly, Obama made some relevant metaphors in the same context using, in addition to the previous terms, other words like "go back", and "back down", as shown in the following examples:

Example(39):

"We will move forward together, or not at all – for the challenges we face are bigger than party, and bigger than politics."(State of the Union Speech: 2011).

Example(40):

"We will not go back" to "I will not walk away" and "I will not back down from". (State of the Union Speech: 2012)

Obama also used metaphors to argue that there are those who would see the path altered or progress stopped altogether. He used terms as "put on hold", "wait", "stand still, as shown in the following example:

Example(41):

"Given these facts, we can no longer afford to put health care reform on hold." (State of the Union Speech: 2009).

Example(42):

"I've been told that our political system is too gridlocked and that we should just put things on hold [...] for a while. For those who make these claims, I have one simple question: How long should we wait? How long should America put its future on hold?" (State of the Union Speech: 2010).

In the above-mentioned examples, the lack of concerted effort is seen as an unnecessary and unacceptable interruption in the progress. In effect, those who would deviate from the "pathway" utilize the lack of movement in the journey "the Nation's Progress"

to justify a further lack of movement, thus putting the goal of the journey at risk.

Example(43):

"You see, Washington has been telling us to wait [...] for decades, even as the problems have grown worse. Meanwhile, China's not waiting to revamp its economy. Germany's not waiting. India's not waiting. These nations are ... not standing still". (State of the Union Speech: 2010)

As indicated in the above-mentioned example, Obama is comparing the American respond to the "Economic Recession" with the respond of all nations, stating that: failure to "move forward" means being lagging behind.

In the same context, Obama used again this type of metaphor in discussing trade, as indicated in the following example:

Example(44):

"We have to seek [...] new markets aggressively, just as our competitors are. If America sits on the sidelines [...] while other nations sign trade deals, we will lose the chance to create jobs on our shore." (State of the Union Speech: 2010)

From the previous example, we can notice that Obama is considering "sitting on the sideline" without taking the proper

action as a loss. So, according to the message he is trying to deliver, the success of the journey is not assured, and instead, must be won from others that are actively seeking the same goal.

During this "journey" *obstruction*, interruptions and obstacles in the nation's progress are considered as a threat; deviations from the "path" of the journey must should not be allowed.

Obama considered issues that would disrupt or slow the progress of the "journey" as "obstacles", or "weight.". in order to address these type of obstacles, he used terms as "obstruct" and "burden" as shown in the following examples:

Example(45):

"Neither party should delay or obstruct every single bill just because they can."(State of the Union Speech: 2010)

In the previous example, Obama used this type of metaphor to encourage the two main parties in the USA to work together in getting rid of the obstacles that might face passing bills.

In other examples connected to the financial crisis, Obama used metaphorical expression using term "path" in order to find a way in dealing with the obstacles that delay the economic growth.

Example(46):

"That is why this budget creates new incentives for teacher performance; pathways for advancement, and rewards for success."(State of the Union Speech: 2009).

Example(47):

"I'm also calling on Congress to continue down the path of earmark reform." (State of the Union Speech: 2010).

Many other political and social elements that might slow the progress were described as having weight that could "burden" people. As shown in the following example:

Example(48):

"This recession has also compounded the burdens [emphasis added] that America's families have been dealing with for decades: the burden of working harder and longer for less, of being unable to save enough to retire or help kids with college."(State of the Union Speech: 2010).

In the previous example, Obama argues that the same burdens that slowing the country's progress are affecting the American people. This type of metaphors provides valuable insight into Obama's political view, particularly his view on the government's role.

Chapter Five

Conclusion and Recommendations

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study aimed at investigating and analyzing metaphors made by Obama in his State of the Union Addresses from the perspective of cognitive linguistics.

The State of the Union speeches are not ordinary speeches, therefore, this type of presidential addresses is a fundamental statement of how a president addresses current policy debates, and; is the one of the presidential speeches that the American people are most likely to hear every year. So, State of the Union speech is one of the most significant addresses in the American political discourse. US President take advantages of state of the union speech to publicize his basic political principles and policies as well as addressing internal and external issues. Thus, this type of speeches has a vital role in the president's political life. In order to make clear to the public the political views and stands of the new government, metaphors are often adopted by the politicians in their discourse to make their speeches powerful and more convincing.

This study has analyzed political metaphors used in four state of the union speeches made by Barack Obama in his midterm. Applying the conceptual metaphor theory proposed by Lakoff and Johnson.

From analyzing metaphors used in state of the union speeches we can notice that the source domains of these metaphors are closely

relevant to people's daily life and experience, which make the most complicated political discourse understandable for public, thus together playing a vital convincing role through arousing strong emotional responses. Moreover, the utilization of metaphors in state of the union speeches reflect three main functions of: simplification, persuasion and motivation.

This dissertation examined and analyzed metaphors used in State of the Union Addresses from the perspective of cognitive linguistics. Through the detailed study and analysis, it can be concluded that metaphors are widely used in Obama's political discourse. It investigates the functions of these metaphors in specific contexts to uncover the hidden meanings beyond the Obama's usage of these metaphors; and to provide those English-learners and students who are not well informed of metaphors and figurative language with special techniques used in political discourse to make speeches more powerful.

The current study concentrated only on the most common metaphors that appear in Obama's State of the Union Addresses. There are also other metaphors like nature metaphors, story metaphors, light metaphors and many other types, which can be investigated in the future with more research fields.

After studying and analyzing Obama's political discourse from the theoretical basis of metaphor usages, this dissertation pinpointed the most used metaphors in his state of the union speeches. Obama

tends to use metaphors in order to make his words more convincing and powerful. Moreover, he utilized many kinds of metaphors to replace something abstract for those common and understandable in order to express his thoughts in a more vivid and visual manner.

The key finding of this study is: there are many aspects and limitations needed to be pointed out through studying State of the Union Speeches. It is recommended to classify, investigate and analyze Obama's political discourse in general.

In general, there are many ways, for further study, of making an analysis in Obama's State of the Union Speeches such as finding and analyzing other metaphors and rhetorical devices not mentioned in this dissertation.

Bibliography

Bibliography

- Alexander Spencer (2012) 'The Social Construction of Terrorism: Media, Metaphor and Policy Implications', Journal of International Relations and Development, Vol. 15, No. 3
- Aristotle (2012). Rhetoric. (W. R. Roberts, Trans.). New York, NY: Dover.
- article entitled "Metaphor, Morality, and Politics" (<http://www.wwcd.org/issues/Lakoff.html>)
- Beard, A. (2000). Language of Politics. London: Routledge, 27.
- Boroditsky, L. (2001). Does language shape thought? English and Mandarin speakers' conceptions of time. Cognitive Psychology, 43
- Burkholder, T. R. & Henry, D. (2009). Criticism of Metaphor. In J.A. Kuypers (Ed.). Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 97-114.
- Cacciari, C., & Glucksberg, S. (1994). Understanding figurative language. In M. A. Gernsbacher (Ed.), Handbook of psycholinguistics. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Cambell, C. (2014, May 29). Obama Can't Stop Using Sports Metaphors To Explain Foreign: Policy. Business Insider. Retrieved from: <http://www.businessinsider.com/obama-foreign-policy-sports-metaphors-20145?international=true&r=US&IR=T>

- Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2006). The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4),
- Cameron, L. (2008). Metaphor shifting in the dynamics of talk. In *Confronting metaphor in use: An applied linguistic approach*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cameron, L., Maslen, R., Todd, Z., Maule, J., Stratton, P., & Stanley, N. (2009). The discourse dynamics approach to metaphor and metaphor-led discourse analysis. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 24(2),
- Carver, Terrell and Pikalo, Jernej (eds), (2007), *Politics, Language and Metaphor*, London: Routledge.
- Casasanto, D. and Boroditsky, L. (2008) Time in the mind: Using space to think about time. *Cognition* 106
- Chaban, N., Bain, J. & Stats, K. (2007a), “‘Frenemies’?: Images of the US–EU Relations in Asia-Pacific Media’, *Critical Policy Analysis*, vol. 1, no. 1.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan (2007) *The communication of leadership: the design of leadership style*. Oxford and New York: Routledge
- Cirugeda, I. L. & Ruiz R. S. (2013). Persuasive Rhetoric in Barack Obama's Immigration Speech: Pre- and Post- Electoral Strategies. In *Journal of Camino Real*, 5(8).
- Coe, K. & Neumann, R. (2011). The major addresses of modern presidents: Parameters of a data set. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 41,
- Corradi Fiumara, G. (1995). *The Metaphoric Process: Connections Between Language and Life*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Crick, N. (2014). *Rhetorical Public Speaking*. Louisiana, USA: Pearson.
- Edwards, J.A. (2008). *Navigating the post-Cold War world: President Clinton's foreign policy rhetoric*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. In *Journal of Communication*, 43(4).

- Escudero, M. P. G. (2011). Barack Obama's Inaugural Address: Metaphor and Values as Captivating Strategies to Celebrate a Presidency. In *Pragmalinguistica*.
- Falk, A. (2010). *The Riddle of Barack Obama*. Santa Barbara, California: Greenwood Publishing Group .
- Fauconnier. G. & M. Turner. 2002. *The Way We think*. New York Basic Books.
- G. N. Leech and M. H. Short (1981), *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*, London: Longman (2nd edition, 2007)
- Gary Blake and Robert W. Bly, *The Elements of Technical Writing*, pg. 71. New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1993. ISBN 0020130856
- Gibbs Jr., R. W. (2006a) Metaphor interpretation as embodied simulation. *Mind and Language* 21.
- Gibbs Jr., R. W. (2006b) *Embodiment and cognitive science* Cambridge University Press , Cambridge, UK
- Gibbs, R. W. (1993). Why idioms are not dead metaphors. In C. Cacciari & P. Tabossi (Eds.), *Idioms: Processing, structure and interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gibbs, R. W., & O'Brien, J. E. (1990). Idioms and mental imagery: The metaphorical motivation for idiomatic meaning. *Cognition*, 36.

- Gibbs, R., Tendahl, M., & Okonski, L. (2011). Inferring pragmatic messages from metaphor. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 7(1),
- Gibbs, Raymond, 2006a. *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Gibbs, Raymond, Tendahl, Markus, 2006. Cognitive effort and effects in metaphor comprehension: relevance theory and psycholinguistics. *Mind & Language* 21,
- Goatly, A. (1997). *The Language of Metaphors*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Goffman E. (1986). *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston :Northeastern University Press .
- Gove. (1981). *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*. The USA: G. & C. Merriam, 01.
- Gozzi, R. Jr. (1999). *The power of metaphor in the age of electronic media*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Greene, R. (2011, November 25). Obama is America's Third Greatest Presidential Orator in Modern Era. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/richard-greene/obama-is-americas-3rdgre_b_813868.html
- Gunawan, S. (2010). Style of Obama's Inaugural Speech. In *K@ta*, 12 (1).

- Habermas, J. 1987 The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. Two, Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason, Boston, Beacon Press.
- <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/briefing-room/speeches-and-remarks>
- Hülse, R., & Spencer, A. (2008). The metaphor of terror: Terrorism studies and the constructivist turn. Security Dialogue, 39(6), 571-592. Retrieved April 19, 2015, from: <http://sdi.sagepub.com/content/39/6/571.full.pdf.html>
- Ilie, C. (2006). Rhetoric. In Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics. Retrieved from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/2048/science/referenceworks/9780080448541>
- Irugeda, I. & Ruiz, R. (2013). Persuasive Rhetoric in Barack Obama's Immigration Speech: Pre- and Post-Electoral Strategies. Camino Real, 5 (8).
- John Lyons. 1977. Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Katz, A. & Mio, J.S. (Eds.) *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Knowles M., Moon R., 2005, introducing Metaphor. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kövecsec, Z. (2002) *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University press.

- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kusnet, D. (2016, January 12). Obama is the nation's orator-in-chief, and he deserves the title and the accolades. The Guardian. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jan/12/obama-orator-in-chief-he-deserves-title-accolades-final-state-of-the-union-address>
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd ed), 202-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1996) *Moral politics: What conservatives know that liberals don't* University of Chicago Press , Chicago, IL
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors we live by* University of Chicago Press , Chicago, IL
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999) *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought* Basic Books , New York, NY
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. [Updated version, 2002].
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press.

- Leech, G., and M. Short (2007). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Leith, S. (2012). *You 'Talkin' To Me? : Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama*. London, UK : Profile.
- Lesz, B. (2011). *To shape the world for the better: an analysis of metaphors in the speeches of Barack Obama*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Tromsø, Norway.
- Leydesdorff, L. (2001). *A Sociological Theory of Communication: The Self-Organization of the Knowledge-Based Society*. Parkland, FL: Universal Publishers.
- Liu, T. (2007) *The Application of the Conceptual Metaphor to English Political Discourses*. Shanghai: Shanghai international studies university.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (2017). Online edition.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (2017). Online edition <http://www.ldoceonline.com/>
- LUHMANN, Niklas. *Art as a Social System*. Trans. Eva Knodt. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- M. H. A, Geoffrey H. (1981). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Macmillan Dictionary. (2017). Online edition, <http://www.macmillandictionary.com>

- Madsen, L. D. (1998). *American Exceptionalism*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Małgorzata Fabiszak (ed.). *Language and Meaning: Cognitive and Functional Perspectives*. (Polish Studies in English Language and Literature vol. 19.) Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 2007. ISBN 1436-7513.
- MIEDER, W. (2009): "Yes We Can", Barack Obama's Proverbial Rhetoric, New York: Peter Lang.
- Mio, J. S. (1997). Metaphor and Symbol. *Metaphor and Politics*, 12(2).
- Mio, J., Riggio, R., Levin, S., & Reese, R. (2005). Presidential leadership and charisma: The effects of metaphor. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 287–294
- Moore, J.A. & Publantz, J. (1999). *To create a new world? American Presidents and the United Nations*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Müller, F. M. (1877[1864]) *The Science of Language*, 9th edn in 2 vols. London: Longman, Green. Google Scholar.
- Müller, R. (2005). Creative Metaphors in Political Discourse. Theoretical considerations on the basis of Swiss Speeches. *Metaphorik.de* (<http://www.metaphorik.de/09/>).
- N, R. C. (1983). 'Oxford English Dictionary- synecdoche', University of Pennsylvania: 2303-2304.

- Núñez, R., Motz, B., & Teuscher, U. (2006). Time after time: The psychological reality of the ego- and time-reference-point distinction in metaphorical construals of time. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 21,
- Obama, B. H. (2009). State of The Union Address. Retrieved from:
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=85753>
- Obama, B. H. (2010). State of The Union Address. Retrieved from:
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=87433>
- Obama, B. H. (2011). State of The Union Address. Retrieved from:
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=88928>
- Obama, B. H. (2012). State of The Union Address. Retrieved from:
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=99000>
- O'Callaghan, J. (1997). The Problem of Language and Mental Representation in Aristotle and St. Thomas. *The Review of Metaphysics*, 50 (3)
- online magazine "Observer" ("What Makes Obama a Good Speaker?", 2008).
- Orwell 1968:
- Oxford Living Dictionary. (2017). Online edition, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/>

- Pika, J. (2002). *The politics of the presidency*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Pragglejazz Group (2007). "MIP: a method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse". *Metaphor and Symbol* 22: 1-39.
- Quinn N (1991).The Cultural Basis of Metaphor. In: J.W. Fernandez (Ed.) *Beyond Metaphor: The theory of tropes in anthropology*. Stanford, C.A: Stanford University Press.
- Rakova, M. 2002. The philosophy of embodied realism: A high price to pay? *Cognitive Linguistics* 13(3)
- Ramachandran, V.S. (2005). *A Brief Tour of Human Consciousness: From: Impostor Poodles to Purple Numbers*. New York: Pi Press.
- Random, H. (2001). *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language*. Thunder Bay Press: 1509-1510.
- Richard. I.A. (1996) *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford University press.
- Ricoeur, The Rule of Metaphor, trans. by Czerny, R, McLaughlin, K and Costello, J, Toronto and Buffalo, University of Toronto Press, 1975,
- Ritchie, D. L. (2013). *Metaphor: Key Topics in Semantics and Pragmatics*. Cambridge, UK :Cambridge University Press .

- Rkholder, T. R. & Henry, D. (2009). Criticism of Metaphor. In J.A. Kuypers (Ed.), *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action* (pp. 97-114). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Rozina, G., Karapetjana, I. (2009). The Use of Language in Political Rhetoric: Linguistic Manipulation. *SDU Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi: Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*.
- Sabbah, F. (2011). Conceptual metaphors of war in news reports covering the 2003 invasion of Iraq by The New York Times and The Daily Star. Paper presented at Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching, Lancaster. Retrieved April 5, 2015, from <http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/pgconference/v05/Sabbah.pdf>
- Sabbah, F. (2011). Conceptual metaphors of war in news reports covering the 2003 invasion of Iraq by The New York Times and The Daily Star. Paper presented at Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching, Lancaster. Retrieved April 5, 2015, from: <http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/pgconference/v05/Sabbah.pdf>
- Scott Mio J., Albert N. Katz. (1996). *Metaphor. Implications and Applications*. New Jersey :Lawrence Erlbaum Associates .
- Seitz, J. (1997, 1 November). Metaphor, Symbolic Play, and Logical Thought in Early Childhood. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*.

- Seitz, J. (1998, 1 February). Nonverbal Metaphor: a Review of Theories and Evidence. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*.
- Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press .
- Shen, Y. (2006). Figures of Speech. In *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/science/referenceworks/9780080448541>
- Spencer, A. (2012). The social construction of terrorism: Media, metaphors and policy implications. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 15(3), 393-419. Retrieved April 19, 2015, from: http://www.gsi.unimuenchen.de/personen/wiss_mitarbeiter/spencer/publ_spencer/jird_spencer_post_print.pdf
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford, MA: Blackwell.
- Steen, G., A. Dorst, B. Herrmann, A. Kaal, T. Krennmayr and T. Pasma. 2010a. *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Steen, Gerard J., 1999. From linguistic to conceptual metaphor in five steps. In: Gibbs, Raymond W. Jr., Steen,

- Gerard J. (Eds.), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Stone A. D. (1988). *Policy Paradox and Political Reason*. New York: Harper Collins . What makes Obama a Good Speaker? (2008, February 13). Retrieved from : <http://observer.com/2008/02/what-makes-obama-a-good-speaker/>
 - SWEETSER, EVE. 1999. Compositionality and blending: Semantic composition in a cognitively realistic framework. *Cognitive linguistics: foundations, scope, and methodology*, ed . by Theo Janssen and Gisela Redeker, 129-162. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
 - Tenbrink, T.: *Space, time, and the use of language: An investigation of relationships*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin (2007)
 - Tendahl, M. (2009). *A hybrid theory of metaphor: Relevance Theory and Cognitive Linguistics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
 - Tendahl, M., & Gibbs. R.W. (2008). Complementary perspectives on metaphor: *Cognitive Linguistics and Relevance Theory*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40.
 - Tyler, Andrea and Vyvyan Evans. 2003. *The Semantics of English prepositions*, CUP, Cambridge.

- Ungerer, F., and Schmid, H.J. (2001). An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse and Society*, 17(3), 359–83.
- Verdonk, P. (2006). Style. In *Encyclopaedia of Language & Linguistics*. Retrieved from : <http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/science/referenceworks/9780080448541>
- Vertessen, Dieter and Christ'l De Landtsheer (2008). "A metaphorical election style: use of metaphor at election time". In *Political language and metaphor: interpreting and changing the world*, eds. Terrell Carver and Jernej Pikalo. London: Routledge.
- Vestermark I (2007). *Metaphors in Politics, A Study of the Metaphorical Personification of American Political Discourse, An Extended Essay*. Lulea University of Technology and Culture.
- Waggoner, J.E. (1990). Interaction theories of metaphor: psychological perspectives. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 5(2).
- Wei JM (2001). „The Pragmatics of Metaphor in Taiwanese Politics“ In *Virtual Missiles Metaphors and Allusions in*

- Taiwanese Political Campaigns. United States: Lexington Books.
- Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2006). Relevance Theory. In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford, MA: Blackwell.
 - Xue, J., Mao, Z., & Li, N. (2013). Conceptual metaphor in American presidential inaugural addresses. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 3(4), 678-683. Retrieved April 19, 2015, from: <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/viewFile/tpls0304678683/6679>
 - Zhang Li & Hu Mingxia, *The Stylistic Analysis on the data retrieval to Obama's Inaugural Speech* [], *The Journal of Baicheng Normal Institute*, 2009, 04: 48-52.
 - Zheng Lingling, *The Analysis on Obama's Two Inaugural Speeches from the Perspective of Neo-Aristotle's Rhetoric*, [D], An Hui University, 2014.

Appendix

State of the Union Addresses - Barack Obama

February 24, 2009

Madame Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, and the First Lady of the United States:

I've come here tonight not only to address the distinguished men and women in this great chamber, but to speak frankly and directly to the men and women who sent us here.

I know that for many Americans watching right now, the state of our economy is a concern that rises above all others. And rightly so. If you haven't been personally affected by this recession, you probably know someone who has – a friend; a neighbor; a member of your family. You don't need to hear another list of statistics to know that our economy is in crisis, because you live it every day. It's the worry you wake up with and the source of sleepless nights. It's the job you thought you'd retire from but now have lost; the business you built your dreams upon that's now hanging by a thread; the college acceptance letter your child had to put back in the envelope. The impact of this recession is real, and it is everywhere.

But while our economy may be weakened and our confidence shaken; though we are living through difficult and uncertain times, tonight I want every American to know this:

We will rebuild, we will recover, and the United States of America will emerge stronger than before.

The weight of this crisis will not determine the destiny of this nation. The answers to our problems don't lie beyond our reach. They exist in our laboratories and universities; in our fields and our factories; in the imaginations of our entrepreneurs and the pride of the hardest-working people on Earth. Those qualities that have made America the greatest force of progress and prosperity in human history we still possess in ample measure. What is required now is for this country to pull together, confront boldly the challenges we face, and take responsibility for our future once more.

Now, if we're honest with ourselves, we'll admit that for too long, we have not always met these responsibilities – as a government or as a people. I say this not to lay blame or look backwards, but because it is only by understanding how we arrived at this moment that we'll be able to lift ourselves out of this predicament.

The fact is, our economy did not fall into decline overnight. Nor did all of our problems begin when the housing market collapsed or the stock market sank. We have known for decades that our survival depends on finding new sources of energy. Yet we import more oil today than ever before. The cost of health care eats up more and more of our savings each year, yet we keep delaying reform. Our children will compete for jobs in a global economy that too many of our schools do not prepare them for. And though all these

challenges went unsolved, we still managed to spend more money and pile up more debt, both as individuals and through our government, than ever before.

In other words, we have lived through an era where too often, short-term gains were prized over long-term prosperity; where we failed to look beyond the next payment, the next quarter, or the next election. A surplus became an excuse to transfer wealth to the wealthy instead of an opportunity to invest in our future. Regulations were gutted for the sake of a quick profit at the expense of a healthy market. People bought homes they knew they couldn't afford from banks and lenders who pushed those bad loans anyway. And all the while, critical debates and difficult decisions were put off for some other time on some other day.

Well that day of reckoning has arrived, and the time to take charge of our future is here.

Now is the time to act boldly and wisely – to not only revive this economy, but to build a new foundation for lasting prosperity. Now is the time to jumpstart job creation, re-start lending, and invest in areas like energy, health care, and education that will grow our economy, even as we make hard choices to bring our deficit down. That is what my economic agenda is designed to do, and that's what I'd like to talk to you about tonight.

It's an agenda that begins with jobs.

As soon as I took office, I asked this Congress to send me a recovery plan by President's Day that would put people back to work and put money in their pockets. Not because I believe in bigger government – I don't. Not because I'm not mindful of the massive debt we've inherited – I am. I called for action because the failure to do so would have cost more jobs and caused more hardships. In fact, a failure to act would have worsened our long-term deficit by assuring weak economic growth for years. That's why I pushed for quick action. And tonight, I am grateful that this Congress delivered, and pleased to say that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is now law.

Over the next two years, this plan will save or create 3.5 million jobs. More than 90% of these jobs will be in the private sector – jobs rebuilding our roads and bridges; constructing wind turbines and solar panels; laying broadband and expanding mass transit.

Because of this plan, there are teachers who can now keep their jobs and educate our kids. Health care professionals can continue caring for our sick. There are 57 police officers who are still on the streets of Minneapolis tonight because this plan prevented the layoffs their department was about to make.

Because of this plan, 95% of the working households in America will receive a tax cut – a tax cut that you will see in your paychecks beginning on April 1st.

Because of this plan, families who are struggling to pay tuition costs will receive a \$2,500 tax credit for all four years of college. And Americans who have lost their jobs in this recession will be able to receive extended unemployment benefits and continued health care coverage to help them weather this storm.

I know there are some in this chamber and watching at home who are skeptical of whether this plan will work. I understand that skepticism. Here in Washington, we've all seen how quickly good intentions can turn into broken promises and wasteful spending. And with a plan of this scale comes enormous responsibility to get it right.

That is why I have asked Vice President Biden to lead a tough, unprecedented oversight effort – because nobody messes with Joe. I have told each member of my Cabinet as well as mayors and governors across the country that they will be held accountable by me and the American people for every dollar they spend. I have appointed a proven and aggressive Inspector General to ferret out any and all cases of waste and fraud. And we have created a new website called recovery.gov so that every American can find out how and where their money is being spent.

So the recovery plan we passed is the first step in getting our economy back on track. But it is just the first step. Because even if we manage this plan flawlessly, there will be no real recovery unless we clean up the credit crisis that has severely weakened our financial system.

I want to speak plainly and candidly about this issue tonight, because every American should know that it directly affects you and your family's well-being. You should also know that the money you've deposited in banks across the country is safe; your insurance is secure; and you can rely on the continued operation of our financial system. That is not the source of concern.

The concern is that if we do not re-start lending in this country, our recovery will be choked off before it even begins.

You see, the flow of credit is the lifeblood of our economy. The ability to get a loan is how you finance the purchase of everything from a home to a car to a college education; how stores stock their shelves, farms buy equipment, and businesses make payroll.

But credit has stopped flowing the way it should. Too many bad loans from the housing crisis have made their way onto the books of too many banks. With so much debt and so little confidence, these banks are now fearful of lending out any more money to households, to businesses, or to each other. When there is no lending, families can't afford to buy homes or cars. So businesses are forced to make layoffs. Our economy suffers even more, and credit dries up even further.

That is why this administration is moving swiftly and aggressively to break this destructive cycle, restore confidence, and re-start lending.

We will do so in several ways. First, we are creating a new lending fund that represents the largest effort ever to help provide auto loans, college loans, and small business loans to the consumers and entrepreneurs who keep this economy running.

Second, we have launched a housing plan that will help responsible families facing the threat of foreclosure lower their monthly payments and re-finance their mortgages. It's a plan that won't help speculators or that neighbor down the street who bought a house he could never hope to afford, but it will help millions of Americans who are struggling with declining home values – Americans who will now be able to take advantage of the lower interest rates that this plan has already helped bring about. In fact, the average family who re-finances today can save nearly \$2000 per year on their mortgage.

Third, we will act with the full force of the federal government to ensure that the major banks that Americans depend on have enough confidence and enough money to lend even in more difficult times. And when we learn that a major bank has serious problems, we will hold accountable those responsible, force the necessary adjustments, provide the support to clean up their balance sheets, and assure the continuity of a strong, viable institution that can serve our people and our economy.

I understand that on any given day, Wall Street may be more comforted by an approach that gives banks bailouts with no strings attached, and that holds nobody accountable for their reckless decisions. But such an approach won't solve the problem. And our goal is to quicken the day when we re-start lending to the American people and American business and end this crisis once and for all.

I intend to hold these banks fully accountable for the assistance they receive, and this time, they will have to clearly demonstrate how taxpayer dollars result in more lending for the American taxpayer. This time, CEOs won't be able to use taxpayer money to pad their paychecks or buy fancy drapes or disappear on a private jet. Those days are over.

Still, this plan will require significant resources from the federal government – and yes, probably more than we've already set aside. But while the cost of action will be great, I can assure you that the cost of inaction will be far greater, for it could result in an economy that sputters along for not months or years, but perhaps a decade. That would be worse for our deficit, worse for business, worse for you, and worse for the next generation. And I refuse to let that happen.

I understand that when the last administration asked this Congress to provide assistance for struggling banks, Democrats and Republicans alike were infuriated by the mismanagement and results that followed. So were the American taxpayers. So was I.

So I know how unpopular it is to be seen as helping banks right now, especially when everyone is suffering in part from their bad decisions. I promise you – I get it.

But I also know that in a time of crisis, we cannot afford to govern out of anger, or yield to the politics of the moment. My job – our job – is to solve the problem. Our job is to govern with a sense of responsibility. I will not spend a single penny for the purpose of rewarding a single Wall Street executive, but I will do whatever it takes to help the small business that can't pay its workers or the family that has saved and still can't get a mortgage.

That's what this is about. It's not about helping banks – it's about helping people. Because when credit is available again, that young family can finally buy a new home. And then some company will hire workers to build it. And then those workers will have money to spend, and if they can get a loan too, maybe they'll finally buy that car, or open their own business. Investors will return to the market, and American families will see their retirement secured once more. Slowly, but surely, confidence will return, and our economy will recover.

So I ask this Congress to join me in doing whatever proves necessary. Because we cannot consign our nation to an open-ended recession. And to ensure that a crisis of this magnitude never happens again, I ask Congress to move quickly on legislation that will finally reform our outdated regulatory system. It is time to put in place tough, new common-sense rules of the road so that our financial market rewards drive and innovation, and punishes short-cuts and abuse.

The recovery plan and the financial stability plan are the immediate steps we're taking to revive our economy in the short-term. But the only way to fully restore America's economic strength is to make the long-term investments that will lead to new jobs, new industries, and a renewed ability to compete with the rest of the world. The only way this century will be another American century is if we confront at last the price of our dependence on oil and the high cost of health care; the schools that aren't preparing our children and the mountain of debt they stand to inherit. That is our responsibility.

In the next few days, I will submit a budget to Congress. So often, we have come to view these documents as simply numbers on a page or laundry lists of programs. I see this document differently. I see it as a vision for America – as a blueprint for our future.

My budget does not attempt to solve every problem or address every issue. It reflects the stark reality of what we've inherited – a trillion dollar deficit, a financial crisis, and a costly recession.

Given these realities, everyone in this chamber – Democrats and Republicans – will have to sacrifice some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars. And that includes me.

But that does not mean we can afford to ignore our long-term challenges. I reject the view that says our problems will simply take care of themselves; that says government has no role in laying the foundation for our common prosperity.

For history tells a different story. History reminds us that at every moment of economic upheaval and transformation, this nation has responded with bold action and big ideas. In the midst of civil war, we laid railroad tracks from one coast to another that spurred commerce and industry. From the turmoil of the Industrial Revolution came a system of public high schools that prepared our citizens for a new age. In the wake of war and depression, the GI Bill sent a generation to college and created the largest middle-class in history. And a twilight struggle for freedom led to a nation of highways, an American on the moon, and an explosion of technology that still shapes our world.

In each case, government didn't supplant private enterprise; it catalyzed private enterprise. It created the conditions for thousands of entrepreneurs and new businesses to adapt and to thrive.

We are a nation that has seen promise amid peril, and claimed opportunity from ordeal. Now we must be that nation again. That is why, even as it cuts back on the programs we don't need, the budget I submit will invest in the three areas that are absolutely critical to our economic future: energy, health care, and education.

It begins with energy.

We know the country that harnesses the power of clean, renewable energy will lead the 21st century. And yet, it is China that has launched the largest effort in history to make their economy energy efficient. We invented solar technology, but we've fallen behind countries like Germany and Japan in producing it. New plug-in hybrids roll off our assembly lines, but they will run on batteries made in Korea.

Well I do not accept a future where the jobs and industries of tomorrow take root beyond our borders – and I know you don't either. It is time for America to lead again.

Thanks to our recovery plan, we will double this nation's supply of renewable energy in the next three years. We have also made the largest investment in basic research funding in American history – an investment that will spur not only new discoveries in energy, but breakthroughs in medicine, science, and technology.

We will soon lay down thousands of miles of power lines that can carry new energy to cities and towns across this country. And we will put Americans to work making our homes and buildings more efficient so that we can save billions of dollars on our energy bills.

But to truly transform our economy, protect our security, and save our planet from the ravages of climate change, we need to ultimately make clean, renewable energy the profitable kind of energy. So I ask this Congress to send me legislation that places a market-based cap on carbon pollution and drives the production of more renewable energy in America. And to support that innovation, we will invest fifteen billion dollars a year to develop technologies like wind power and solar power; advanced biofuels, clean coal, and more fuel-efficient cars and trucks built right here in America.

As for our auto industry, everyone recognizes that years of bad decision-making and a global recession have pushed our automakers to the brink. We should not, and will not, protect them from their own bad practices. But we are committed to the goal of a re-tooled, re-imagined auto industry that can compete and win. Millions of jobs depend on it. Scores of communities depend on it. And I believe the nation that invented the automobile cannot walk away from it.

None of this will come without cost, nor will it be easy. But this is America. We don't do what's easy. We do what is necessary to move this country forward.

For that same reason, we must also address the crushing cost of health care.

This is a cost that now causes a bankruptcy in America every thirty seconds. By the end of the year, it could cause 1.5 million Americans to lose their homes. In the last eight years, premiums have grown four times faster than wages. And in each of these years, one million more Americans have lost their health insurance. It is one of the major reasons why small businesses close their doors and corporations ship jobs overseas. And it's one of the largest and fastest-growing parts of our budget.

Given these facts, we can no longer afford to put health care reform on hold.

Already, we have done more to advance the cause of health care reform in the last thirty days than we have in the last decade. When it was days old, this Congress passed a law to provide and protect health insurance for eleven million American children whose parents work full-time. Our recovery plan will invest in electronic health records and new technology that will reduce errors, bring down costs, ensure privacy, and save lives. It will launch a new effort to conquer a disease that has touched the life of nearly every American by seeking a cure for cancer in our time. And it makes the largest investment ever in preventive care, because that is one of the best ways to keep our people healthy and our costs under control.

This budget builds on these reforms. It includes an historic commitment to comprehensive health care reform – a down-payment on the principle that we must have quality, affordable health care for every American. It's a commitment that's paid for in part by efficiencies in our system that are long overdue. And it's a step we must take if we hope to bring down our deficit in the years to come.

Now, there will be many different opinions and ideas about how to achieve reform, and that is why I'm bringing together businesses and workers, doctors and health care providers, Democrats and Republicans to begin work on this issue next week.

I suffer no illusions that this will be an easy process. It will be hard. But I also know that nearly a century after Teddy Roosevelt first called for reform, the cost of our health care has weighed down our economy and the conscience of our nation long enough. So let there be no doubt: health care reform cannot wait, it must not wait, and it will not wait another year.

The third challenge we must address is the urgent need to expand the promise of education in America.

In a global economy where the most valuable skill you can sell is your knowledge, a good education is no longer just a pathway to opportunity – it is a pre-requisite.

Right now, three-quarters of the fastest-growing occupations require more than a high school diploma. And yet, just over half of our citizens have that level of education. We have one of the highest high school dropout rates of any industrialized nation. And half of the students who begin college never finish.

This is a prescription for economic decline, because we know the countries that out-teach us today will out-compete us tomorrow. That is why it will be the goal of this administration to ensure that every child has access to a complete and competitive education – from the day they are born to the day they begin a career.

Already, we have made an historic investment in education through the economic recovery plan. We have dramatically expanded early childhood education and will continue to improve its quality, because we know that the most formative learning comes in those first years of life. We have made college affordable for nearly seven million more students. And we have provided the resources necessary to prevent painful cuts and teacher layoffs that would set back our children's progress.

But we know that our schools don't just need more resources. They need more reform. That is why this budget creates new incentives for teacher performance; pathways for advancement, and rewards for success. We'll invest in innovative programs that are already helping schools meet high standards and close achievement gaps. And we will expand our commitment to charter schools.

It is our responsibility as lawmakers and educators to make this system work. But it is the responsibility of every citizen to participate in it. And so tonight, I ask every American to commit to at least one year or more of higher education or career training. This can be community college or a four-year school; vocational training or an apprenticeship. But whatever the training may be, every American will need to get more than a high school diploma. And dropping out of high school is no longer an option. It's not just quitting on yourself, it's quitting on your country – and this country needs and values the talents of every American. That is why we will provide the support necessary for you to complete college and meet a new goal: by 2020, America will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world.

I know that the price of tuition is higher than ever, which is why if you are willing to volunteer in your neighborhood or give back to your community or serve your country, we will make sure that you can afford a higher education. And to encourage a renewed spirit of national service for this and future generations, I ask this Congress to send me the bipartisan legislation that bears the name of Senator Orrin Hatch as well as an American who has never stopped asking what he can do for his country – Senator Edward Kennedy.

These education policies will open the doors of opportunity for our children. But it is up to us to ensure they walk through them. In the end, there is no program or policy that can substitute for a mother or father who

will attend those parent/teacher conferences, or help with homework after dinner, or turn off the TV, put away the video games, and read to their child. I speak to you not just as a President, but as a father when I say that responsibility for our children's education must begin at home.

There is, of course, another responsibility we have to our children. And that is the responsibility to ensure that we do not pass on to them a debt they cannot pay. With the deficit we inherited, the cost of the crisis we face, and the long-term challenges we must meet, it has never been more important to ensure that as our economy recovers, we do what it takes to bring this deficit down.

I'm proud that we passed the recovery plan free of earmarks, and I want to pass a budget next year that ensures that each dollar we spend reflects only our most important national priorities.

Yesterday, I held a fiscal summit where I pledged to cut the deficit in half by the end of my first term in office. My administration has also begun to go line by line through the federal budget in order to eliminate wasteful and ineffective programs. As you can imagine, this is a process that will take some time. But we're starting with the biggest lines. We have already identified two trillion dollars in savings over the next decade.

In this budget, we will end education programs that don't work and end direct payments to large agribusinesses that don't need them. We'll eliminate the no-bid contracts that have wasted billions in Iraq, and reform our defense budget so that we're not paying for Cold War-era weapons systems we don't use. We will root out the waste, fraud, and abuse in our Medicare program that doesn't make our seniors any healthier, and we will restore a sense of fairness and balance to our tax code by finally ending the tax breaks for corporations that ship our jobs overseas.

In order to save our children from a future of debt, we will also end the tax breaks for the wealthiest 2% of Americans. But let me perfectly clear, because I know you'll hear the same old claims that rolling back these tax breaks means a massive tax increase on the American people: if your family earns less than \$250,000 a year, you will not see your taxes increased a single dime. I repeat: not one single dime. In fact, the recovery plan provides a tax cut – that's right, a tax cut – for 95% of working families. And these checks are on the way.

To preserve our long-term fiscal health, we must also address the growing costs in Medicare and Social Security. Comprehensive health care reform is the best way to strengthen Medicare for years to come. And we must also begin a conversation on how to do the same for Social Security, while creating tax-free universal savings accounts for all Americans.

Finally, because we're also suffering from a deficit of trust, I am committed to restoring a sense of honesty and accountability to our budget. That is why this budget looks ahead ten years and accounts for spending that was left out under the old rules – and for the first time, that includes the full cost of fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. For seven years, we have been a nation at war. No longer will we hide its price.

We are now carefully reviewing our policies in both wars, and I will soon announce a way forward in Iraq that leaves Iraq to its people and responsibly ends this war.

And with our friends and allies, we will forge a new and comprehensive strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan to defeat al Qaeda and combat extremism. Because I will not allow terrorists to plot against the American people from safe havens half a world away.

As we meet here tonight, our men and women in uniform stand watch abroad and more are readying to deploy. To each and every one of them, and to the families who bear the quiet burden of their absence, Americans are united in sending one message: we honor your service, we are inspired by your sacrifice, and you have our unyielding support. To relieve the strain on our forces, my budget increases the number of our soldiers and Marines. And to keep our sacred trust with those who serve, we will raise their pay, and give our veterans the expanded health care and benefits that they have earned.

To overcome extremism, we must also be vigilant in upholding the values our troops defend – because there is no force in the world more powerful than the example of America. That is why I have ordered the closing of the detention center at Guantanamo Bay, and will seek swift and certain justice for captured terrorists – because living our values doesn't make us weaker, it makes us safer and it makes us stronger. And that is why I can stand here tonight and say without exception or equivocation that the United States of America does not torture.

In words and deeds, we are showing the world that a new era of engagement has begun. For we know that America cannot meet the threats of this century alone, but the world cannot meet them without America. We cannot shun the negotiating table, nor ignore the foes or forces that could do us harm. We are instead called to move forward with the sense of confidence and candor that serious times demand.

To seek progress toward a secure and lasting peace between Israel and her neighbors, we have appointed an envoy to sustain our effort. To meet the challenges of the 21st century – from terrorism to nuclear proliferation; from pandemic disease to cyber threats to crushing poverty – we will strengthen old alliances, forge new ones, and use all elements of our national power.

And to respond to an economic crisis that is global in scope, we are working with the nations of the G-20 to restore confidence in our financial system, avoid the possibility of escalating protectionism, and spur demand for American goods in markets across the globe. For the world depends on us to have a strong economy, just as our economy depends on the strength of the world's.

As we stand at this crossroads of history, the eyes of all people in all nations are once again upon us – watching to see what we do with this moment; waiting for us to lead.

Those of us gathered here tonight have been called to govern in extraordinary times. It is a tremendous burden, but also a great privilege – one that has been entrusted to few generations of Americans. For in our hands lies the ability to shape our world for good or for ill.

I know that it is easy to lose sight of this truth – to become cynical and doubtful; consumed with the petty and the trivial.

But in my life, I have also learned that hope is found in unlikely places; that inspiration often comes not from those with the most power or celebrity, but from the dreams and aspirations of Americans who are anything but ordinary.

I think about Leonard Abess, the bank president from Miami who reportedly cashed out of his company, took a \$60 million bonus, and gave it out to all 399 people who worked for him, plus another 72 who used to work for him. He didn't tell anyone, but when the local newspaper found out, he simply said, "I knew some of these people since I was 7 years old. I didn't feel right getting the money myself."

I think about Greensburg, Kansas, a town that was completely destroyed by a tornado, but is being rebuilt by its residents as a global example of how clean energy can power an entire community – how it can bring jobs and businesses to a place where piles of bricks and rubble once lay. "The tragedy was terrible," said one of the men who helped them rebuild. "But the folks here know that it also provided an incredible opportunity."

And I think about Ty'Sheoma Bethea, the young girl from that school I visited in Dillon, South Carolina – a place where the ceilings leak, the paint peels off the walls, and they have to stop teaching six times a day because the train barrels by their classroom. She has been told that her school is hopeless, but the other day after class she went to the public library and typed up a letter to the people sitting in this room. She even asked her principal for the money to buy a stamp. The letter asks us for help, and says, "We are just students trying to become lawyers, doctors, congressmen like yourself and one day president, so we can make a change to not just the state of South Carolina but also the world. We are not quitters."

We are not quitters.

These words and these stories tell us something about the spirit of the people who sent us here. They tell us that even in the most trying times, amid the most difficult circumstances, there is a generosity, a resilience, a decency, and a determination that perseveres; a willingness to take responsibility for our future and for posterity.

Their resolve must be our inspiration. Their concerns must be our cause. And we must show them and all our people that we are equal to the task before us.

I know that we haven't agreed on every issue thus far, and there are surely times in the future when we will part ways. But I also know that every American who is sitting here tonight loves this country and wants it to

succeed. That must be the starting point for every debate we have in the coming months, and where we return after those debates are done. That is the foundation on which the American people expect us to build common ground.

And if we do – if we come together and lift this nation from the depths of this crisis; if we put our people back to work and restart the engine of our prosperity; if we confront without fear the challenges of our time and summon that enduring spirit of an America that does not quit, then someday years from now our children can tell their children that this was the time when we performed, in the words that are carved into this very chamber, “something worthy to be remembered.” Thank you, God Bless you, and may God Bless the United States of America.

Madame Speaker, Vice President Biden, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans: Our Constitution declares that from time to time, the President shall give to Congress information about the state of our union. For two hundred and twenty years, our leaders have fulfilled this duty. They have done so during periods of prosperity and tranquility. And they have done so in the midst of war and depression; at moments of great strife and great struggle.

It's tempting to look back on these moments and assume that our progress was inevitable – that America was always destined to succeed. But when the Union was turned back at Bull Run and the Allies first landed at Omaha Beach, victory was very much in doubt. When the market crashed on Black Tuesday and civil rights marchers were beaten on Bloody Sunday, the future was anything but certain. These were times that tested the courage of our convictions, and the strength of our union. And despite all our divisions and disagreements; our hesitations and our fears; America prevailed because we chose to move forward as one nation, and one people.

Again, we are tested. And again, we must answer history's call.

One year ago, I took office amid two wars, an economy rocked by severe recession, a financial system on the verge of collapse, and a government deeply in debt. Experts from across the political spectrum warned that if we did not act, we might face a second depression. So we acted – immediately and aggressively. And one year later, the worst of the storm has passed.

But the devastation remains. One in ten Americans still cannot find work. Many businesses have shuttered. Home values have declined. Small towns and rural communities have been hit especially hard. For those who had already known poverty, life has become that much harder.

This recession has also compounded the burdens that America's families have been dealing with for decades – the burden of working harder and longer for less; of being unable to save enough to retire or help kids with college.

So I know the anxieties that are out there right now. They're not new. These struggles are the reason I ran for President. These struggles are what I've witnessed for years in places like Elkhart, Indiana and Galesburg, Illinois. I hear about them in the letters that I read each night. The toughest to read are those written by children – asking why they have to move from their home, or when their mom or dad will be able to go back to work.

For these Americans and so many others, change has not come fast enough. Some are frustrated; some are angry. They don't understand why it seems like bad behavior on Wall Street is rewarded but hard work on

Main Street isn't; or why Washington has been unable or unwilling to solve any of our problems. They are tired of the partisanship and the shouting and the pettiness. They know we can't afford it. Not now.

So we face big and difficult challenges. And what the American people hope – what they deserve – is for all of us, Democrats and Republicans, to work through our differences; to overcome the numbing weight of our politics. For while the people who sent us here have different backgrounds, different stories and different beliefs, the anxieties they face are the same. The aspirations they hold are shared. A job that pays the bills. A chance to get ahead. Most of all, the ability to give their children a better life.

You know what else they share? They share a stubborn resilience in the face of adversity. After one of the most difficult years in our history, they remain busy building cars and teaching kids; starting businesses and going back to school. They're coaching little league and helping their neighbors. As one woman wrote me, "We are strained but hopeful, struggling but encouraged."

It is because of this spirit – this great decency and great strength – that I have never been more hopeful about America's future than I am tonight. Despite our hardships, our union is strong. We do not give up. We do not quit. We do not allow fear or division to break our spirit. In this new decade, it's time the American people get a government that matches their decency; that embodies their strength.

And tonight, I'd like to talk about how together, we can deliver on that promise.

It begins with our economy.

Our most urgent task upon taking office was to shore up the same banks that helped cause this crisis. It was not easy to do. And if there's one thing that has unified Democrats and Republicans, it's that we all hated the bank bailout. I hated it. You hated it. It was about as popular as a root canal.

But when I ran for President, I promised I wouldn't just do what was popular – I would do what was necessary. And if we had allowed the meltdown of the financial system, unemployment might be double what it is today. More businesses would certainly have closed. More homes would have surely been lost.

So I supported the last administration's efforts to create the financial rescue program. And when we took the program over, we made it more transparent and accountable. As a result, the markets are now stabilized, and we have recovered most of the money we spent on the banks.

To recover the rest, I have proposed a fee on the biggest banks. I know Wall Street isn't keen on this idea, but if these firms can afford to hand out big bonuses again, they can afford a modest fee to pay back the taxpayers who rescued them in their time of need.

As we stabilized the financial system, we also took steps to get our economy growing again, save as many jobs as possible, and help Americans who had become unemployed.

That's why we extended or increased unemployment benefits for more than 18 million Americans; made health insurance 65% cheaper for families who get their coverage through COBRA; and passed 25 different tax cuts.

Let me repeat: we cut taxes. We cut taxes for 95% of working families. We cut taxes for small businesses. We cut taxes for first-time homebuyers. We cut taxes for parents trying to care for their children. We cut taxes for 8 million Americans paying for college. As a result, millions of Americans had more to spend on gas, and food, and other necessities, all of which helped businesses keep more workers. And we haven't raised income taxes by a single dime on a single person. Not a single dime.

Because of the steps we took, there are about two million Americans working right now who would otherwise be unemployed. 200,000 work in construction and clean energy. 300,000 are teachers and other education workers. Tens of thousands are cops, firefighters, correctional officers, and first responders. And we are on track to add another one and a half million jobs to this total by the end of the year.

The plan that has made all of this possible, from the tax cuts to the jobs, is the Recovery Act. That's right – the Recovery Act, also known as the Stimulus Bill. Economists on the left and the right say that this bill has helped saved jobs and avert disaster. But you don't have to take their word for it.

Talk to the small business in Phoenix that will triple its workforce because of the Recovery Act.

Talk to the window manufacturer in Philadelphia who said he used to be skeptical about the Recovery Act, until he had to add two more work shifts just because of the business it created.

Talk to the single teacher raising two kids who was told by her principal in the last week of school that because of the Recovery Act, she wouldn't be laid off after all.

There are stories like this all across America. And after two years of recession, the economy is growing again. Retirement funds have started to gain back some of their value. Businesses are beginning to invest again, and slowly some are starting to hire again.

But I realize that for every success story, there are other stories, of men and women who wake up with the anguish of not knowing where their next paycheck will come from; who send out resumes week after week and hear nothing in response. That is why jobs must be our number one focus in 2010, and that is why I am calling for a new jobs bill tonight.

Now, the true engine of job creation in this country will always be America's businesses. But government can create the conditions necessary for businesses to expand and hire more workers.

We should start where most new jobs do – in small businesses, companies that begin when an entrepreneur takes a chance on a dream, or a worker decides its time she became her own boss.

Through sheer grit and determination, these companies have weathered the recession and are ready to grow. But when you talk to small business owners in places like Allentown, Pennsylvania or Elyria, Ohio, you find out that even though banks on Wall Street are lending again, they are mostly lending to bigger companies. But financing remains difficult for small business owners across the country.

So tonight, I'm proposing that we take \$30 billion of the money Wall Street banks have repaid and use it to help community banks give small businesses the credit they need to stay afloat. I am also proposing a new small business tax credit – one that will go to over one million small businesses who hire new workers or raise wages. While we're at it, let's also eliminate all capital gains taxes on small business investment; and provide a tax incentive for all businesses, large and small, to invest in new plants and equipment.

Next, we can put Americans to work today building the infrastructure of tomorrow. From the first railroads to the interstate highway system, our nation has always been built to compete. There's no reason Europe or China should have the fastest trains, or the new factories that manufacture clean energy products.

Tomorrow, I'll visit Tampa, Florida, where workers will soon break ground on a new high-speed railroad funded by the Recovery Act. There are projects like that all across this country that will create jobs and help our nation move goods, services, and information. We should put more Americans to work building clean energy facilities, and give rebates to Americans who make their homes more energy efficient, which supports clean energy jobs. And to encourage these and other businesses to stay within our borders, it's time to finally slash the tax breaks for companies that ship our jobs overseas and give those tax breaks to companies that create jobs in the United States of America.

The House has passed a jobs bill that includes some of these steps. As the first order of business this year, I urge the Senate to do the same. People are out of work. They are hurting. They need our help. And I want a jobs bill on my desk without delay.

But the truth is, these steps still won't make up for the seven million jobs we've lost over the last two years. The only way to move to full employment is to lay a new foundation for long-term economic growth, and finally address the problems that America's families have confronted for years.

We cannot afford another so-called economic "expansion" like the one from last decade – what some call the "lost decade" – where jobs grew more slowly than during any prior expansion; where the income of the average American household declined while the cost of health care and tuition reached record highs; where prosperity was built on a housing bubble and financial speculation.

From the day I took office, I have been told that addressing our larger challenges is too ambitious – that such efforts would be too contentious, that our political system is too gridlocked, and that we should just put things on hold for awhile.

For those who make these claims, I have one simple question:

How long should we wait? How long should America put its future on hold?

You see, Washington has been telling us to wait for decades, even as the problems have grown worse. Meanwhile, China's not waiting to revamp its economy. Germany's not waiting. India's not waiting. These nations aren't standing still. These nations aren't playing for second place. They're putting more emphasis on math and science. They're rebuilding their infrastructure. They are making serious investments in clean energy because they want those jobs.

Well I do not accept second-place for the United States of America. As hard as it may be, as uncomfortable and contentious as the debates may be, it's time to get serious about fixing the problems that are hampering our growth.

One place to start is serious financial reform. Look, I am not interested in punishing banks, I'm interested in protecting our economy. A strong, healthy financial market makes it possible for businesses to access credit and create new jobs. It channels the savings of families into investments that raise incomes. But that can only happen if we guard against the same recklessness that nearly brought down our entire economy.

We need to make sure consumers and middle-class families have the information they need to make financial decisions. We can't allow financial institutions, including those that take your deposits, to take risks that threaten the whole economy.

The House has already passed financial reform with many of these changes. And the lobbyists are already trying to kill it. Well, we cannot let them win this fight. And if the bill that ends up on my desk does not meet the test of real reform, I will send it back.

Next, we need to encourage American innovation. Last year, we made the largest investment in basic research funding in history – an investment that could lead to the world's cheapest solar cells or treatment that kills cancer cells but leaves healthy ones untouched. And no area is more ripe for such innovation than energy. You can see the results of last year's investment in clean energy – in the North Carolina company that will create 1200 jobs nationwide helping to make advanced batteries; or in the California business that will put 1,000 people to work making solar panels.

But to create more of these clean energy jobs, we need more production, more efficiency, more incentives. That means building a new generation of safe, clean nuclear power plants in this country. It means making tough decisions about opening new offshore areas for oil and gas development. It means continued

investment in advanced biofuels and clean coal technologies. And yes, it means passing a comprehensive energy and climate bill with incentives that will finally make clean energy the profitable kind of energy in America.

I am grateful to the House for passing such a bill last year. This year, I am eager to help advance the bipartisan effort in the Senate. I know there have been questions about whether we can afford such changes in a tough economy; and I know that there are those who disagree with the overwhelming scientific evidence on climate change. But even if you doubt the evidence, providing incentives for energy efficiency and clean energy are the right thing to do for our future – because the nation that leads the clean energy economy will be the nation that leads the global economy. And America must be that nation.

Third, we need to export more of our goods. Because the more products we make and sell to other countries, the more jobs we support right here in America. So tonight, we set a new goal: We will double our exports over the next five years, an increase that will support two million jobs in America. To help meet this goal, we're launching a National Export Initiative that will help farmers and small businesses increase their exports, and reform export controls consistent with national security.

We have to seek new markets aggressively, just as our competitors are. If America sits on the sidelines while other nations sign trade deals, we will lose the chance to create jobs on our shores. But realizing those benefits also means enforcing those agreements so our trading partners play by the rules. And that's why we will continue to shape a Doha trade agreement that opens global markets, and why we will strengthen our trade relations in Asia and with key partners like South Korea, Panama, and Colombia.

Fourth, we need to invest in the skills and education of our people.

This year, we have broken through the stalemate between left and right by launching a national competition to improve our schools. The idea here is simple: instead of rewarding failure, we only reward success. Instead of funding the status quo, we only invest in reform – reform that raises student achievement, inspires students to excel in math and science, and turns around failing schools that steal the future of too many young Americans, from rural communities to inner-cities. In the 21st century, one of the best anti-poverty programs is a world-class education. In this country, the success of our children cannot depend more on where they live than their potential.

When we renew the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we will work with Congress to expand these reforms to all fifty states. Still, in this economy, a high school diploma no longer guarantees a good job. I urge the Senate to follow the House and pass a bill that will revitalize our community colleges, which are a career pathway to the children of so many working families. To make college more affordable, this bill will finally end the unwarranted taxpayer-subsidies that go to banks for student loans. Instead, let's take that money and give families a \$10,000 tax credit for four years of college and increase Pell Grants. And let's tell another one million students that when they graduate, they will be required to pay only ten percent of their income on student loans, and all of their debt will be forgiven after twenty years – and forgiven after ten

years if they choose a career in public service. Because in the United States of America, no one should go broke because they chose to go to college. And it's time for colleges and universities to get serious about cutting their own costs – because they too have a responsibility to help solve this problem.

Now, the price of college tuition is just one of the burdens facing the middle-class. That's why last year I asked Vice President Biden to chair a task force on Middle-Class Families. That's why we're nearly doubling the child care tax credit, and making it easier to save for retirement by giving every worker access to a retirement account and expanding the tax credit for those who start a nest egg. That's why we're working to lift the value of a family's single largest investment – their home. The steps we took last year to shore up the housing market have allowed millions of Americans to take out new loans and save an average of \$1,500 on mortgage payments. This year, we will step up re-financing so that homeowners can move into more affordable mortgages. And it is precisely to relieve the burden on middle-class families that we still need health insurance reform.

Now let's be clear – I did not choose to tackle this issue to get some legislative victory under my belt. And by now it should be fairly obvious that I didn't take on health care because it was good politics.

I took on health care because of the stories I've heard from Americans with pre-existing conditions whose lives depend on getting coverage; patients who've been denied coverage; and families – even those with insurance – who are just one illness away from financial ruin.

After nearly a century of trying, we are closer than ever to bringing more security to the lives of so many Americans. The approach we've taken would protect every American from the worst practices of the insurance industry. It would give small businesses and uninsured Americans a chance to choose an affordable health care plan in a competitive market. It would require every insurance plan to cover preventive care. And by the way, I want to acknowledge our First Lady, Michelle Obama, who this year is creating a national movement to tackle the epidemic of childhood obesity and make our kids healthier.

Our approach would preserve the right of Americans who have insurance to keep their doctor and their plan. It would reduce costs and premiums for millions of families and businesses. And according to the Congressional Budget Office – the independent organization that both parties have cited as the official scorekeeper for Congress – our approach would bring down the deficit by as much as \$1 trillion over the next two decades.

Still, this is a complex issue, and the longer it was debated, the more skeptical people became. I take my share of the blame for not explaining it more clearly to the American people. And I know that with all the lobbying and horse-trading, this process left most Americans wondering what's in it for them.

But I also know this problem is not going away. By the time I'm finished speaking tonight, more Americans will have lost their health insurance. Millions will lose it this year. Our deficit will grow. Premiums will go up.

Patients will be denied the care they need. Small business owners will continue to drop coverage altogether. I will not walk away from these Americans, and neither should the people in this chamber.

As temperatures cool, I want everyone to take another look at the plan we've proposed. There's a reason why many doctors, nurses, and health care experts who know our system best consider this approach a vast improvement over the status quo. But if anyone from either party has a better approach that will bring down premiums, bring down the deficit, cover the uninsured, strengthen Medicare for seniors, and stop insurance company abuses, let me know. Here's what I ask of Congress, though: Do not walk away from reform. Not now. Not when we are so close. Let us find a way to come together and finish the job for the American people.

Now, even as health care reform would reduce our deficit, it's not enough to dig us out of a massive fiscal hole in which we find ourselves. It's a challenge that makes all others that much harder to solve, and one that's been subject to a lot of political posturing.

So let me start the discussion of government spending by setting the record straight. At the beginning of the last decade, America had a budget surplus of over \$200 billion. By the time I took office, we had a one year deficit of over \$1 trillion and projected deficits of \$8 trillion over the next decade. Most of this was the result of not paying for two wars, two tax cuts, and an expensive prescription drug program. On top of that, the effects of the recession put a \$3 trillion hole in our budget. That was before I walked in the door.

Now if we had taken office in ordinary times, I would have liked nothing more than to start bringing down the deficit. But we took office amid a crisis, and our efforts to prevent a second Depression have added another \$1 trillion to our national debt.

I am absolutely convinced that was the right thing to do. But families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The federal government should do the same. So tonight, I'm proposing specific steps to pay for the \$1 trillion that it took to rescue the economy last year.

Starting in 2011, we are prepared to freeze government spending for three years. Spending related to our national security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security will not be affected. But all other discretionary government programs will. Like any cash-strapped family, we will work within a budget to invest in what we need and sacrifice what we don't. And if I have to enforce this discipline by veto, I will.

We will continue to go through the budget line by line to eliminate programs that we can't afford and don't work. We've already identified \$20 billion in savings for next year. To help working families, we will extend our middle-class tax cuts. But at a time of record deficits, we will not continue tax cuts for oil companies, investment fund managers, and those making over \$250,000 a year. We just can't afford it.

Now, even after paying for what we spent on my watch, we will still face the massive deficit we had when I took office. More importantly, the cost of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security will continue to skyrocket.

That's why I've called for a bipartisan, Fiscal Commission, modeled on a proposal by Republican Judd Gregg and Democrat Kent Conrad. This can't be one of those Washington gimmicks that lets us pretend we solved a problem. The Commission will have to provide a specific set of solutions by a certain deadline. Yesterday, the Senate blocked a bill that would have created this commission. So I will issue an executive order that will allow us to go forward, because I refuse to pass this problem on to another generation of Americans. And when the vote comes tomorrow, the Senate should restore the pay-as-you-go law that was a big reason why we had record surpluses in the 1990s.

I know that some in my own party will argue that we cannot address the deficit or freeze government spending when so many are still hurting. I agree, which is why this freeze will not take effect until next year, when the economy is stronger. But understand – if we do not take meaningful steps to rein in our debt, it could damage our markets, increase the cost of borrowing, and jeopardize our recovery – all of which could have an even worse effect on our job growth and family incomes.

From some on the right, I expect we'll hear a different argument – that if we just make fewer investments in our people, extend tax cuts for wealthier Americans, eliminate more regulations, and maintain the status quo on health care, our deficits will go away. The problem is, that's what we did for eight years. That's what helped lead us into this crisis. It's what helped lead to these deficits. And we cannot do it again.

Rather than fight the same tired battles that have dominated Washington for decades, it's time to try something new. Let's invest in our people without leaving them a mountain of debt. Let's meet our responsibility to the citizens who sent us here. Let's try common sense.

To do that, we have to recognize that we face more than a deficit of dollars right now. We face a deficit of trust – deep and corrosive doubts about how Washington works that have been growing for years. To close that credibility gap we must take action on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue to end the outsized influence of lobbyists; to do our work openly; and to give our people the government they deserve.

That's what I came to Washington to do. That's why – for the first time in history – my Administration posts our White House visitors online. And that's why we've excluded lobbyists from policy-making jobs or seats on federal boards and commissions.

But we can't stop there. It's time to require lobbyists to disclose each contact they make on behalf of a client with my Administration or Congress. And it's time to put strict limits on the contributions that lobbyists give to candidates for federal office. Last week, the Supreme Court reversed a century of law to open the floodgates for special interests – including foreign corporations – to spend without limit in our elections. Well I don't think American elections should be bankrolled by America's most powerful interests, or worse, by foreign entities. They should be decided by the American people, and that's why I'm urging Democrats and Republicans to pass a bill that helps to right this wrong.

I'm also calling on Congress to continue down the path of earmark reform. You have trimmed some of this spending and embraced some meaningful change. But restoring the public trust demands more. For example, some members of Congress post some earmark requests online. Tonight, I'm calling on Congress to publish all earmark requests on a single website before there's a vote so that the American people can see how their money is being spent.

Of course, none of these reforms will even happen if we don't also reform how we work with one another.

Now, I am not naïve. I never thought the mere fact of my election would usher in peace, harmony, and some post-partisan era. I knew that both parties have fed divisions that are deeply entrenched. And on some issues, there are simply philosophical differences that will always cause us to part ways. These disagreements, about the role of government in our lives, about our national priorities and our national security, have been taking place for over two hundred years. They are the very essence of our democracy.

But what frustrates the American people is a Washington where every day is Election Day. We cannot wage a perpetual campaign where the only goal is to see who can get the most embarrassing headlines about their opponent – a belief that if you lose, I win. Neither party should delay or obstruct every single bill just because they can. The confirmation of well-qualified public servants should not be held hostage to the pet projects or grudges of a few individual Senators. Washington may think that saying anything about the other side, no matter how false, is just part of the game. But it is precisely such politics that has stopped either party from helping the American people. Worse yet, it is sowing further division among our citizens and further distrust in our government.

So no, I will not give up on changing the tone of our politics. I know it's an election year. And after last week, it is clear that campaign fever has come even earlier than usual. But we still need to govern. To Democrats, I would remind you that we still have the largest majority in decades, and the people expect us to solve some problems, not run for the hills. And if the Republican leadership is going to insist that sixty votes in the Senate are required to do any business at all in this town, then the responsibility to govern is now yours as well. Just saying no to everything may be good short-term politics, but it's not leadership. We were sent here to serve our citizens, not our ambitions. So let's show the American people that we can do it together. This week, I'll be addressing a meeting of the House Republicans. And I would like to begin monthly meetings with both the Democratic and Republican leadership. I know you can't wait.

Throughout our history, no issue has united this country more than our security. Sadly, some of the unity we felt after 9/11 has dissipated. We can argue all we want about who's to blame for this, but I am not interested in re-litigating the past. I know that all of us love this country. All of us are committed to its defense. So let's put aside the schoolyard taunts about who is tough. Let's reject the false choice between protecting our people and upholding our values. Let's leave behind the fear and division, and do what it takes to defend our nation and forge a more hopeful future – for America and the world.

That is the work we began last year. Since the day I took office, we have renewed our focus on the terrorists who threaten our nation. We have made substantial investments in our homeland security and disrupted plots that threatened to take American lives. We are filling unacceptable gaps revealed by the failed Christmas attack, with better airline security, and swifter action on our intelligence. We have prohibited torture and strengthened partnerships from the Pacific to South Asia to the Arabian Peninsula. And in the last year, hundreds of Al Qaeda's fighters and affiliates, including many senior leaders, have been captured or killed – far more than in 2008.

In Afghanistan, we are increasing our troops and training Afghan Security Forces so they can begin to take the lead in July of 2011, and our troops can begin to come home. We will reward good governance, reduce corruption, and support the rights of all Afghans – men and women alike. We are joined by allies and partners who have increased their own commitment, and who will come together tomorrow in London to reaffirm our common purpose. There will be difficult days ahead. But I am confident we will succeed.

As we take the fight to al Qaeda, we are responsibly leaving Iraq to its people. As a candidate, I promised that I would end this war, and that is what I am doing as President. We will have all of our combat troops out of Iraq by the end of this August. We will support the Iraqi government as they hold elections, and continue to partner with the Iraqi people to promote regional peace and prosperity. But make no mistake: this war is ending, and all of our troops are coming home.

Tonight, all of our men and women in uniform — in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world – must know that they have our respect, our gratitude, and our full support. And just as they must have the resources they need in war, we all have a responsibility to support them when they come home. That is why we made the largest increase in investments for veterans in decades. That is why we are building a 21st century VA. And that is why Michelle has joined with Jill Biden to forge a national commitment to support military families.

Even as we prosecute two wars, we are also confronting perhaps the greatest danger to the American people – the threat of nuclear weapons. I have embraced the vision of John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan through a strategy that reverses the spread of these weapons, and seeks a world without them. To reduce our stockpiles and launchers, while ensuring our deterrent, the United States and Russia are completing negotiations on the farthest-reaching arms control treaty in nearly two decades. And at April's Nuclear Security Summit, we will bring forty-four nations together behind a clear goal: securing all vulnerable nuclear materials around the world in four years, so that they never fall into the hands of terrorists.

These diplomatic efforts have also strengthened our hand in dealing with those nations that insist on violating international agreements in pursuit of these weapons. That is why North Korea now faces increased isolation, and stronger sanctions – sanctions that are being vigorously enforced. That is why the international community is more united, and the Islamic Republic of Iran is more isolated. And as Iran's leaders continue to ignore their obligations, there should be no doubt: they, too, will face growing consequences.

That is the leadership that we are providing – engagement that advances the common security and prosperity of all people. We are working through the G-20 to sustain a lasting global recovery. We are working with Muslim communities around the world to promote science, education and innovation. We have gone from a bystander to a leader in the fight against climate change. We are helping developing countries to feed themselves, and continuing the fight against HIV/AIDS. And we are launching a new initiative that will give us the capacity to respond faster and more effectively to bio-terrorism or an infectious disease – a plan that will counter threats at home, and strengthen public health abroad.

As we have for over sixty years, America takes these actions because our destiny is connected to those beyond our shores. But we also do it because it is right. That is why, as we meet here tonight, over 10,000 Americans are working with many nations to help the people of Haiti recover and rebuild. That is why we stand with the girl who yearns to go to school in Afghanistan; we support the human rights of the women marching through the streets of Iran; and we advocate for the young man denied a job by corruption in Guinea. For America must always stand on the side of freedom and human dignity.

Abroad, America's greatest source of strength has always been our ideals. The same is true at home. We find unity in our incredible diversity, drawing on the promise enshrined in our Constitution: the notion that we are all created equal, that no matter who you are or what you look like, if you abide by the law you should be protected by it; that if you adhere to our common values you should be treated no different than anyone else.

We must continually renew this promise. My Administration has a Civil Rights Division that is once again prosecuting civil rights violations and employment discrimination. We finally strengthened our laws to protect against crimes driven by hate. This year, I will work with Congress and our military to finally repeal the law that denies gay Americans the right to serve the country they love because of who they are. We are going to crack down on violations of equal pay laws – so that women get equal pay for an equal day's work. And we should continue the work of fixing our broken immigration system – to secure our borders, enforce our laws, and ensure that everyone who plays by the rules can contribute to our economy and enrich our nations.

In the end, it is our ideals, our values, that built America – values that allowed us to forge a nation made up of immigrants from every corner of the globe; values that drive our citizens still. Every day, Americans meet their responsibilities to their families and their employers. Time and again, they lend a hand to their neighbors and give back to their country. They take pride in their labor, and are generous in spirit. These aren't Republican values or Democratic values they're living by; business values or labor values. They are American values.

Unfortunately, too many of our citizens have lost faith that our biggest institutions – our corporations, our media, and yes, our government – still reflect these same values. Each of these institutions are full of honorable men and women doing important work that helps our country prosper. But each time a CEO rewards himself for failure, or a banker puts the rest of us at risk for his own selfish gain, people's doubts grow. Each time lobbyists game the system or politicians tear each other down instead of lifting this country

up, we lose faith. The more that TV pundits reduce serious debates into silly arguments, and big issues into sound bites, our citizens turn away.

No wonder there's so much cynicism out there.

No wonder there's so much disappointment.

I campaigned on the promise of change – change we can believe in, the slogan went. And right now, I know there are many Americans who aren't sure if they still believe we can change – or at least, that I can deliver it.

But remember this – I never suggested that change would be easy, or that I can do it alone. Democracy in a nation of three hundred million people can be noisy and messy and complicated. And when you try to do big things and make big changes, it stirs passions and controversy. That's just how it is.

Those of us in public office can respond to this reality by playing it safe and avoid telling hard truths. We can do what's necessary to keep our poll numbers high, and get through the next election instead of doing what's best for the next generation.

But I also know this: if people had made that decision fifty years ago or one hundred years ago or two hundred years ago, we wouldn't be here tonight. The only reason we are is because generations of Americans were unafraid to do what was hard; to do what was needed even when success was uncertain; to do what it took to keep the dream of this nation alive for their children and grandchildren.

Our administration has had some political setbacks this year, and some of them were deserved. But I wake up every day knowing that they are nothing compared to the setbacks that families all across this country have faced this year. And what keeps me going – what keeps me fighting – is that despite all these setbacks, that spirit of determination and optimism – that fundamental decency that has always been at the core of the American people – lives on.

It lives on in the struggling small business owner who wrote to me of his company, "None of us," he said, "...are willing to consider, even slightly, that we might fail."

It lives on in the woman who said that even though she and her neighbors have felt the pain of recession, "We are strong. We are resilient. We are American."

It lives on in the 8-year old boy in Louisiana, who just sent me his allowance and asked if I would give it to the people of Haiti. And it lives on in all the Americans who've dropped everything to go some place they've never been and pull people they've never known from rubble, prompting chants of "U.S.A! U.S.A! U.S.A!" when another life was saved.

The spirit that has sustained this nation for more than two centuries lives on in you, its people.

We have finished a difficult year. We have come through a difficult decade. But a new year has come. A new decade stretches before us. We don't quit. I don't quit. Let's seize this moment – to start anew, to carry the dream forward, and to strengthen our union once more.

Thank you. God Bless You. And God Bless the United States of America.

Barack Obama's Third State of the Union Address 2011

25/1/2011

Tonight I want to begin by congratulating the men and women of the 112th Congress, as well as your new Speaker, [John Boehner](#). And as we mark this occasion, we are also mindful of the empty chair in this Chamber, and pray for the health of our colleague – and our friend – [Gabby Giffords](#).

It's no secret that those of us here tonight have had our differences over the last two years. The debates have been contentious; we have fought fiercely for our beliefs. And that's a good thing. That's what a robust democracy demands. That's what helps set us apart as a nation.

But there's a reason the [tragedy in Tucson](#) gave us pause. Amid all the noise and passions and rancor of our public debate, Tucson reminded us that no matter who we are or where we come from, each of us is a part of something greater – something more consequential than party or political preference.

We are part of the American family. We believe that in a country where every race and faith and point of view can be found, we are still bound together as one people; that we share common hopes and a common creed; that the dreams of a little girl in Tucson are not so different than those of our own children, and that they all deserve the chance to be fulfilled.

That, too, is what sets us apart as a nation.

Now, by itself, this simple recognition won't usher in a new era of cooperation. What comes of this moment is up to us. What comes of this moment will be determined not by whether we can sit together tonight, but whether we can work together tomorrow.

I believe we can. I believe we must. That's what the people who sent us here expect of us. With their votes, they've determined that governing will now be a shared responsibility between parties. New laws will only pass with support from Democrats and Republicans. We will move forward together, or not at all – for the challenges we face are bigger than party, and bigger than politics.

At stake right now is not who wins the next election – after all, we just had an election. At stake is whether new jobs and industries take root in this country, or somewhere else. It's whether the hard work and industry of our people is rewarded. It's whether we sustain the leadership that has made America not just a place on a map, but a light to the world.

We are poised for progress. Two years after the [worst recession most of us have ever known](#), the stock market has come roaring back. Corporate profits are up. The economy is growing again.

But we have never measured progress by these yardsticks alone. We measure progress by the success of our people. By the jobs they can find and the quality of life those jobs offer. By the prospects of a small business owner who dreams of turning a good idea into a thriving enterprise. By the opportunities for a better life that we pass on to our children.

That's the project the American people want us to work on. Together.

We did that in December. Thanks to the tax cuts we passed, Americans' paychecks are a little bigger today. Every business can write off the full cost of the new investments they make this year. These steps, taken by Democrats and Republicans, will grow the economy and add to the more than one million private sector jobs created last year.

But we have more work to do. The steps we've taken over the last two years may have broken the back of this recession – but to win the future, we'll need to take on challenges that have been decades in the making.

Many people watching tonight can probably remember a time when finding a good job meant showing up at a nearby factory or a business downtown. You didn't always need a degree, and your competition was pretty much limited to your neighbors. If you worked hard, chances are you'd have a job for life, with a decent paycheck, good benefits, and the occasional promotion. Maybe you'd even have the pride of seeing your kids work at the same company.

That world has changed. And for many, the change has been painful. I've seen it in the shuttered windows of once booming factories, and the vacant storefronts of once busy Main Streets. I've heard it in the frustrations of Americans who've seen their paychecks dwindle or their jobs disappear – proud men and women who feel like the rules have been changed in the middle of the game.

They're right. The rules have changed. In a single generation, revolutions in technology have transformed the way we live, work and do business. Steel mills that once needed 1,000 workers can now do the same work with 100. Today, just about any company can set up shop, hire workers, and sell their products wherever there's an internet connection.

Meanwhile, nations like China and India realized that with some changes of their own, they could compete in this new world. And so they started educating their children earlier and longer, with greater emphasis on math and science. They're investing in research and new technologies. Just recently, China became home to the world's largest private solar research facility, and the world's fastest computer.

So yes, the world has changed. The competition for jobs is real. But this shouldn't discourage us. It should challenge us. Remember – for all the hits we've taken these last few years, for all the naysayers predicting our decline, America still has the largest, most prosperous economy in the world. No workers are more productive than ours. No country has more successful companies, or grants more patents to inventors and entrepreneurs. We are home to the world's best colleges and universities, where more students come to study than any other place on Earth.

What's more, we are the first nation to be founded for the sake of an idea – the idea that each of us deserves the chance to shape our own destiny. That is why centuries of pioneers and immigrants have risked everything to come here. It's why our students don't just memorize equations, but answer questions like “What do you think of that idea? What would you change about the world? What do you want to be when you grow up?”

The future is ours to win. But to get there, we can't just stand still. As Robert Kennedy told us, “The future is not a gift. It is an achievement.” Sustaining the American Dream has never been about standing pat. It has required each generation to sacrifice, and struggle, and meet the demands of a new age.

Now it's our turn. We know what it takes to compete for the jobs and industries of our time. We need to out-innovate, out-educate, and out-build the rest of the world. We have to make America the best place on Earth to do business. We

need to take responsibility for our deficit, and reform our government. That's how our people will prosper. That's how we'll win the future. And tonight, I'd like to talk about how we get there.

The first step in winning the future is encouraging American innovation.

None of us can predict with certainty what the next big industry will be, or where the new jobs will come from. Thirty years ago, we couldn't know that something called the Internet would lead to an economic revolution. What we can do – what America does better than anyone – is spark the creativity and imagination of our people. We are the nation that put cars in driveways and computers in offices; the nation of Edison and the Wright brothers; of Google and Facebook. In America, innovation doesn't just change our lives. It's how we make a living.

Our free enterprise system is what drives innovation. But because it's not always profitable for companies to invest in basic research, throughout history our government has provided cutting-edge scientists and inventors with the support that they need. That's what planted the seeds for the Internet. That's what helped make possible things like computer chips and GPS.

Just think of all the good jobs – from manufacturing to retail – that have come from those breakthroughs.

Half a century ago, when the Soviets beat us into space with the launch of a satellite called Sputnik, we had no idea how we'd beat them to the moon. The science wasn't there yet. NASA didn't even exist. But after investing in better research and education, we didn't just surpass the Soviets; we unleashed a wave of innovation that created new industries and millions of new jobs.

This is our generation's Sputnik moment. Two years ago, I said that we needed to reach a level of research and development we haven't seen since the height of the Space Race. In a few weeks, I will be sending a budget to Congress that helps us meet that goal. We'll invest in biomedical research, information technology, and especially clean energy technology – an investment that will strengthen our security, protect our planet, and create countless new jobs for our people.

Already, we are seeing the promise of renewable energy. Robert and Gary Allen are brothers who run a small Michigan roofing company. After September 11th, they volunteered their best roofers to help repair the Pentagon. But half of their factory went unused, and the recession hit them hard.

Today, with the help of a government loan, that empty space is being used to manufacture solar shingles that are being sold all across the country. In Robert's words, "We reinvented ourselves."

That's what Americans have done for over two hundred years: reinvented ourselves. And to spur on more success stories like the Allen Brothers, we've begun to reinvent our energy policy. We're not just handing out money. We're issuing a challenge. We're telling America's scientists and engineers that if they assemble teams of the best minds in their fields, and focus on the hardest problems in clean energy, we'll fund the Apollo Projects of our time.

At the California Institute of Technology, they're developing a way to turn sunlight and water into fuel for our cars. At Oak Ridge National Laboratory, they're using supercomputers to get a lot more power out of our nuclear facilities. With

more research and incentives, we can break our dependence on oil with biofuels, and become the first country to have 1 million electric vehicles on the road by 2015.

We need to get behind this innovation. And to help pay for it, I'm asking Congress to eliminate the billions in taxpayer dollars we currently give to oil companies. I don't know if you've noticed, but they're doing just fine on their own. So instead of subsidizing yesterday's energy, let's invest in tomorrow's.

Now, clean energy breakthroughs will only translate into clean energy jobs if businesses know there will be a market for what they're selling. So tonight, I challenge you to join me in setting a new goal: by 2035, 80% of America's electricity will come from clean energy sources. Some folks want wind and solar. Others want nuclear, clean coal, and natural gas. To meet this goal, we will need them all – and I urge Democrats and Republicans to work together to make it happen.

Maintaining our leadership in research and technology is crucial to America's success. But if we want to win the future – if we want innovation to produce jobs in America and not overseas – then we also have to win the race to educate our kids.

Think about it. Over the next ten years, nearly half of all new jobs will require education that goes beyond a high school degree. And yet, as many as a quarter of our students aren't even finishing high school. The quality of our math and science education lags behind many other nations. America has fallen to 9th in the proportion of young people with a college degree. And so the question is whether all of us – as citizens, and as parents – are willing to do what's necessary to give every child a chance to succeed.

That responsibility begins not in our classrooms, but in our homes and communities. It's family that first instills the love of learning in a child. Only parents can make sure the TV is turned off and homework gets done. We need to teach our kids that it's not just the winner of the Super Bowl who deserves to be celebrated, but the winner of the science fair; that success is not a function of fame or PR, but of hard work and discipline.

Our schools share this responsibility. When a child walks into a classroom, it should be a place of high expectations and high performance. But too many schools don't meet this test. That's why instead of just pouring money into a system that's not working, we launched a competition called Race to the Top. To all fifty states, we said, "If you show us the most innovative plans to improve teacher quality and student achievement, we'll show you the money."

Race to the Top is the most meaningful reform of our public schools in a generation. For less than one percent of what we spend on education each year, it has led over 40 states to raise their standards for teaching and learning. These standards were developed, not by Washington, but by Republican and Democratic governors throughout the country. And Race to the Top should be the approach we follow this year as we replace No Child Left Behind with a law that is more flexible and focused on what's best for our kids.

You see, we know what's possible for our children when reform isn't just a top-down mandate, but the work of local teachers and principals; school boards and communities.

Take a school like [Bruce Randolph](#) in Denver. Three years ago, it was rated one of the worst schools in Colorado; located on turf between two rival gangs. But last May, 97% of the seniors received their diploma. Most will be the first

in their family to go to college. And after the first year of the school's transformation, the principal who made it possible wiped away tears when a student said "Thank you, Mrs. Waters, for showing... that we are smart and we can make it."

Let's also remember that after parents, the biggest impact on a child's success comes from the man or woman at the front of the classroom. In South Korea, teachers are known as "nation builders." Here in America, it's time we treated the people who educate our children with the same level of respect. We want to reward good teachers and stop making excuses for bad ones. And over the next ten years, with so many Baby Boomers retiring from our classrooms, we want to prepare 100,000 new teachers in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math.

In fact, to every young person listening tonight who's contemplating their career choice: If you want to make a difference in the life of our nation; if you want to make a difference in the life of a child – become a teacher. Your country needs you.

Of course, the education race doesn't end with a high school diploma. To compete, higher education must be within reach of every American. That's why we've ended the unwarranted taxpayer subsidies that went to banks, and used the savings to make college affordable for millions of students. And this year, I ask Congress to go further, and make permanent our tuition tax credit – worth \$10,000 for four years of college.

Because people need to be able to train for new jobs and careers in today's fast-changing economy, we are also revitalizing America's community colleges. Last month, I saw the promise of these schools at Forsyth Tech in North Carolina. Many of the students there used to work in the surrounding factories that have since left town. One mother of two, a woman named Kathy Proctor, had worked in the furniture industry since she was 18 years old. And she told me she's earning her degree in biotechnology now, at 55 years old, not just because the furniture jobs are gone, but because she wants to inspire her children to pursue their dreams too. As Kathy said, "I hope it tells them to never give up."

If we take these steps – if we raise expectations for every child, and give them the best possible chance at an education, from the day they're born until the last job they take – we will reach the goal I set two years ago: by the end of the decade, America will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world.

One last point about education. Today, there are hundreds of thousands of students excelling in our schools who are not American citizens. Some are the children of undocumented workers, who had nothing to do with the actions of their parents. They grew up as Americans and pledge allegiance to our flag, and yet live every day with the threat of deportation. Others come here from abroad to study in our colleges and universities. But as soon as they obtain advanced degrees, we send them back home to compete against us. It makes no sense.

Now, I strongly believe that we should take on, once and for all, the issue of illegal immigration. I am prepared to work with Republicans and Democrats to protect our borders, enforce our laws and address the millions of undocumented workers who are now living in the shadows. I know that debate will be difficult and take time. But tonight, let's agree to make that effort. And let's stop expelling talented, responsible young people who can staff our research labs, start new businesses, and further enrich this nation.

The third step in winning the future is rebuilding America. To attract new businesses to our shores, we need the fastest, most reliable ways to move people, goods, and information – from high-speed rail to high-speed internet.

Our infrastructure used to be the best – but our lead has slipped. South Korean homes now have greater internet access than we do. Countries in Europe and Russia invest more in their roads and railways than we do. China is building faster trains and newer airports. Meanwhile, when our own engineers graded our nation’s infrastructure, they gave us a “D.”

We have to do better. America is the nation that built the transcontinental railroad, brought electricity to rural communities, and constructed the interstate highway system. The jobs created by these projects didn’t just come from laying down tracks or pavement. They came from businesses that opened near a town’s new train station or the new off-ramp.

Over the last two years, we have begun rebuilding for the 21st century, a project that has meant thousands of good jobs for the hard-hit construction industry. Tonight, I’m proposing that we redouble these efforts.

We will put more Americans to work repairing crumbling roads and bridges. We will make sure this is fully paid for, attract private investment, and pick projects based on what’s best for the economy, not politicians.

Within 25 years, our goal is to give 80% of Americans access to high-speed rail, which could allow you go places in half the time it takes to travel by car. For some trips, it will be faster than flying – without the pat-down. As we speak, routes in California and the Midwest are already underway.

Within the next five years, we will make it possible for business to deploy the next generation of high-speed wireless coverage to 98% of all Americans. This isn’t just about a faster internet and fewer dropped calls. It’s about connecting every part of America to the digital age. It’s about a rural community in Iowa or Alabama where farmers and small business owners will be able to sell their products all over the world. It’s about a firefighter who can download the design of a burning building onto a handheld device; a student who can take classes with a digital textbook; or a patient who can have face-to-face video chats with her doctor.

All these investments – in innovation, education, and infrastructure – will make America a better place to do business and create jobs. But to help our companies compete, we also have to knock down barriers that stand in the way of their success.

Over the years, a parade of lobbyists has rigged the tax code to benefit particular companies and industries. Those with accountants or lawyers to work the system can end up paying no taxes at all. But all the rest are hit with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and it has to change.

So tonight, I’m asking Democrats and Republicans to simplify the system. Get rid of the loopholes. Level the playing field. And use the savings to lower the corporate tax rate for the first time in 25 years – without adding to our deficit.

To help businesses sell more products abroad, we set a goal of doubling our exports by 2014 – because the more we export, the more jobs we create at home. Already, our exports are up. Recently, we signed agreements with India and China that will support more than 250,000 jobs in the United States. And last month, we finalized a trade agreement with South Korea that will support at least 70,000 American jobs. This agreement has unprecedented support from business and labor; Democrats and Republicans, and I ask this Congress to pass it as soon as possible.

Before I took office, I made it clear that we would enforce our trade agreements, and that I would only sign deals that keep faith with American workers, and promote American jobs. That's what we did with Korea, and that's what I intend to do as we pursue agreements with Panama and Colombia, and continue our Asia Pacific and global trade talks.

To reduce barriers to growth and investment, I've ordered a review of government regulations. When we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them. But I will not hesitate to create or enforce commonsense safeguards to protect the American people. That's what we've done in this country for more than a century. It's why our food is safe to eat, our water is safe to drink, and our air is safe to breathe. It's why we have speed limits and child labor laws. It's why last year, we put in place consumer protections against hidden fees and penalties by credit card companies, and new rules to prevent another financial crisis. And it's why we passed reform that finally prevents the health insurance industry from exploiting patients.

Now, I've heard rumors that a few of you have some concerns about the new health care law. So let me be the first to say that anything can be improved. If you have ideas about how to improve this law by making care better or more affordable, I am eager to work with you. We can start right now by correcting a flaw in the legislation that has placed an unnecessary bookkeeping burden on small businesses.

What I'm not willing to do is go back to the days when insurance companies could deny someone coverage because of a pre-existing condition. I'm not willing to tell James Howard, a brain cancer patient from Texas, that his treatment might not be covered. I'm not willing to tell Jim Houser, a small business owner from Oregon, that he has to go back to paying \$5,000 more to cover his employees. As we speak, this law is making prescription drugs cheaper for seniors and giving uninsured students a chance to stay on their parents' coverage. So instead of re-fighting the battles of the last two years, let's fix what needs fixing and move forward.

Now, the final step – a critical step – in winning the future is to make sure we aren't buried under a mountain of debt.

We are living with a legacy of deficit-spending that began almost a decade ago. And in the wake of the financial crisis, some of that was necessary to keep credit flowing, save jobs, and put money in people's pockets.

But now that the worst of the recession is over, we have to confront the fact that our government spends more than it takes in. That is not sustainable. Every day, families sacrifice to live within their means. They deserve a government that does the same.

So tonight, I am proposing that starting this year, we freeze annual domestic spending for the next five years. This would reduce the deficit by more than \$400 billion over the next decade, and will bring discretionary spending to the lowest share of our economy since Dwight Eisenhower was president.

This freeze will require painful cuts. Already, we have frozen the salaries of hardworking federal employees for the next two years. I've proposed cuts to things I care deeply about, like community action programs. The Secretary of Defense has also agreed to cut tens of billions of dollars in spending that he and his generals believe our military can do without.

I recognize that some in this Chamber have already proposed deeper cuts, and I'm willing to eliminate whatever we can honestly afford to do without. But let's make sure that we're not doing it on the backs of our most vulnerable citizens.

And let's make sure what we're cutting is really excess weight. Cutting the deficit by gutting our investments in innovation and education is like lightening an overloaded airplane by removing its engine. It may feel like you're flying high at first, but it won't take long before you'll feel the impact.

Now, most of the cuts and savings I've proposed only address annual domestic spending, which represents a little more than 12% of our budget. To make further progress, we have to stop pretending that cutting this kind of spending alone will be enough. It won't.

The bipartisan Fiscal Commission I created last year made this crystal clear. I don't agree with all their proposals, but they made important progress. And their conclusion is that the only way to tackle our deficit is to cut excessive spending wherever we find it – in domestic spending, defense spending, health care spending, and spending through tax breaks and loopholes.

This means further reducing health care costs, including programs like Medicare and Medicaid, which are the single biggest contributor to our long-term deficit. Health insurance reform will slow these rising costs, which is part of why nonpartisan economists have said that repealing the health care law would add a quarter of a trillion dollars to our deficit. Still, I'm willing to look at other ideas to bring down costs, including one that Republicans suggested last year: medical malpractice reform to rein in frivolous lawsuits.

To put us on solid ground, we should also find a bipartisan solution to strengthen Social Security for future generations. And we must do it without putting at risk current retirees, the most vulnerable, or people with disabilities; without slashing benefits for future generations; and without subjecting Americans' guaranteed retirement income to the whims of the stock market.

And if we truly care about our deficit, we simply cannot afford a permanent extension of the tax cuts for the wealthiest 2% of Americans. Before we take money away from our schools, or scholarships away from our students, we should ask millionaires to give up their tax break.

It's not a matter of punishing their success. It's about promoting America's success.

In fact, the best thing we could do on taxes for all Americans is to simplify the individual tax code. This will be a tough job, but members of both parties have expressed interest in doing this, and I am prepared to join them.

So now is the time to act. Now is the time for both sides and both houses of Congress – Democrats and Republicans – to forge a principled compromise that gets the job done. If we make the hard choices now to rein in our deficits, we can make the investments we need to win the future.

Let me take this one step further. We shouldn't just give our people a government that's more affordable. We should give them a government that's more competent and efficient. We cannot win the future with a government of the past.

We live and do business in the information age, but the last major reorganization of the government happened in the age of black and white TV. There are twelve different agencies that deal with exports. There are at least five different entities that deal with housing policy. Then there's my favorite example: the Interior Department is in charge of salmon

while they're in fresh water, but the Commerce Department handles them in when they're in saltwater. And I hear it gets even more complicated once they're smoked.

Now, we have made great strides over the last two years in using technology and getting rid of waste. Veterans can now download their electronic medical records with a click of the mouse. We're selling acres of federal office space that hasn't been used in years, and we will cut through red tape to get rid of more. But we need to think bigger. In the coming months, my administration will develop a proposal to merge, consolidate, and reorganize the federal government in a way that best serves the goal of a more competitive America. I will submit that proposal to Congress for a vote – and we will push to get it passed.

In the coming year, we will also work to rebuild people's faith in the institution of government. Because you deserve to know exactly how and where your tax dollars are being spent, you will be able to go to a website and get that information for the very first time in history. Because you deserve to know when your elected officials are meeting with lobbyists, I ask Congress to do what the White House has already done: put that information online. And because the American people deserve to know that special interests aren't larding up legislation with pet projects, both parties in Congress should know this: if a bill comes to my desk with earmarks inside, I will veto it.

A 21st century government that's open and competent. A government that lives within its means. An economy that's driven by new skills and ideas. Our success in this new and changing world will require reform, responsibility, and innovation. It will also require us to approach that world with a new level of engagement in our foreign affairs.

Just as jobs and businesses can now race across borders, so can new threats and new challenges. No single wall separates East and West; no one rival superpower is aligned against us.

And so we must defeat determined enemies wherever they are, and build coalitions that cut across lines of region and race and religion. America's moral example must always shine for all who yearn for freedom, justice, and dignity. And because we have begun this work, tonight we can say that American leadership has been renewed and America's standing has been restored.

Look to Iraq, where nearly 100,000 of our brave men and women have left with their heads held high; where American combat patrols have ended; violence has come down; and a new government has been formed. This year, our civilians will forge a lasting partnership with the Iraqi people, while we finish the job of bringing our troops out of Iraq. America's commitment has been kept; the Iraq War is coming to an end.

Of course, as we speak, al Qaeda and their affiliates continue to plan attacks against us. Thanks to our intelligence and law enforcement professionals, we are disrupting plots and securing our cities and skies. And as extremists try to inspire acts of violence within our borders, we are responding with the strength of our communities, with respect for the rule of law, and with the conviction that American Muslims are a part of our American family.

We have also taken the fight to al Qaeda and their allies abroad. In Afghanistan, our troops have taken Taliban strongholds and trained Afghan Security Forces. Our purpose is clear – by preventing the Taliban from reestablishing a stranglehold over the Afghan people, we will deny al Qaeda the safe-haven that served as a launching pad for 9/11.

Thanks to our heroic troops and civilians, fewer Afghans are under the control of the insurgency. There will be tough fighting ahead, and the Afghan government will need to deliver better governance. But we are strengthening the capacity of the Afghan people and building an enduring partnership with them. This year, we will work with nearly 50 countries to begin a transition to an Afghan lead. And this July, we will begin to bring our troops home.

In Pakistan, al Qaeda's leadership is under more pressure than at any point since 2001. Their leaders and operatives are being removed from the battlefield. Their safe-havens are shrinking. And we have sent a message from the Afghan border to the Arabian Peninsula to all parts of the globe: we will not relent, we will not waver, and we will defeat you.

American leadership can also be seen in the effort to secure the worst weapons of war. Because Republicans and Democrats approved the New START Treaty, far fewer nuclear weapons and launchers will be deployed. Because we rallied the world, nuclear materials are being locked down on every continent so they never fall into the hands of terrorists.

Because of a diplomatic effort to insist that Iran meet its obligations, the Iranian government now faces tougher and tighter sanctions than ever before. And on the Korean peninsula, we stand with our ally South Korea, and insist that North Korea keeps its commitment to abandon nuclear weapons.

This is just a part of how we are shaping a world that favors peace and prosperity. With our European allies, we revitalized NATO, and increased our cooperation on everything from counter-terrorism to missile defense. We have reset our relationship with Russia, strengthened Asian alliances, and built new partnerships with nations like India. This March, I will travel to Brazil, Chile, and El Salvador to forge new alliances for progress in the Americas. Around the globe, we are standing with those who take responsibility – helping farmers grow more food; supporting doctors who care for the sick; and combating the corruption that can rot a society and rob people of opportunity.

Recent events have shown us that what sets us apart must not just be our power – it must be the purpose behind it. In South Sudan – with our assistance – the people were finally able to vote for independence after years of war. Thousands lined up before dawn. People danced in the streets. One man who lost four of his brothers at war summed up the scene around him: "This was a battlefield for most of my life. Now we want to be free."

We saw that same desire to be free in Tunisia, where the will of the people proved more powerful than the writ of a dictator. And tonight, let us be clear: the United States of America stands with the people of Tunisia, and supports the democratic aspirations of all people.

We must never forget that the things we've struggled for, and fought for, live in the hearts of people everywhere. And we must always remember that the Americans who have borne the greatest burden in this struggle are the men and women who serve our country.

Tonight, let us speak with one voice in reaffirming that our nation is united in support of our troops and their families. Let us serve them as well as they have served us – by giving them the equipment they need; by providing them with the care and benefits they have earned; and by enlisting our veterans in the great task of building our own nation.

Our troops come from every corner of this country – they are black, white, Latino, Asian and Native American. They are Christian and Hindu, Jewish and Muslim. And, yes, we know that some of them are gay. Starting this year, no

American will be forbidden from serving the country they love because of who they love. And with that change, I call on all of our college campuses to open their doors to our military recruiters and the ROTC. It is time to leave behind the divisive battles of the past. It is time to move forward as one nation.

We should have no illusions about the work ahead of us. Reforming our schools; changing the way we use energy; reducing our deficit – none of this is easy. All of it will take time. And it will be harder because we will argue about everything. The cost. The details. The letter of every law.

Of course, some countries don't have this problem. If the central government wants a railroad, they get a railroad – no matter how many homes are bulldozed. If they don't want a bad story in the newspaper, it doesn't get written.

And yet, as contentious and frustrating and messy as our democracy can sometimes be, I know there isn't a person here who would trade places with any other nation on Earth.

We may have differences in policy, but we all believe in the rights enshrined in our Constitution. We may have different opinions, but we believe in the same promise that says this is a place where you can make it if you try. We may have different backgrounds, but we believe in the same dream that says this is a country where anything's possible. No matter who you are. No matter where you come from.

That dream is why I can stand here before you tonight. That dream is why a working class kid from Scranton can stand behind me. That dream is why someone who began by sweeping the floors of his father's Cincinnati bar can preside as Speaker of the House in the greatest nation on Earth.

That dream – that American Dream – is what drove the Allen Brothers to reinvent their roofing company for a new era. It's what drove those students at Forsyth Tech to learn a new skill and work towards the future. And that dream is the story of a small business owner named Brandon Fisher.

Brandon started a company in Berlin, Pennsylvania that specializes in a new kind of drilling technology. One day last summer, he saw the news that halfway across the world, 33 men were trapped in a Chilean mine, and no one knew how to save them.

But Brandon thought his company could help. And so he designed a rescue that would come to be known as Plan B. His employees worked around the clock to manufacture the necessary drilling equipment. And Brandon left for Chile.

Along with others, he began drilling a 2,000 foot hole into the ground, working three or four days at a time with no sleep. Thirty-seven days later, Plan B succeeded, and the miners were rescued. But because he didn't want all of the attention, Brandon wasn't there when the miners emerged. He had already gone home, back to work on his next project.

Later, one of his employees said of the rescue, "We proved that Center Rock is a little company, but we do big things."

We do big things.

From the earliest days of our founding, America has been the story of ordinary people who dare to dream. That's how we win the future.

We are a nation that says, “I might not have a lot of money, but I have this great idea for a new company. I might not come from a family of college graduates, but I will be the first to get my degree. I might not know those people in trouble, but I think I can help them, and I need to try. I’m not sure how we’ll reach that better place beyond the horizon, but I know we’ll get there. I know we will.”

We do big things.

The idea of America endures. Our destiny remains our choice. And tonight, more than two centuries later, it is because of our people that our future is hopeful, our journey goes forward, and the state of our union is strong.

Thank you, God Bless You, and may God Bless the United States of America.

Barack Obama's Fourth State of the Union Address

24/1/2012

Thank you, thank you. Everybody, please be seated. [Mr. Speaker](#), [Mr. Vice President](#), members of Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow [Americans](#):

Last month, I went to [Andrews Air Force Base](#) and welcomed home some of our last troops to serve in [Iraq](#). Together, we offered a final, proud salute to the colors under which more than a million of our fellow citizens fought, and several thousand gave their lives. We gather tonight knowing that this generation of heroes has made the United States safer and more respected around the world.

For the first time in nine years, there are no Americans fighting in Iraq. For the first time in two decades, [Osama bin Laden](#) is not a threat to this country. Most of [al-Qaeda](#)'s top lieutenants have been defeated. The [Taliban](#)'s momentum has been broken, and some troops in [Afghanistan](#) have begun to come home. These achievements are a testament to the courage, selflessness, and teamwork of [America](#)'s [Armed Forces](#). [At a time when too many of our institutions have let us down, they exceed all expectations. They're not consumed with personal ambition. They don't obsess over their differences. They focus on the mission at hand. They work together.](#) Imagine what we could accomplish if we followed their example.

Think about the America within our reach: a country that leads the world in educating its people. An America that attracts a new generation of high-tech manufacturing and high-paying jobs. A future where we're in control of our own energy, and our security and prosperity aren't so tied to unstable parts of the world. An economy built to last, [where hard work pays off, and responsibility is rewarded](#). We can do this. I know we can, because we've done it before. At the end of [World War II](#), when [another generation of heroes](#) returned home from combat, they built the strongest economy and middle class the world has ever known.

My [grandfather](#), a veteran of [Patton](#)'s Army, got the chance to go to college on the [G.I. Bill](#). My [grandmother](#), who worked on a bomber assembly line, was part of a workforce that turned out the best products on Earth. The two of them shared the optimism of a nation that had triumphed over a [depression](#) and [fascism](#). They understood they were part of something larger; that they were contributing to a story of success that every American had a chance to share – the basic American promise that if you worked hard, you could do well enough to raise a family, [own a home, send your kids to college, and put a little away for retirement](#).

The defining issue of our time is how to keep that promise alive. No challenge is more urgent. No debate is more important. We can either settle for a country where a shrinking number of people do really well, while a growing number of Americans barely get by, or we can restore an economy where everyone gets a fair shot, and everyone does their fair share, and everyone plays by the same set of rules.

What's at stake aren't Democratic values or Republican values, but American values. And we have to reclaim them. Let's remember how we got here. Long before the [recession](#), jobs and manufacturing began leaving our shores. Technology made businesses more efficient, but also made some jobs obsolete. Folks at the top saw their incomes rise like never before, but most hardworking Americans struggled with costs that were growing, paychecks that weren't, and personal debt that kept piling up.

In [2008](#), the house of cards collapsed. We learned that [mortgages had been sold to people who couldn't afford or understand them](#). Banks had made huge bets and bonuses with other people's money. Regulators had looked the other way, or didn't have the authority to stop the bad behavior. It was wrong. It was irresponsible. And it plunged our economy into a crisis that put millions out of work, saddled us with more debt, and left innocent, hard-working Americans holding the bag. In the six months before I took office, we lost nearly four million jobs, and we lost another four million before our policies were in full effect. Those are the facts. But so are these. In the last 22 months, businesses have created more than three million jobs.

Last year, they created the most jobs since [2005](#). American manufacturers are hiring again, creating jobs for the first time since the late-[1990s](#). Together, we've agreed to cut the [deficit](#) by more than two-trillion dollars. And we've put in place new rules to hold [Wall Street](#) accountable, so a crisis like this never happens again.

The state of our Union is getting stronger, and we've come too far to turn back now. As long as I'm [President](#), I will work with anyone in this chamber to build on this momentum. But I intend to fight obstruction with action, and I will oppose any effort to return to the very same policies that brought on this economic crisis in the first place.

No. We will not go back to an economy weakened by [outsourcing](#), bad debt, and phony financial profits. Tonight, I want to speak about how we move forward, and lay out a blueprint for an economy that's built to last. An economy built on American manufacturing, American energy, skills for American workers, and a renewal of American values.

Now, this blueprint begins with American manufacturing. On the day I took office, our auto industry was on the verge of collapse. Some even said we should let it die. With a million jobs at stake, I refused to let that happen. In exchange for help, we demanded responsibility. We got workers and automakers to settle their differences. We got the industry to retool and restructure. Today, [General Motors](#) is back on top as the world's number one automaker.

[Chrysler](#) has grown faster in the U.S. than any major car company. [Ford](#) is investing billions in U.S. plants and factories. And together, the entire industry added nearly 160,000 jobs. We bet on American workers. We bet on American ingenuity. And tonight, the American auto industry is back.

What's happening in [Detroit](#) can happen in other industries. It can happen in [Cleveland](#) and [Pittsburgh](#) and [Raleigh](#). We can't bring back every job that's left our shores. But right now, it's getting more expensive to do business in places like [China](#). Meanwhile, America is more productive. A few weeks ago, the [CEO](#) of [Master Lock](#) told me that it now makes business sense for him to bring jobs back home. Today, for the first time in fifteen years, Master Lock's unionized plant in [Milwaukee](#) is running at full capacity.

So we have a huge opportunity, at this moment, to bring manufacturing back. But we have to seize it. Tonight, my message to business leaders is simple: ask yourselves what you can do to bring jobs back to your country, and your country will do everything we can to help you succeed.

We should start with our [tax code](#). Right now, companies get tax breaks for moving jobs and profits overseas. Meanwhile, companies that choose to stay in America get hit with one of the highest tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and everyone knows it.

So let's change it. First, if you're a business that wants to outsource jobs, you shouldn't get a tax deduction for doing it. That money should be used to cover moving expenses for companies like Master Lock that decide to bring jobs home.

Second, no American company should be able to avoid paying its fair share of taxes by moving jobs and profits overseas. From now on, every [multinational company](#) should have to pay a basic minimum tax. And every penny should go towards lowering taxes for companies that choose to stay here and hire here.

Third, if you're an American manufacturer, you should get a bigger tax cut. If you're a high-tech manufacturer, we should double the tax deduction you get for making products here. And if you want to relocate in a community that was hit hard when a factory left town, you should get help financing a new plant, equipment, or training for new workers.

My message is simple. It's time to stop rewarding businesses that ship jobs overseas, and start rewarding companies that create jobs right here in America. Send me these tax reforms, and I'll sign them right away.

We're also making it easier for American businesses to sell products all over the world. Two years ago, I set a goal of doubling U.S. exports over five years. With the bipartisan trade agreements I signed into law, we are on track to meet that goal ahead of schedule. Soon, there will be millions of new customers for American goods in [Panama](#), [Colombia](#), and [South Korea](#). Soon, there will be new cars on the streets of [Seoul](#) imported from [Detroit](#), and [Toledo](#), and [Chicago](#).

I will go anywhere in the world to open new markets for American products. And I will not stand by when our competitors don't play by the rules. We've brought trade cases against [China](#) at nearly twice the rate as the last administration, and it's made a difference. Over a thousand Americans are working today because we stopped a surge in Chinese tires. But we need to do more. It's not right when another country lets our movies, music, and software be pirated. It's not fair when foreign manufacturers have a leg up on ours only because they're heavily subsidized.

Tonight, I'm announcing the creation of a Trade Enforcement Unit that will be charged with investigating unfair trade practices in countries like China. There will be more inspections to prevent counterfeit or unsafe goods from crossing our borders. And this Congress should make sure that no foreign company has an advantage over American manufacturing when it comes to accessing finance or new markets like [Russia](#). Our workers are the most productive on Earth, and if the playing field is level, I promise you: America will always win.

I also hear from many business leaders who want to hire in the United States but can't find workers with the right skills. Growing industries in science and technology have twice as many openings as we have workers who can do the job. Think about that: openings at a time when millions of Americans are looking for work.

That's inexcusable. And we know how to fix it.

Jackie Bray is a single mom from [North Carolina](#) who was laid off from her job as a mechanic. Then [Siemens](#) opened a [gas turbine](#) factory in [Charlotte](#), and formed a partnership with [Central Piedmont Community College](#). The company helped the college design courses in laser and robotics training. It paid Jackie's tuition, then hired her to help operate their plant.^[1]

I want every American looking for work to have the same opportunity as Jackie did. Join me in a national commitment to train two million Americans with skills that will lead directly to a job. My Administration has already lined up more

companies that want to help. Model partnerships between businesses like Siemens and community colleges in places like [Charlotte](#), [Orlando](#), and [Louisville](#) are up and running. Now you need to give more community colleges the resources they need to become community career centers: places that teach people skills that local businesses are looking for right now, from data management to high-tech manufacturing.

And I want to cut through the maze of confusing training programs, so that from now on, people like Jackie have one program, one website, and one place to go for all the information and help they need. It's time to turn our unemployment system into a reemployment system that puts people to work.

These reforms will help people get jobs that are open today. But to prepare for the jobs of tomorrow, our commitment to skills and [education](#) has to start earlier. For less than one-percent of what our Nation spends on education each year, we've convinced nearly every State in the country to raise their standards for teaching and learning – the first time that's happened in a generation. But challenges remain. And we know how to solve them.

At a time when other countries are [doubling down](#) on education, tight budgets have forced States to lay off thousands of teachers. We know a good teacher can increase the lifetime income of a classroom by over \$250,000. A great teacher can offer an escape from poverty to the child who dreams beyond his circumstance. Every person in this chamber can point to a teacher who changed the trajectory of their lives. Most teachers work tirelessly, with modest pay, sometimes digging into their own pocket for school supplies, just to make a difference.

Teachers matter. So instead of bashing them, or defending the [status quo](#), let's offer schools a deal. Give them the resources to keep good teachers on the job, and reward the best ones. In return, grant schools flexibility: to teach with creativity and passion; to stop [teaching to the test](#); and to replace teachers who just aren't helping kids learn. That's a bargain worth making.

We also know that when students aren't allowed to walk away from their education, more of them walk the stage to get their diploma. When students are not allowed to drop out, they do better. So tonight, I call on every State to require that all students stay in high school until they graduate or turn eighteen.

When kids do graduate, the most daunting challenge can be the cost of college. At a time when Americans owe more in tuition debt than credit card debt, this Congress needs to stop the interest rates on student loans from doubling in July. Extend the tuition tax credit we started that saves middle-class families thousands of dollars. And give more young people the chance to earn their way through college by doubling the number of [work-study](#) jobs in the next five years.

Of course, it's not enough for us to increase student aid. We can't just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we'll run out of money. States also need to do their part, by making [higher education](#) a higher priority in their budgets. And colleges and universities have to do their part by working to keep costs down. Recently, I spoke with a group of college presidents who've done just that. Some schools re-design courses to help students finish more quickly. Some use better technology. The point is, it's possible. So let me put colleges and universities on notice: if you can't stop tuition from going up, the funding you get from taxpayers will go down. Higher education can't be a luxury. It's an economic imperative that every family in America should be able to afford.

Let's also remember that hundreds of thousands of talented, hardworking students in this country face another challenge: the fact that they aren't yet [American citizens](#). Many were brought here as small children, are American

through and through, yet they live every day with the threat of [deportation](#). Others came more recently, to study business and science and engineering, but as soon as they get their degree, we send them home to invent new products and create new jobs somewhere else.

That doesn't make sense.

I believe as strongly as ever that we should take on [illegal immigration](#). That's why my Administration has put more boots on the border than ever before. That's why there are fewer illegal crossings than when I took office.

The opponents of action are out of excuses. We should be working on comprehensive [immigration reform](#) right now. But if election-year politics keeps Congress from acting on a comprehensive plan, let's at least agree to stop expelling responsible young people who want to staff our labs, start new businesses, and defend this country. Send me a law that gives them the chance to earn their citizenship. I will sign it right away.

You see, an economy built to last is one where we encourage the talent and ingenuity of every person in this country. That means women should earn equal pay for equal work. It means we should support everyone who's willing to work; and every risk-taker and entrepreneur who aspires to become the next [Steve Jobs](#).

After all, innovation is what America has always been about. Most new jobs are created in [start-ups](#) and [small businesses](#). So let's pass an agenda that helps them succeed. Tear down regulations that prevent aspiring entrepreneurs from getting the financing to grow. Expand tax relief to small businesses that are raising wages and creating good jobs. Both parties agree on these ideas. So put them in a bill, and get it on my desk this year.

Innovation also demands basic research. Today, the discoveries taking place in our federally-financed labs and universities could lead to new treatments that kill cancer cells but leave healthy ones untouched. New lightweight vests for cops and soldiers that can stop any bullet. Don't gut these investments in our budget. Don't let other countries win the race for the future. Support the same kind of research and innovation that led to the [computer chip](#) and the [Internet](#); to new American jobs and new American industries.

Nowhere is the promise of innovation greater than in American-made energy. Over the last three years, we've opened millions of new acres for [oil and gas](#) exploration, and tonight, I'm directing my Administration to open more than 75% of our potential offshore oil and gas resources. Right now, American oil production is the highest that it's been in eight years. That's right: eight years. Not only that: last year, we relied less on foreign oil than in any of the past sixteen years.

But with only two-percent of the world's oil reserves, oil isn't enough. This country needs an all-out, all-of-the-above strategy that develops every available source of American energy, a strategy that's cleaner, cheaper, and full of new jobs.

We have a supply of [natural gas](#) that can last America nearly one hundred years, and my Administration will take every possible action to safely develop this energy. Experts believe this will support more than 600,000 jobs by the end of the decade. And I'm requiring all companies that drill for gas on public lands to disclose the chemicals they use. America will develop this resource without putting the health and safety of our citizens at risk.

The development of natural gas will create jobs and power trucks and factories that are cleaner and cheaper, proving that we don't have to choose between our environment and our economy. And by the way, it was public research dollars, over the course of thirty years, that helped develop the technologies to extract all this natural gas out of shale rock, reminding us that Government support is critical in helping businesses get new energy ideas off the ground.

What's true for natural gas is true for [clean energy](#). In three years, our partnership with the private sector has already positioned America to be the world's leading manufacturer of high-tech batteries. Because of federal investments, renewable energy use has nearly doubled. And thousands of Americans have jobs because of it.

When Bryan Ritterby was laid off from his job making furniture, he said he worried that at 55, no one would give him a second chance. But he found work at Energetx, a [wind turbine](#) manufacturer in [Michigan](#). Before the recession, the factory only made luxury yachts. Today, it's hiring workers like Bryan, who said, "I'm proud to be working in the industry of the future."²¹

Our experience with [shale gas](#) shows us that the payoffs on these public investments don't always come right away. Some technologies don't pan out; some companies fail. But I will not walk away from the promise of clean energy. I will not walk away from workers like Bryan. I will not cede the [wind](#) or [solar](#) or battery industry to [China](#) or [Germany](#) because we refuse to make the same commitment here. We have subsidized oil companies for a century. That's long enough. It's time to end the taxpayer giveaways to an industry that's rarely been more profitable, and double-down on a [clean energy](#) industry that's never been more promising. Pass clean energy tax credits and create these jobs.

We can also spur energy innovation with new incentives. The differences in this chamber may be too deep right now to pass a comprehensive plan to fight [climate change](#). But there's no reason why Congress shouldn't at least set a clean energy standard that creates a market for innovation. So far, you haven't acted. Well tonight, I will. I'm directing my Administration to allow the development of clean energy on enough public land to power three million homes. And I'm proud to announce that the [Department of Defense](#), the world's largest consumer of energy, will make one of the largest commitments to clean energy in history, with the [Navy](#) purchasing enough capacity to power a quarter of a million homes a year.

Of course, the easiest way to save money is to waste less energy. So here's another proposal: help manufacturers eliminate energy waste in their factories and give businesses incentives to upgrade their buildings. Their energy bills will be \$100 billion lower over the next decade, and America will have less pollution, more manufacturing, and more jobs for construction workers who need them. Send me a bill that creates these jobs.

Building this new energy future should be just one part of a broader agenda to repair America's infrastructure. So much of America needs to be rebuilt. We've got crumbling roads and bridges. A [power grid](#) that wastes too much energy. An incomplete [high-speedbroadband](#) network that prevents a small business owner in rural America from selling her products all over the world.

During the Great Depression, America built the [Hoover Dam](#) and the [Golden Gate Bridge](#). After World War II, we connected our States with a [system of highways](#). Democratic and Republican administrations invested in great projects that benefited everybody, from the workers who built them to the businesses that still use them today.

In the next few weeks, I will sign an [executive order](#) clearing away the red tape that slows down too many construction projects. But you need to fund these projects. Take the money we're no longer spending at war, use half of it to pay down our debt, and use the rest to do some [nation-building](#) right here at home.

There's never been a better time to build, especially since the construction industry was one of the hardest-hit when the housing bubble burst. Of course, construction workers weren't the only ones hurt. So were millions of innocent Americans who've seen their home values decline. And while Government can't fix the problem on its own, responsible homeowners shouldn't have to sit and wait for the housing market to hit bottom to get some relief.

That's why I'm sending this Congress a plan that gives every responsible homeowner the chance to save about \$3,000 a year on their mortgage, by refinancing at historically low interest rates. No more red tape. No more runaround from the banks. A small fee on the largest financial institutions will ensure that it won't add to the deficit, and will give banks that were rescued by taxpayers a chance to repay a deficit of trust.

Let's never forget: millions of Americans who work hard and play by the rules every day deserve a Government and a financial system that do the same. It's time to apply the same rules from top to bottom: no bailouts, no handouts, and no copouts. An America built to last insists on responsibility from everybody.

We've all paid the price for lenders who sold mortgages to people who couldn't afford them, and buyers who knew they couldn't afford them. That's why we need smart regulations to prevent irresponsible behavior. Rules to prevent financial fraud or toxic dumping or faulty medical devices don't destroy the [free market](#). They make the free market work better.

There is no question that some regulations are outdated, unnecessary, or too costly. In fact, I've approved fewer regulations in the first three years of my presidency than my Republican [predecessor](#) did in his. I've ordered every federal agency to eliminate rules that don't make sense. We've already announced over 500 reforms, and just a fraction of them will save business and citizens more than ten-billion dollars over the next five years. We got rid of one rule from forty years ago that could have forced some dairy farmers to spend \$10,000 a year proving that they could contain a spill, because [milk](#) was somehow classified as an oil. With a rule like that, I guess it was worth [crying over spilled milk](#).

I'm confident a farmer can contain a milk spill without a federal agency looking over his shoulder. But I will not back down from making sure an oil company can contain [the kind of oil spill](#) we saw in [the Gulf two years ago](#). I will not back down from protecting our kids from [mercury](#) pollution, or making sure that our food is safe and our water is clean. I will not go back to the days when [health insurance companies](#) had unchecked power to cancel your policy, deny you coverage, or charge women differently from men.

And I will not go back to the days when [Wall Street](#) was allowed to play by its own set of rules. The new rules we passed restore what should be any financial system's core purpose: getting funding to entrepreneurs with the best ideas, and getting loans to responsible families who want to buy a home, start a business, or send a kid to college.

So if you're a big bank or financial institution, you are no longer allowed to make risky bets with your customers' deposits. You're required to write out a "living will" that details exactly how you'll pay the bills if you fail, because the rest of us aren't bailing you out ever again. And if you're a [mortgage lender](#) or a [payday lender](#) or a [credit card](#)

company, the days of signing people up for products they can't afford with confusing forms and deceptive practices are over. Today, American consumers finally have a watchdog in [Richard Cordray](#) with one job: to look out for them.

We will also establish a Financial Crimes Unit of highly trained investigators to crack down on large-scale fraud and protect people's investments. Some financial firms violate major anti-fraud laws because there's no real penalty for being a repeat offender. That's bad for consumers, and it's bad for the vast majority of bankers and financial service professionals who do the right thing. So pass legislation that makes the penalties for fraud count.

And tonight, I am asking my [Attorney General](#) to create a special unit of federal prosecutors and leading state attorneys general to expand our investigations into the abusive lending and packaging of risky mortgages that led to the housing crisis. This new unit will hold accountable those who broke the law, speed assistance to homeowners, and help turn the page on an era of recklessness that hurt so many Americans.

A return to the American values of fair play and shared responsibility will help us protect our people and our economy. But it should also guide us as we look to pay down our debt and invest in our future. Right now, our most immediate priority is stopping a tax hike on 160-million working Americans while the recovery is still fragile. People cannot afford losing \$40 out of each paycheck this year. There are plenty of ways to get this done. So let's agree right here, right now: no side issues. No drama. Pass the payroll tax cut without delay.

When it comes to the deficit, we've already agreed to more than two-trillion dollars in cuts and savings. But we need to do more, and that means making choices. Right now, we're poised to spend nearly a trillion dollars more on what was supposed to be a temporary tax break for the wealthiest two-percent of Americans. Right now, because of loopholes and shelters in the tax code, a quarter of all millionaires pay lower tax rates than millions of middle-class households. Right now, [Warren Buffett](#) pays a lower tax rate than his secretary.

Do we want to keep these tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans? Or do we want to keep our investments in everything else, like education and medical research, a strong military, and care for our veterans? Because if we're serious about paying down our debt, we can't do both.

The American people know what the right choice is. So do I. As I told the [Speaker](#) this summer, I'm prepared to make more reforms that rein in the long term costs of [Medicare](#) and [Medicaid](#), and strengthen [Social Security](#), so long as those programs remain a guarantee of security for [seniors](#).

But in return, we need to change our tax code so that people like me, and an awful lot of Members of [Congress](#), pay our fair share of taxes. Tax reform should follow the Buffett rule: if you make more than a million dollars a year, you should not pay less than 30% in taxes. And my Republican friend [Tom Coburn](#) is right: [Washington](#) should stop subsidizing millionaires. In fact, if you're earning a million dollars a year, you shouldn't get special tax subsidies or deductions. On the other hand, if you make under \$250,000 a year, like 98% of American families, your taxes shouldn't go up. You're the ones struggling with rising costs and stagnant wages. You're the ones who need relief.

Now, you can call this [class warfare](#) all you want. But asking a [billionaire](#) to pay at least as much as his secretary in taxes? Most Americans would call that [common sense](#).

We don't begrudge financial success in this country. We admire it. When Americans talk about folks like me paying my fair share of taxes, it's not because they envy the rich. It's because they understand that when I get tax breaks I don't need and the country can't afford, it either adds to the deficit, or somebody else has to make up the difference – like a senior on a fixed income; or a student trying to get through school; or a family trying to make ends meet. That's not right. Americans know it's not right. They know that this generation's success is only possible because past generations felt a responsibility to each other, and to their country's future, and they know our way of life will only endure if we feel that same sense of shared responsibility. That's how we'll reduce our deficit. That's an America built to last.

I recognize that people watching tonight have differing views about taxes and debt; energy and health care. But no matter what party they belong to, I bet most Americans are thinking the same thing right now: nothing will get done this year, or next year, or maybe even the year after that, because Washington is broken. [Can you blame them for feeling a little cynical?](#)

The greatest blow to confidence in our economy last year didn't come from events beyond our control. It came from a debate in Washington over whether the United States would pay its bills or not. Who benefited from that fiasco?

I've talked tonight about the deficit of trust between [Main Street](#) and [Wall Street](#). But the divide between this city and the rest of the country is at least as bad, and it seems to get worse every year.

[Some of this has to do with the corrosive influence of money in politics. So together, let's take some steps to fix that. Send me a bill that bans insider trading by Members of Congress, and I will sign it tomorrow. Let's limit any elected official from owning stocks in industries they impact. Let's make sure people who bundle campaign contributions for Congress can't lobby Congress, and vice versa](#), an idea that has bipartisan support, at least outside of Washington.

Some of what's broken has to do with the way Congress does its business these days. A simple majority is no longer enough to get anything, even routine business, passed through the [Senate](#). Neither party has been blameless in these tactics. Now both parties should put an end to it. For starters, I ask the Senate to pass a rule that all judicial and public service nominations receive a simple up or down vote within 90 days.

The [executive branch](#) also needs to change. Too often, it's inefficient, outdated and remote. That's why I've asked this Congress to grant me the authority to consolidate the federal bureaucracy so that our Government is leaner, quicker, and more responsive to the needs of the American people.

Finally, none of these reforms can happen unless we also lower the temperature in this town. We need to end the notion that the two parties must be locked in a perpetual campaign of mutual destruction; that politics is about clinging to rigid ideologies instead of building consensus around common sense ideas.

I'm a [Democrat](#). But I believe what [Republican Abraham Lincoln](#) believed: that Government should do for people only what they cannot do better by themselves, and no more. That's why my education reform offers more competition, and more control for schools and States. That's why we're getting rid of regulations that don't work. That's why our health care law relies on a reformed private market, not a Government program.

On the other hand, even my Republican friends who complain the most about Government spending have supported federally-financed roads, and clean energy projects, and federal offices for the folks back home.

The point is, we should all want a smarter, more effective Government. And while we may not be able to bridge our biggest philosophical differences this year, we can make real progress. With or without this Congress, I will keep taking actions that help the economy grow. But I can do a whole lot more with your help. Because when we act together, there is nothing the United States of America can't achieve.

That is the lesson we've learned from our actions abroad over the last few years. Ending the [Iraq War](#) has allowed us to strike decisive blows against our enemies. From [Pakistan](#) to [Yemen](#), the al-Qaeda operatives who remain are scrambling, knowing that they can't escape the reach of the United States of America.

From this position of strength, we've begun to wind down the [War in Afghanistan](#). Ten thousand of our troops have come home. Twenty-three thousand more will leave by the end of this summer. This transition to Afghan lead will continue, and we will build an enduring partnership with Afghanistan, so that it is never again a source of attacks against America.

As the tide of war recedes, a wave of change has washed across the [Middle East](#) and [North Africa](#), from [Tunis](#) to [Cairo](#); from [Sana'a](#) to [Tripoli](#). A year ago, [Gaddafi](#) was one of the world's longest-serving dictators, a murderer with American blood on his hands. Today, he is gone. And in [Syria](#), I have no doubt that the [Assad](#) regime will soon discover that the forces of change can't be reversed, and that human dignity can't be denied.

How this incredible transformation will end remains uncertain. But we have a huge stake in the outcome. And while it is ultimately up to the people of the region to decide their fate, we will advocate for those values that have served our own country so well. We will stand against violence and intimidation. We will stand for the rights and dignity of all human beings; men and women; [Christians](#), [Muslims](#), and [Jews](#). We will support policies that lead to strong and stable democracies and open markets, because tyranny is no match for liberty.

And we will safeguard America's own security against those who threaten our citizens, our friends, and our interests. Look at [Iran](#). Through the power of our diplomacy, a world that was once divided about how to deal with Iran's nuclear program now stands as one. The regime is more isolated than ever before; its leaders are faced with crippling sanctions, and as long as they shirk their responsibilities, this pressure will not relent. Let there be no doubt: America is determined to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, and I will take no options off the table to achieve that goal. But a peaceful resolution to this issue is still possible, and far better, and if Iran changes course and meets its obligations, it can rejoin the community of nations.

The renewal of American leadership can be felt across the globe. Our oldest alliances in [Europe](#) and [Asia](#) are stronger than ever. Our ties to the [Americas](#) are deeper. Our iron-clad commitment — and I mean ironclad — to [Israel](#)'s security has meant the closest military cooperation between our two countries in history. We've made it clear that America is a [Pacific](#) power, and a new beginning in [Burma](#) has lit a new hope. From the coalitions we've built to secure nuclear materials, to the missions we've led against hunger and disease; from the blows we've dealt to our enemies, to the enduring power of our moral example: America is back.

Anyone who tells you otherwise, anyone who tells you that America is in decline or that our influence has waned, doesn't know what they're talking about. That's not the message we get from leaders around the world, all of whom are eager to work with us. That's not how people feel from [Tokyo](#) to [Berlin](#); from [Cape Town](#) to [Rio](#); where opinions of

America are higher than they've been in years. Yes, the world is changing; no, we can't control every event. But America remains the one indispensable nation in world affairs, and as long as I'm President, I intend to keep it that way.

That's why, working with our military leaders, I have proposed a new defense strategy that ensures we maintain the finest military in the world, while saving nearly half a trillion dollars in our budget. To stay one step ahead of our adversaries, I have already sent this Congress legislation that will secure our country from the growing danger of [cyber-threats](#).

Above all, our freedom endures because of the men and women in uniform who defend it. As they come home, we must serve them as well as they served us. That includes giving them the care and benefits they have earned, which is why we've increased annual [VA](#) spending every year I've been President. And it means enlisting our veterans in the work of rebuilding our Nation.

With the bipartisan support of this Congress, we are providing new tax credits to companies that hire vets. [Michelle](#) and [Jill Biden](#) have worked with American businesses to secure a pledge of 135,000 jobs for veterans and their families. And tonight, I'm proposing a Veterans Job Corps that will help our communities hire veterans as cops and firefighters, so that America is as strong as those who defend her.

Which brings me back to where I began. Those of us who've been sent here to serve can learn from the service of our troops. When you put on that uniform, it doesn't matter if you're [black](#) or [white](#); [Asian](#) or [Latino](#); [conservative](#) or [liberal](#); [rich](#) or [poor](#); [gay](#) or [straight](#). When you're marching into battle, you look out for the person next to you, or the mission fails. When you're in the thick of the fight, you rise or fall as one unit, serving one Nation, leaving no one behind.

One of my proudest possessions is the flag that the [SEAL Team](#) took with them on [the mission to get bin Laden](#). On it are each of their names. Some may be Democrats. Some may be Republicans. But that doesn't matter. Just like it didn't matter that day in the [Situation Room](#), when I sat next to [Bob Gates](#), a man who was George Bush's defense secretary; and [Hillary Clinton](#), a woman who [ran against me for president](#).

All that mattered that day was the mission. No one thought about politics. No one thought about themselves. One of the young men involved in the raid later told me that he didn't deserve credit for the mission. It only succeeded, he said, because every single member of that unit did their job: the pilot who landed the helicopter that spun out of control; the translator who kept others from entering the compound; the troops who separated the women and children from the fight; the [SEALs](#) who charged up the stairs. More than that, the mission only succeeded because every member of that unit trusted each other. Because you can't charge up those stairs, into darkness and danger, unless you know that there's someone behind you, watching your back.

So it is with America. Each time I look at that flag, I'm reminded that our destiny is stitched together like those fifty stars and those thirteen stripes. No one built this country on their own. This Nation is great because we built it together. This Nation is great because we worked as a team. This Nation is great because we get each other's backs. And if we hold fast to that truth, in this moment of trial, there is no challenge too great, no mission too hard. As long as we're joined in common purpose, as long as we maintain our common resolve, our journey moves forward, our future is hopeful, and the state of our Union will always be strong.

Thank you, God bless you, and may [God bless the United States of America.](#)