Former US President Barack Obama's Speeches to 2010 and 2014 Cadets at the Commencement Ceremony of the United States Military Academy: a Critical Discourse Analysis

Nguyen Hai Quynh[1], Bui Thi Thu Huong[2]

[1](Faculty of Languages and Cultures, Thai Nguyen University of Sciences, Thai Nguyen University, Thai Nguyen University, Vietnam)
[2](International Cooperation Division, Department of Foreign Affairs, Ha Giang Province, Vietnam)

Abstract: *From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, this study is an attempt to exploit and uncover the underlying ideologies of the Former US President Obama in his two speeches of 2010 and 2014 at the West Point commencement ceremony. Specifically, in order to explore how linguistic elements manifest the Former President's ideologies, general linguistic features of two speeches related to vocabulary, grammar and textual structure are put into focus. In terms of vocabulary, only overwording, antonyms and metaphor are analyzed to reveal his ideologies encoded through language. Then, grammar features with his use of pronouns, voices and modality are mainly focused. In terms of textual structure, the author pays special attention to the larger-scale structure used in both speeches. The findings of the study are pointed out with some common features and differences in language use of the Former President Obama when he reinforces his voice, exercise his power and express his ideologies in his speeches. This study also helps prove the close relationship between language and ideology and that people can exert their voice and ideologies on others to change or maintain social relationships by his language. In the last part of the thesis, some implications of the study are drawn out with the hope of affirming its contributions to some aspects of our lives.*
Key Word*: Former US President Barack Obama's Speeches; 2010 and 2014 Cadets; Critical Discourse Analysis.*

I. Introduction

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) is regarded as a relatively new research field not only in Vietnam but also in many other countries around the world. Since its first appearance in Britain in the 1970s, CDA has attracted much attention from scholars, researchers, linguistics and social analysts. According to Van Dijk (1988), CDA is a field concerned with studying and analyzing written texts and spoken words to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias and how these sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced and transformed within specific social, economic, political and historical contexts. In addition, Fairclough (2001), a founding father of CDA, also asserted that CDA helps make clear the relationship between the use of language and the exercise of power and ideologies. Its principal aim is to look at the influence of ideologies and power relations on the content and structure of discourse. Viewing language as a form of social practice and focusing on the ways that social and political domination are revealed in texts, CDA has really become a significant approach to language analysis. In the light of CDA, ideological assumptions, the relationships between language, power, ideology and society behind written texts or oral speeches will therefore be uncovered. Hence, realizing the great importance and the role of CDA in analyzing discourse in order to explore hidden ideologies in discourses will be the first reason for the author's choice.

Moreover, with the rapid development of many countries in the world today, most of people have a desire to assert their position and influence on other countries. The United States is not an exception. As a country with the strongest economic growth, its position, domination, strength and ideology *"America must always lead"* have been obviously revealed in many aspects, especially through presidential speeches using CDA perspective. Currently, before the extremely complex situation of the world where America's long war is against core al Qaeda, Russia and China are both flexing their muscles and a number of al Qaeda affiliates in countries such as Syria are enjoying something of a resurgence, any move of US attracts great attention from public opinion. Thus, when the Former President Barack Obama delivered what was touted as a major foreign policy address on his travel to West Point to congratulate the newest officers at US Military Academy commencement ceremony on May 28th 2014, it

---

seemed that all attention was turned to America. Compared to his West Point 2010 address delivered when he had just started his term as the Former President of the United States, the 2014 speech, marking the nearly end of his term, is more highly appreciated. It is supposed to be an important step in outlining his new foreign policy principles and setting up a new military doctrine as well as his vision for how the United States should lead in the years to come.

As Fairclough said, people are members of the society and their speeches are a reflection of a set of experiential, relational, and expressive values (Fairclough, 1992: 110). Therefore, the way Obama used language to express his constant purposes, the way he exercised power through language cleverly and the way his ideologies were embedded and encoded in language use in the West Point 2010 and 2014 speeches prove that language is really a useful social tool. It plays a crucial role for every political action prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. Accordingly, CDA includes not only a description and interpretation of discourse in context, but also offers an explanation of why and how discourse works. CDA then takes us beyond the level of description to a deeper understanding of texts. Therefore, choosing the suitable theoretical and analytical framework of CDA as the basic one to analyze Obama's West Point speeches of 2010 and 2014 and then discover his ideologies reflected in discourses will be the main concern of this study.

The study primarily aims at analyzing President Obama's West Point speeches at the US military academy in 2010 and 2014 to explore his underlying ideas or ideologies in general and to find out the common features of Obama's speeches as well as the relationship between language and ideology behind texts in particular.

Next, to raise language leaners' awareness of underlying ideologies in texts and developing their ability of critical thinking through uses of linguistic elements are considered as another important goal that the author attempts to reach. Through the research, the author hopes to reaffirm that CDA can serve as a useful tool to discover the hidden relationship of language and ideology behind the surface of language. In order to attain these aims, the study is supposed to find out:
- Ideologies offered by Obama in West Point 2010 and 2014 speeches;
- The way he expressed his ideologies in West Point 2010 and 2014 speeches.

II. Theoretical Background

1. An overview of CDA

Different scholars have different ways to define what CDA means. However, most of them broadly agreed with the view of CDA as suggested by Fairclough (1993:135) that CDA as a field of linguistic aims *"to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power"* (Fairclough, 1995: 132). Van Dijk also has stated that *"Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context."* (Van Dijk, 2001:352).

2. Major concepts of CDA

In CDA, the concept of *"discourse"* is widely connected with the well-known definition of Fairclough that discourse means language use in speech and writing as a form of *"social practice"* (Fairclough, 2001:18). By saying that, he means language is not only a part of society but also a social process. This process consists of the text, text production and text interpretation. In order to understand a speech or a text, it is very necessary to get into the depth of that spoken or written text because one key principle of CDA is that the way we write and what we say is not arbitrary - it is purposeful whether the choices are conscious or unconscious. Hence, discourse or language we use (both written and spoken) requires not only a local coherence within texts but also an assessment of the significance or values of the global textual items within it (Sayer, 2006:450).

Ideology is a central concept of CDA. According to van Dijk (1995: 248), *"ideologies are basic frameworks of social cognition, shared by members of social groups, constituted by relevant selections of sociocultural values, and organized by an ideological schema that represents the self-definition of a group".* In other words, ideologies are localized between societal structures and the structures of the minds of social members. Hence, social actors may easily realize their social properties with their knowledge and beliefs making up the concrete models of their daily-life experiences. Indirectly, ideologies control how people plan and understand their social practices and the structures of text and talk.

3. Fairclough's Hallidayan systemic functional approach

Fairclough's Hallidayan systemic functional approach has been central to CDA and has great influence on this study. From the field of linguistics, Fairclough's main point of reference is Halliday's Systemic functional linguistics (SFL) considered valuable resource for CDA because it is concerned with the relationship between language and other elements of social life. Because SFL obviously "*has most in common with CDA and more to offer*

CDA", it *"theorizes language in a way which harmonizes far more with the perspective of critical social science than other theories of language"* (Fairclough and Chouliaraki, 1999:139). In SFL, language is structured towards three meta-functions: experiential, interpersonal and textual that are respectively realized by choices of Transitivity, Mood and Modality and Theme/Rheme systems of the language. Experiential meaning deals with the question *"What is going on?"* recognized through transitivity system that construes the world of experience into a manageable set of process types. For the interpersonal meaning realized by mood structure, CDA analysts should find the answer for the question *"How do we use language to exchange?".* Lastly, thematic structure is a cue to find out the textual meaning which deals with creating relevance between parts of what is being said and between the text and context. The question *"How is the content of the text organized?"* can help recognize the thematic structure (the configuration Theme + Rheme) which organizes the clause as a message.

4. Norman Fairclough's framework for CDA

According to Fairclough, he identifies three ways in which language operates as discourse: (1) as text; (2) as the social processes of producing and interpreting a text, or the interaction; and (3) as the social conditions for the production and interpretation of the text, or the social context. Then these dimensions of discourse link directly to the three-stage approach he advocates for analysis, namely description of the text, interpretation of the relationship between texts and the social processes of interaction, and explanation of the relationship between interaction and the social context (Fairclough 2001). All these stages will be discussed further as follows.

Description is the first stage which is concerned with the formal properties of the text and focuses on three aspects including vocabulary, grammar and textual structures (Fairclough, 2001:21). According to Faiclough (2001: 92-93), he provided a model of ten questions related to three criteria to help find out the text's formal properties which are supposed to imply speakers' ideologies and values. In terms of *vocabulary*, to find out the answers for given questions, Fairclough (2001) divided into smaller questions for realizing experiential and relational values. For *experiential values,* CDA analysts should try to find out classification of scheme; words which are ideologically contested; rewording or overwording; meaning relations such as synonym, hyponymy or antonym and use of metaphor. For *relational values,* euphemistic expressions and formal or informal words should be explored. In terms of *grammar aspect, experiential values* are expressed through types of process and participant predominance, agency, nominalizations, active or passive sentences and positive or negative sentences. Cues for finding *relational values* are modes of sentences, features of relational modality and the use of pronoun *"we"* and *"you".* Also, grammatical features express expressive values through expressive modality. Additionally, how sentences are linked together can be found through logical connectors, coordination or subordination and means used for referring inside and outside the text.

The second stage is the interpretation of the relationship between text and interaction. In detail, it is mainly concerned with the relationship between text and interaction with seeing texts as the product of a process and as a resource in the process of interpretation with two levels, interpretation of content (upper section) and interpretation of texts (lower section). The upper section is related to both context and text as Fairclough's assumption and consists of situational and intertextual context. Fairclough refers to the situational context and the intertextual context as central to the process of interpretation. The situational context provides external cues which have to be interpreted on the basis of MR: *"participants arrive at interpretations of situational context partly on the basis of external cues-features of the physical situation, properties of participants, what has previously been said: but also partly on the basis of aspects of their MR in terms of which they interpret these cues - specifically, representations of societal and institutional social orders which allow them to ascribe the situations they are actually in to particular situation types"* (Fairclough, 1989:114). In the interpretation of situation, Fairclough (2001) guided CDA analysts to focus on some main tasks: *What is going on? Who is involved? What relationships are at issue? And what is the role of language in what is going on?* Dealing with interpreting the intertextual context, *presupposition* should be brought into focus.

The last stage, explanation, is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context with the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation of their social effects (Fairclough, 2001:21-22). One of the aims of discourse is to show how language works and what context it is being used. That is the reason why Fairclough (1992:28) states that *"discourse is more than just language use: it is language use seen as a type of social practice".* It is very clear that both social effects and social determinants of discourse undergo three levels of social organization: the societal level, the institutional level and the situational level. Fairclough (2001:138) also suggests three questions with some main cues to find out explanation of a particular discourse. To uncover social determinants, CDA analysts should consider what power relations at situational, institutional and societal levels help shape discourses. To state hidden ideologies in texts, it is suggested to discover what elements of MR drawn upon have an ideological character. Lastly, CDA analysts should take into consideration how the discourse is positioned in relation to struggles at the situational, institutional and societal levels and whether these struggles overt or covert the normative discourse sustaining existing power relations or transforming them in order to understand effects of those determinants in discourse.

III. Methodology and analysis procedures

1. Data collection

In terms of data, the author chooses two speeches delivered by the Former President Barack Obama at the US Military Academy commencement ceremony in 2010 and 2014 as the main subject for the study. Outlining his foreign policy and defense plan for the remainder of his term, the Former President Obama's address for the US Military Academy's class of 2014 was a particularly important document called the Obama Doctrine because it was all that people around the world were expecting from the Former President Obama and the U.S.

For his address in 2010, Obama offered a glimpse of a new national security doctrine that distances his administration from George W. Bush's policy of preemptive war, emphasizing global institutions and America's role in promoting democratic values. In terms of data collection, lots of books, articles and studies in the field of CDA were collected and exploited thoroughly. In addition, special attention was paid to how different CDA scholars suggested ways of doing CDA.

There may be, of course, different viewpoints and different approaches to CDA. After studying carefully, Norman Fairclough's theory of CDA considered most suitable for the aims and subject of the study was finally chosen.

2. Data analysis procedure

Three stages of CDA including description, interpretation and explanation proposed by Norman Fairclough (2001) will be applied as an insightful investigation into the Former President Obama's addresses in order to explore how linguistic elements manifest his ideologies. To attain this aims, both quantitative and qualitative method are used. Three staged proposed by Fairclough (2001) are analyzed together.

Specifically, general linguistic features of two speeches (lexicology, grammar and textual structure) are discovered and analyzed to see how ideologies of the speaker are encoded through language use. In terms of vocabulary, only *overwording, antonyms and metaphors* will be focused. Then, grammar features with the use of *personal pronoun, voice and modality* will be analyzed carefully. The textual analysis will be also stressed in terms of *textual structure* with its larger-scale structure.

Then, the relationship between the processes of text production and interaction will be made clear with the interpretation of situational and intertextual context. In interpreting the situational context, questions given by Fairclough (2001) will be used as useful suggestions: *what is going on? Who is involved? What relationships are at issue? And what is the role of language in what is going on?* In terms of intertextual context, the researcher will pay attention to the use of presupposition.

Lastly, explanation concerned with the relationship between those processes and social context will be mentioned. As a part of social process or social practices, those speeches are exploited to see how they are determined by social structures and how they change or maintain certain social relationship in social structure.

IV. Data presentation and discussion

1. Context of Obama's speeches at West Point in 2010 and 2014

The United States Military Academy (USMA), known as West Point, is one of the leading cradles of army training of America, which is located in West Point, New York. That is the place where US Presidents often make their speeches to the graduate cadets at the commencement ceremony of the USMA and express their ideologies through their diplomatic or military policies and plans. The Former President Obama is not an exception. In 2010, the Former President Obama gave a prepared speech to the graduating class of 2010 aiming at offering a glimpse of a new national security doctrine, emphasizing global institutions and America's role in promoting democratic values and defending his escalation of the war in Afghanistan. Four years later, in the same setting, the Former President Obama came back the USMA and delivered his address to the newest officers on May 28th, 2014 in order to reflect on America's foreign policy agenda with outlining his vision for how the US and the military should lead in the years to come. When his second term as President will soon end, two speeches at West Point in 2010 and 2014 may be regarded as forceful witnesses marking the beginning and the nearly ending of President Obama's long eight-year term

2. Ideologies of the Former President Barack Obama in West Point 2010 and 2014 speeches

In the West Point 2010 speech, Obama laid out a new military and diplomatic strategy and repudiated the policies of the Bush administration by offering a glimpse of a new national security doctrine. By calling people to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and prevent its capacity to threaten America and our allies in the future, Obama put a stress on *"finding opportunities, fighting injustice, forging a more perfect union"* (in his 2010 speech) and remaining America's role in promoting democratic values and defending his escalation of the war in Afghanistan. Through his address, his recognition of a range of concerns about their approach, his ideas of defending freedom, calling the need of unity as well as his thoughts of pursuing some concrete objectives that guided the US's actions to cooperate with friends and allies were uncovered. He made an attempt instilling in Cadets a *"sense*

of duty", "*sense of honor*", "*love of country*", "*freedom*" and "*commendation*" of a grateful nation (in his 2010 speech). He emphasized "*where ideas are suppressed, we provide space for open debate. Where democratic institutions take hold, we add a wind at their back. When humanitarian disaster strikes, we extend a hand. Where human dignity is denied, America opposes poverty and is a source of opportunity. That is who we are. That is what we do*". That is his way of arousing soldiers 'patriotism and responsibility of protecting their country.

Secondly, his commencement speech in 2014, as a forceful witness, marks an important point of time in President Obama's long eight-year term. In a sign of the sentiments of the Cadets and those attending the ceremony, the President officially declared that America had ended the Iraq war and was preparing to end the Afghanistan conflict, decimated al Qaeda's leadership and eliminated Osama bin Laden. Confronting the complex problems of the US and the world, he skillfully sent his messages and thoughts of outlining new foreign policy principles of "*might doing right*", setting up a new military doctrine as well as his vision for how the United States should lead in the next years to all new Cadets in particular and American people in general. Now, it was time to shift foreign policy to combat a continuing terrorist threat. In addition, the President also drew an overall picture with great intentions for the US and its military force, as "*the backbone of that leadership*", to remain its strength and voice in the world and "*extend peace and prosperity around the globe*" (in his 2014 speech). This fully confirmed his ideas of continuing "*American leadership*", "*American strength*", "*peace and freedom*", "*security*", "*counterterrorism actions*" (in his 2014 speech). It was not simply a straw in the wind of the US foreign policy in the future but a way of expressing great ideals of a Commander-in-Chief of America.

3. Realization of Obama's ideologies through his use of Vocabulary in West Point 2010 and 2014 speeches
3.1. In terms of using Overwording

Table no 2: Repetition of Vocabulary in the Speeches of 2010 and 2014

Repetition of vocabulary in the speech of 2010	Times of occurrence	Repetition of vocabulary in the speech of 2014	Times of occurrence
1. The United States Military Arms		**1. The United States Military Arms**	
West Point	5	West Point	8
The/This Army	6	The/This Army, Academy, Institution, The United States Army	1
The/This Academy	6		
The United States Army	3		
Well-deserved	2		
2. America and American people		**2. America and American people**	
America	23	America	26
(our) country	10	(our/the) country	4
(our) nation	10	The United States	10
The United States of America	3	The United States of America, Homeland	2
		(our/a) nation	3
American(s)	13	American(s)	25
Civilian	3	Citizens	4
Strong (er), Strengthen, Strength	15	Strong(er/est), Strengthen, Strength	6
Build, Built, Building	11	We're strengthened by, (our) People	4
Believe, Belief	8	Believe, Belief	9
Power, Powerful	9	Effort	12
Challenge	8	Willingness, Mission	5
Success, Succeed	7	Effective, Sacrifice(d)	4
History	7	History	3
Leader, Lead	6	Lead	10
Freedom, Free (d)	6	Freedom	4
Global, Globe	5	Necessary	3
Great, Grateful, Honor	4	Value, Achieve, Prosperity, Pride, Proud	2
Peace, Peaceful	4		
Sacrifice, Influence, Safe, Just, Tradition	3	Peace, Peacefully	12
Trial, Spirit, value, Attempt, Race, Love of the Country	2		
3. America's Military and Security		**3. America's Military and Security**	
Serve (ing)	10	Serve	2
Soldier	9	Soldier	2
Military	6	Military	20
Service	6	Service	2
Security	6	Security	12
(our) troops	4	Troops	5
Security/Armed force	4	Secure	5
4. Cadets of 2010		**4. Cadets of 2014**	
Cadets	7	Cadets	1

Duty, Achieve(ment)	3	The newest officer	1
The class of 2010, Long Grey Line, Graduates	2	The class of 2014, Long Grey Line, Graduates	2
Motto, Mission, Love of Country, Inspire	2		
5. America's concerns and new security strategies		**5. America's national defense and foreign policy in the future**	
War	16	War	9
Fight(ing)	11	Partner(ship)	16
Afghan/Afghanistan	12	Afghan/Afghanistan	15
Foresee	5	The world	10
Terrorist	5	Terror(ism/ist)	12/17
Al Qaeda	5	Al Qaeda	6
Extremist, Experience	4	Extremist,	5
Iraq/ Iraqis	3	Iraq	7
Attack, Face, Change, Effort, Opportunity, Fear(ful)	3	Syrian	10
Enemy(ies)	3	Allies (Alliance), Action	13
		Leadership	18
		Iran(ian), the 9/11, Attack, Beyond our border,	4
		Ukraine (nian), Russia(n)	7
		Threat(en)	11
		Danger(ous), Conflict	8
Pakistan, Islam, Allies, Combat, Coalition, Counterpart, Partner, Struggle, Engagement, Commitment, Our national defense	2	Aggression, Kidnapped, Challenge, Wounded(s), Respond	3
Go through, Support, Protect, Shape, Persist, Have no doubt, Have to see the horizon, Interest, Understand, Wound	2	South China Sea, South Asia(n), Pakistan, Israel, Schoolgirl, Dispute, Interest, Solution, At stake, Built coalition, Question	2

It is very interesting when having a look at the Table 2. It can be assumed that the Former President Obama usefully exploited the repetition technique in his two speeches in a quite clever way. In both speeches, his use of repetition serves not only to convey, enhance, emphasize but also to strengthen his points. Notably, there are some common themes mentioned in both addresses: The USMA, America and American people and the United States' Military and Security. Firstly, that the USMA becomes one of main points in his speeches is understandable. This Academy takes a great role in training, educating and instilling in the Corps of Cadets a spirit of service so that each graduate is commissioned as *"leader of character"* to the values of *"Duty, Honor and Love of Country"* and prepares for a career of professional excellence and service to America. Secondly, the notion of America and American people was presented in an excellent way in both his commencement speeches. This theme is not new in the Presidential speeches. However, Obama made it special in his way by articulating that the United States is a global leader – a nation that *"must always lead on the world stage"* (in that of 2014) and *"is both the land of the free and the home of the brave"* (in that of 2010). This partly depicts his ideologies of strengthening the power of the United States as a whole and produces the effect of arousing the national pride among audiences. Thirdly, the U.S's military and security have been central points in both speeches. By using repetition, he showed that, in his view, military is always *"the backbone of that leadership"* under any circumstance. It can be said that Obama has put a stress on soldiers' mission as well as their spirit of *"service"* for the country through arousing their responsibilities. Attracting listeners' attention and reminding them of the country's tasks skillfully are considered the success of the President in expressing his ideas through his language use.

More interestingly, the cadets of 2010 are one of the Former President's concerns at West Point 2010 commencement ceremony but the cadets of 2014 are not. Obama paid a heartfelt compliment on their spirit of service, duty, and honor and on what they have done in the training time as well. He also praised the cadets' pursuit of being *"soldier-scholars"* and lauded the records of academic excellence that the Class of 2010 has set up. His way of presenting his ideas has created a strong impact on audiences. They feel proud when they will be part of a highly distinguished and internationally respected membership – a member of the Long Gray Line. Together with this pride, the President also helps them realize their duties, their missions and their mottos obviously. Last but not least, the most important point of difference between Obama's two speeches lies in America's concerns and its foreign policy in the future. Due to the different contexts and history, issues that Obama paid attention are different. Those repeated words helped to speak out what he thought, what he was concerned and what the United States was confronting the world. That's why he placed a heavy emphasis on winning *"international cooperation"*, having to *"see the horizon beyond these wars"*, pursuing *"a strategy of national renewal and global leadership"* and setting up *"a new international order"* to help the U.S defeat Al Qaeda, extremists, terrorists, enemies and other threats to freedom. However, in the speech of 2014, Obama's concerns changed. He spent a plenty of time mentioning *"leadership and partnership"* with

the stress that nonmilitary and cooperative international option response to global challenges should be considered before military intervention.

In brief, with the discussion of using overwording in two discourses above, it can be affirmed that repeated words truly carries the values that help people convey their ideologies. It is a typical linguistic feature through which President Obama's ideologies are clearly uncovered. That is his ideology of a strong America – a nation is and will always be the Centre of the world. That is his ideology of great American people who are ready to sacrifice for the freedom, peace and prosperity of their country. Then that is his ideology of strong American military that can be the backbone of American leadership but cannot be the only or even primary component of that leadership in every case. His praise and tribute really contributes greatly to making explicit his ideology.

However, there is a notable point of difference in his speech of 2010 and 2014. Days of 2010 is considered as the beginning of his term as America's the Former President after one year of his inauguration. That is why he spent much space praising West point, cadets of 2010 and American soldiers as well. He represented his willingness and his positive attitude toward the newest American officers and audience there and through that, he won the heart of the people and gradually persuaded the public to approve and support his new security strategies which distanced his administration from his former President's policy of preemptive war, George W. Bush. Meanwhile, the speech of 2014 is considered more world-oriented than that of 2010. After the long 6-year-journey as the President, Obama has changed his position step by step from "unknown" to "well-known" to the world. Therefore, many hot issues on the globe were discussed thoroughly in his speech of 2014. That is the way that Obama expresses his power and ideology to become *"the greatest leader"* in the world. It is assumed that the topics and themes that Obama chose to mention in his speeches are quite suitable with the social context due to the social changes. He showed that he was not only the President of America, the most powerful leader but a friend of his audience. In this case, language that he used is actually conditioned by his purposes, his experiences and the social context as well.

3.2. In terms of using Antonyms

All antonymous phrases or clauses above are put in the parallel structures or in the adjoining sentences. In analyzing the speech of 2010, it is quite easy to find the contrast in the backgrounds of Cadets of 2010. What is more, Obama skillfully put two opposite pictures together to serve his points. One is the picture of the United States with the *"destruction, division, hardship, trial, loss and dependence"* and the other is the picture of the United States with *"construction, solidarity, greatness, victory and freedom".* By making contrast, his attitudes were presented in a quite persuasive and appealing way to uncover the underlying ideologies. He showed that the choice now belongs to the United States and the people, not him. It is the United States and America who choose to fight the wars instead of being died in the battles, who build their freedom and future instead of being destroyed and exploited by terrorists, fascism or Civil War and who never give in to fear every time instead of being scared by extremists. Whether the United States can go through turmoils, come out stronger and lead the world depends on what they choose, what they think and what they will do.

Accordingly, Obama's ideology is also highlighted through his use of antonymous phrases and clauses in the speech of 2014. He gave a two-side picture of the world where the United States was confronted. That is the world with the accelerating speed of change and a place with full of "*threats, dangers, enemies and fears".* However, it is also the world with "*peace, new opportunities, partners and hopes*" of new better life for America. In a word, using antonym in the speeches to serve his purposes is regarded as a useful tool. In both speeches, the use of antonym helps the speaker convey and pass out his underlying power and ideology.

It is concluded that discourse that Obama has created helps people understand more about the world they are living. It is conditioned by his purposes, in other words, that discourse is the contextualization of social practices, not a tool making those social practices in this case. Because of getting audience's attention and love, he represented his deep understanding about his cadets of 2014 as well as his soldiers through using contrast. Moreover, because of defending his foreign and security strategies, he used antonym successfully to make American people realize what they should do and follow in the next years. The Former President Obama truly makes him much greater and more powerful under his pen.

3.3. In terms of using metaphors
Table no 3: Use of Antonymous Phrases and Clauses in the Speeches of 2010 and 2014

Use of Antonymous phrases and clauses in the speeches of 2010 and 2014			
The speech of 2010	**Line**	**The speech of 2014**	**Line**
(My power) Limited >< Absolute	28-29	This present opportunity >< but also new dangers	55-56
From privilege >< From poverty	62	The left >< (the) right	77
From cities >< small towns	62	Secure >< Danger	86
Daunting >< Resilient	96-98	Lessens >< Heightens	159-160
Destroy >< Build	129-130	No certainty >< Near certainty	217
Capitals >< Outposts	160-161	Not create more enemies >< Than take off the battlefield	219

We should not discard our freedom >< Extremists try to exploit them	209-210	Reduce >< Increase	234-235
We cannot succumb to division >< Others try to drive us apart	210-211	Play out >< Remain	256-257
Extremists want a war between America and Islam >< Muslims are part of our national life	218-219	That's not leadership >< That's retreat	305
Adversaries want to divide us >< we are united by our support	220	That's not strength >< That's weakness	305-306
Won >< Lost	226	Flout >< Affirm	309-310
Enduring hardship >< Achieving greatness	234	Remote villages >< Iconic squares	330-331
Trial >< Victory	279	Hopes >< Fears	385
		Not foreseen >< Seen	408

As we can see in Table 3, some notable metaphors used in his speeches are listed in details. Firstly, "*journey*" metaphor is exploited in both speeches. Obama used this conceptual metaphor to call on people to make their *attempts in the journey to contribute to the development of their country such as "pushed yourself through the agony of Beast Barracks; difficult days ahead; the horizon beyond these wars; run from the mountains of Pakistan to the streets of our cities; moment of surrender to mark the journey's end; gone through turmoil; gone through Civil War; a long and hard road awaits you; come of age in the footsteps; the path ahead is uncertain" (in the speech of 2010) and "beginning a long climb out of the worst economic crisis; shape and enforce rules of the road; into harm's way; no end to tyranny" (in the speech of 2014).* In these cases, America and American people are personalized as a traveller who is unified and move forward in a long road to achieve their goals. Clearly, the journey metaphor has a particular resounding meaning in Obama's discourses not only because it is rooted in the American historical experience of people undertaking voyages across the sea but because it makes a great contribution in helping the President express his power through his language.

Secondly, the "*construction*" metaphor is another kind of conceptual metaphor prevalent in both his speeches. The construction metaphor is quite common in American political discourse emphasizing an essential theme of American mythology of creation as it is related to the Frontier myth of building a civilization out of the wilderness. In both his speeches, the construction analogy generally refers to the positive connotations of creation and building like build "*our future, its strengths, economic sources, the capacity, partnerships*" and shape "*moments of change, the world*" (in the speech of 2010); build "*international support, capacity, coalitions*" and shape "*institutions, world opinion, rules and time in uniform*" (in the speech of 2014). The words "*build, built, building, shape*" were repeated many times in both speeches to serve his policies of creating coalitions among countries, forming new partnerships and preparing the capacity, economic sources and international support to shape the peaceful world. He addressed his audience to emphasizing his ideology of building as positive and destroying as negative (*Unlike a terrorist whose goal is to destroy*). It is really a great way to illustrate his idea for the need of collaborative actions among nations as coalitions. In addition, building in his ideology also refers to the construction of America to be a relative and friend of all countries in the world. That is why American people are encouraged to continue believing in the pursuit of equality, freedom, and prosperity and to achieve the American Dream - its central socio-cultural value. In sum, the construction metaphor reflects what the President thought, urged and guided his citizens to respond to the world challenges. This is also a part of his vision for how the United States should act to develop its strengths and remain the top position on the world stage.

What is more, conceptual metaphors found by converting abstract notions into concrete ones related to human (*hand, shoulder, backbone, age, weakness*) and natural phenomena (*nature, currents, blow, flood, swirl, flow, tide*) are exploited in both speeches of the President. Obviously, human body is one the primary metaphoric resources. In his speeches, the President used some parts of human body and their actions metaphorically for what he wanted to imply based on common points between them. If his use of metaphorical expressions related to human draws out the image of a close and friendly President, those related to natural phenomenon proves the creativeness of a great leader – a man of profound learning. In the speech of 2010, "*wind*" was used to refer to American supports for Democracy, "*flood*"- the cover of cynicism through pictures in the news, "*swirl*" - the strengths of political debates in public forums, "*currents*" - cooperation, "*shadows*" - the cover of struggles at cadets of 2010's time, "the *land/the home*"- the United States of the brave, heroes and the free and especially, "sap its strength" implies an American of gradual weakness. In the speech of 2014, "*flows*" was used to refer the number of refugee, "*winding down*" - "ending war in Afghanistan, "*huge blows*" – American struggle against al Qaeda, "*over water and food*" - the climate change, "*steer the currents of*" - leading the human history, "*season*" – the period of war, and "*landscape*" for the world.

In order to serve his points of outlining a strategy for America and American military in the years to come, President Obama has taken advantages of a number of metaphorical expressions to illustrate for their action in the speech of 2014. Among them, the most remarkable is his saying ***"Just because we have the best hammer does not mean that every problem is a nail"***. *"Hammer"* is implied the U.S strengths of military and *"nail"* is referred to a small issue. Obama's power and ideology was actually uncovered through this use of metaphor. He wanted to reaffirm and emphasize that although the U.S has the strongest military force, *"the backbone of that leadership",* it will not use that strength for all problems happening in the world. In other words, the military intervention of the U.S will be considered carefully before giving a final decision. This can be referred as limiting the use of American power

to defending the nation's core interests. However, the Former President also expressed that the U.S reserved the right to take unilateral military action *"when our core interests demand it, when our people are threatened, when our livehoods are at stake"* and *"when the security of our allies is in danger"*. It means not every problem has a military solution and the proper measure of strength and leadership is not merely eagerness to deploy military power.

As can be seen, using metaphors is considered one of the greatest successes of the President in his speeches. Under his pen, some metaphorical expressions he created comes into life through the social process and through what the President has had in his minds including the natural and social world, his beliefs, his knowledge of language and his understanding of the society. Hence, it is a truth that language is not powerful on its own. It gains power and make itself a powerful tool by people who make of this use. Language he created is not only a part and a reflection of the social practices but helps to maintain and develop those practices in a useful way.

4. Realization of Obama's ideologies through his use of Grammar in West Point 2010 and 2014 speeches
4.1. In terms of using Pronouns
To begin with, there is a common point between two speeches in which the pronoun *"we"* was used the most frequently with 101 times of occurrences (plus 65 times of its possessive form *"our"*) in his speech of 2010 and 107 times (plus 101 times of its possessive form *"our"*) in that of 2014. It is understandable that Obama has to put more effort into bettering relations with the audience to gain public support for his future plans, connecting people when calling actions and showing the solidarity in his speeches - his plans are everyone's plans. It is not only himself but also all American has responsibility for building the sources of America's strengths and influence, building coalitions and partnerships among countries and facing unforeseen trials together. This is really an appealing way of calling actions, gaining trust of people and persuading them to approve his plans in years to come.

Secondly, making speeches at the commencement ceremony of West Point, the President's use of the pronoun *"you"* and *"your"* is quite easy to understand. However, he had a tendency of mentioning *"you"* and *"your"* with higher occurrences in the speech of 2010 than that of 2014. His use of the pronoun "you" showed his strong voice and power through producing an effect on his audience. His audience felt that they were remarkable among people and became an indispensable part of the country. They are people who will represent their people and country and always carry with them the respect of their citizens. They are the next generations of America who will build upon the foundation of their forefathers and lead their country with the spirit of honor, duty, love of country and the spirit of service *"Loyal 'til the end"*.

Last but not least, as the President, Obama is well recognized with his use pronoun *"I"* in his speeches. However, the degree of recognition is different between two his speeches. The pronoun *"I"* makes the speech more subjective and helps to show the authority of the speaker. It is a powerful way to assert the position of the President toward his audience and give the speaker a personal voice that distances him from others. Besides, the pronoun "I" also helps clearly express his feelings and belief, not others, on some issues like *"I am haunted by those deaths. I am haunted by those wounds…I have no doubt"* (in the speech of 2014) or *"I know this to be true…I see the strength and resilience of the American people"* (in that of 2010).

4.2. In terms of using Voices
Table no 6: Use of Voices in the Speeches of 2010 and 2014

Use of Voices in the speeches of 2010 and 2014			
The speech of 2010	**Numbers of clauses**	**The speech of 2014**	**Numbers of clauses**
Active	429	Active	473
Passive	27	Passive	34

As can be seen in Table 6, Obama had a tendency of exploiting active voice more than the passive one in both his speeches. In the speech of 2010, among 456 clauses are 429 active clauses. Similarly, the majority of clauses in that of 2014 are active with 473 ones. It means that the agent in most cases is quite clear. Using active voice in most cases can truly help the President well demonstrate his ideology. This helps the audience to realize clearly the doer of actions, know who did what and to whom, and then avoid the misunderstanding and ambiguity when outlining his visions for America and military force. In addition, in well-constructed active sentences, the President directly identified who were involved in and took responsibility for what had happened, was happening and would happen. Obviously, Obama succeeded in creating the clarity of the agent of the action, not intended to hide the agent's identity while presenting his ideas. On the other hand, his use of passive voice also makes a great contribution in conveying his ideology despite his limitation of its use. Generally speaking, the more action the President incorporate into his speeches, the more he engages his audience's attention. With this in mind, he was commonly preferable to use the active voice to make a stress on the doer of the action that, in some case, would be taken for granted toward listeners.

4.3. In terms of Modality

Table no 8: Use of Modality in the Speeches of 2010 and 2014

Use of Modality in the speeches of 2010 and 2014			
The speech of 2010	**Times of Occurence**	**The speech of 2014**	**Times of Occurence**
Will	35	Will	35
Can	9	Cannot	8
Must	8	Must	8
Have to	8	Have to	7
Need	4	Need	7
Cannot	4	Can	7
Would	3	Should	7
May	2	Should not	4
May, Might, Will not, Would not, Should not, Could not, Need not	1	Would	3
		May	3
		Could	2
		Want, May not, Might, Must not	1

From the findings shown in Table 8, we can easily find that "*will*" is a preferable choice of the speaker with the same number of times of occurrences in both his speeches (35 times). What is more, "*must*" and "*have to*" are two modal auxiliary verbs ranked the third position in the President's choice. In most cases of using "*must*" and "*have to*" in both his speeches, they are used together with the pronoun "*we*" so that despite of indicating a strong obligation and certainty, the President's authority is not very clear. Last but not least, "*need*" and "*should*" are exploited to serve his purposes of making recommendations and giving advice for what are supposed to be necessary and important for the Unites States in his plans. However, "*need*" and "*should*" are mainly exploited in the speech of 2014 with the same number of times of occurrences (7 times). They helps to give the President's suggestions of how military force and power should be used, how the Unites States should lead and what American people should do, not his obligations or requests of doing those. Therefore, people can recognize what is the best for them to do in the future. By utilizing these modal verbs, not only the President's ideology was successfully conveyed but his authority over the audience and his responsibility for the action being conducted was made clear in order to convince the people to acknowledge, sustain and advocate his policies. In conclusion, exploiting modality in his speeches is really a powerful and appealing strategy of language to express his ideology. It is worthy of mentioning that in order to withhold permission from or impose obligations upon the audience by employing various modalities in both his addresses. Through modality, the President puts himself in a position whereby he can show the audience his permission, obligation, suggestion and promise under his administration. Language is not independently powerful. It obtains power through the use of powerful orators and is conditioned by their purposes of speaking. That is why the President mainly uses the modal verb "*will*" in order to illustrate what possibly happens for the United States, its military and security force.

5. Realization of Obama's ideologies through his use of Textual Structure in West Point 2010 and 2014 speeches

Table no 1: The 10-question model of the Description Stage (Faiclough, 2001:92-93)

❖ **In terms of Vocabulary:**
Question 1. *What experiential values do words have?*
- What classification schemes are drawn upon?
- Are there words which are ideologically contested?
- Is there rewording or overwording?
- What ideological significant meaning relations (synonymy, hyponymy, autonomy) are there between words?
Question 2. *What relational values do words have?*
- Are there euphemistic expressions?
- Are there markedly formal or informal words?
Question 3. *What expressive values do words have?*
Question 4. *What metaphors are used?*
❖ **In terms of Grammar:**
Question 5. *What experiential values do grammatical features have?*
- What types of process and participants dominate?
- Is agency unclear?
- Are processes what they seem?
- Are nominalizations used?
- Are sentences active or passive?
- Are sentences positive or negative?
Question 6. *What relational values do grammatical features have?*
- What modes (declarative, grammatical question, imperative) are used?
- Are there important features of relational modality?
- Are the pronouns we and you used and if so how?

Question 7. *What expressive values do grammatical features have?*
- Are there important features of expressive modality?
Question 8: *How are (simple) sentences linked together?*
- What logical connectors are used?
- Are complex sentences characterized by coordination or subordination?
- What means are used for referring inside and outside the text?

❖ *In terms of textual structures:*
Question 9. *What interactional conventions are used?*
- Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?
Question 10. *What larger-scale structures does the text have?*

In terms of textual structure, the author will follow the suggested questions proposed by Fairclough (2001) in table 1. Considered as a master of grabbing and keeping audience's attention, which is the number one goal of any public speaker, the President Obama constructed himself the best way of organizing his speeches so as to make it clearer and easier for the audience to follow. It can be found that both his speeches of 2010 and 2014 are well organized and well-structured with the clear format and good combination of several techniques in expressing ideas, creating coherence and cohesion in the texts and speaking out his ideology by his own language. The structure of his both speeches were consistently built, which began giving cadets a *salute* with his congratulation to cadets and his tribute to all American soldiers who have sacrificed for America's freedom.

Then, by using *personal stories* of Liz Betterbed and Alex Rosenberg (in his 2010 speech) and Joe DeMoss (in his 2014 speech), the President let soldiers clearly recognize the love, honor and "*service of the country*" of the previous generation. This made a good impression on the audience, helped show his goodwill and win their affection and more importantly, served his points of calling their patriotism and national unity. As a developing part of his speeches, all his main ideas were given afterwards in order to highlight the social background of US and the world. From then, due to different social issues in different contexts of America, the Former President drew an overall picture of society in which American people know what they should do and which ideals they should follow to remain the strength of nation. Aiming at outlining his plans for the U.S and call their actions, Obama skillfully stated and analyzed the complex situation of his country and challenges of the world. Accordingly, the President also cleverly used some powerful quotations and illustrated by real soldiers (John Meyer and Greg Ambrosia) to support, emphasize and strengthen his ideas and make his speech much more convincing. Then, to conclude his speeches, Obama restated his ideas in a persuasive way by emphasizing their legacy "*will be an America that has emerged stronger*" and "*we are ready to lead once more*".

Besides, in the speech of 2014, the President built a clear and well-organized structure and exploited linkers and connectors effectively. He arranged his ideas in a logic way in which he presented the present context of the country and the world at first and then guided people's actions and ideals to his later. Specifically, the present situation of the United States with removing its troops in Iraq, winding down its war in Afghanistan, refocusing investment in "*what has always been a key source of American strength*" such as its military, economy, business, position and values was pointed out obviously. This also leads to his third and key point of stating his vision and ideas for how the United States and its military should lead in the future by suggesting the principle of using military force, "*counterterrorism*" and "*American leadership*". That is why he organized his ideas in a logic, coherent and persuasive way with using a string of connectors and linking sentences such as "*First… On the other hand… This leads to my second point... Let me make one final point about… this issue of transparency is directly relevant to a third aspect… Which brings me to the fourth and final element of… Ultimately*".

In summary, the Former President constructed a very clear and logic form of organizing his speeches by starting with a salute, telling some personal stories, expressing his main ideas, giving his comments and lastly making a conclusion . We also realize the relationship between the speaker – giving information and the audience – receiving information through the text form (a speech) as well. By using the discursive structure and quoting others' sayings, the President not only strengthened his voice but strongly expressed his ideology in determining what was included or excluded, how his ideas were represented and which techniques should be used to make them clearer and more logical. At the societal level, his discourse is, therefore, determined by social practice in which social practice urges him to have obvious foreign strategies to respond to the world. In this case, language is truly regarded as not only a reflection or expression of social processes and practices but a part of those processes and practices.

V. Conclusion

As can be seen in the study, a great deal of effort was made to exploit President Obama's West Point speeches at the US military academy in 2010 and 2014 with the hope of exploring his underlying ideologies embedded in these discourses and pointing out how they are expressed as well. Based on the findings of the study, it is very clear that the President's ideologies are successfully uncovered at the textual level. He has exploited overwording, antonymous and metaphorical strategies (in terms of vocabulary), pronoun, voices and modality (in

terms of grammar) and larger-scale structure (in terms of textual structure) effectively in order to serve his purposes of wining people's affection and calling their approvals for his defending nation plan and foreign policy and his ideals of *"service, honor and love of country"*.

There are some common features of President Obama's language use in expressing his ideals in both his speeches. In terms of overwording use, both mentioned themes of the USMA, America and American people and its military and security force. This repetition technique helps not only convey, enhance but emphasize his points of attracting people's attention, arousing the national pride and responsibilities among them, strengthening the power of the U.S and its military force and reminding them of their country's missions and mottos. Next, both his speeches exploited metaphorical expressions related to *"journey", "construction", "human"* and *"natural phenomena"*. Through these, the President has expressed his authority and ideology in calling collective actions and effort among people, encouraging them not give up but to face, persist and come out stronger and instilling in them a spirit of duty, honor and love of country. Accordingly, American people are persuaded to continue building freedom, equality and prosperity of the nation, creating coalitions among countries and developing American leadership and partnerships. This is his ideology for how the U.S and American people should lead to respond to the challenges of the world.

In terms of using pronoun, personal pronouns "we" and "you" are the most favorable choices of the Former President when aiming at bettering the relationship with his audience, gaining public support for his plans, expressing the national solidarity and connecting people closer together when calling their actions and their spirit of service. In terms of voices, the Former President Obama had a tendency of using active voice much more than passive one. This is very important for the Former President to speak in the way that helps connect with people, take the control in every case and especially clarify the agent of the action so as to avoid the misunderstanding and ambiguity when seeking people's approval for his plans. Furthermore, both speeches share a common feature in terms of modality through his main uses of *"will"*, *"can"*, *"must"* and *"have to"*. Additionally, the discursive structure used in both speeches helps determine which should be represented first and later and what should be included. Indeed, two speeches with his clear, logic and persuasive writing style have served to reinforce his voice and convey his ideals. It is assumed that the discourse he created is seen as a part of social practice and structure and determined by social practice and his purpose of speaking.

On the other hand, there are some differences in expressing the Former President's ideas at the textual level. Due to the different purposes and social contexts of two speeches, some themes discovered through his overwording use are different, too. The U.S top concerns in 2010 were war, Afghanistan, Al Qaeda and terrorists meanwhile the leadership, partnership, allies, actions, terrorism, extremist, Syrian, the world were most remarkable in 2014. This obviously reflected his different concerns and policies in two different points of time, of which one is a new security strategy and one is a new foreign policy for the U.S. In this case, we clearly reaffirm that language is conditioned and determined by social practices. In terms of using antonyms, his 2010 speech emphasized on the contrast of Cadets' background and the two-side picture of the U.S while the contrastive picture of the world where the U.S had to face was put into focus in his 2014 speech. Making a contrast that guided what American people should choose and follow is quite a politic strategy of the Former President Obama. From this, his calling actions and seeking approval for his plan became much easier. In terms of metaphor use, his speech of 2014 made a strong impression on not only Americans but people around the world with his famous saying *"Just because we have the best hammer does not mean that every problem is a nail"*, which truly conveyed the Former President's ideology. U.S military intervention has to be considerable before giving a final decision but they also reserved the right to take unilateral military action if necessary.

To sum up, it can be claimed that language, as a form of social practice, is a powerful and effective tool in conveying the Former President's ideas and ideals to his soldiers and American people, which can help to remain, change or influence their minds. Under the light of CDA, the relationships between language, ideology and ideological assumptions are obviously uncovered. Undoubtedly, CDA perspective plays a fundamental role in the reproduction of ideologies of speakers. Through this study, it helps reaffirm the powerful influence of language on addressing social problems. CDA, as a useful tool, can truly serve to discover the underlying ideas as well as the hidden relationship between language and ideologies behind the surface of language.

References

[1]. Chouliaraki, L & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking   Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
[2]. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
[3]. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.
[4]. Fairclough, N. (1993). *Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities. Discourse and Society*. London: Longman.
[5]. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Boston: Addison Wesley.
[6]. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. (2nd edition). London: Longman.
[7]. Sayer, A. (2006). *"Language and significance-or the importance of import". Journal of Language and Politics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
[8]. Wodak, R. (1995). *Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis*. In Verschueren, J., Ostman, J. O. and Bloommaert, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics Manual*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[9].   Van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as discourse.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
[10].   Van Dijk, T.A. (1991). *Racism and the Press.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
[11].   Van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In Christiina Schaffner and Anita L. Wenden (eds.). *Language and Peace*. Dartmouth: Aldershot.
[12].   Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Schiffrin et al., (Eds). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
[13].   http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/15-1/mcgregorcda.html.
[14].   https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/05/28/remarks-president-united-states-military-academy-commencement-ceremony
[15].   http://www.cbsnews.com/news/text-of-obamas-speech-to-west-point-2010-cadets/
[16].   http://edition.cnn.com/2014/05/28/opinion/bergen-obama-doctrine-smart-power/
[17].   https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2014/05/28/america-must-always-lead-president-obama-addresses-west-point-graduates
[18].   http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/23/us/politics/23obama.html
[19].   http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2010/05/22/AR2010052201586.html