

”YES WE CAN” OR “MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN”:

Comparison of representations in Barack Obama and Donald Trump’s
inaugural addresses

Bachelor’s thesis

Anu Mettomäki

University of Jyväskylä

Department of Language and Communication Studies

English

December 2017

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kieli- ja viestintätieteidenlaitos
Tekijä – Author Anu Mettomäki	
Työn nimi – Title ”Yes we can” or “Make America great again” Comparison of representations in Barack Obama and Donald Trump’s inaugural addresses	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli	Työn laji – Level Kandidaatintutkielma
Aika – Month and year Joulukuu 2017	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 24 + 2 liitettä
<p>Tiivistelmä – Abstract</p> <p>Kielellä ja kielenkäyttötavoilla, diskursseilla, on suuria vaikutuksia ihmisten asenteisiin, toimintatapoihin ja tapaan nähdä maailma. Erityisesti poliittiset diskurssit ovat merkittävä tutkimuksen kohde, sillä ne saavuttavat usein suuren yleisön. Koska poliitikoilla on näkyvä rooli yhteiskunnassa, on tärkeää tutkia, millaisia asenteita, ideologioita ja arvoja he levittävät puheidensa välityksellä. Tätä teemaa voidaan tarkastella hyödyntäen kriittistä diskurssianalyysia, jonka avulla usein tarkastellaan eriarvoisuutta ja vallan väärinkäyttöä.</p> <p>Tämän tutkielman tarkoituksena oli selvittää, millaisia representaatioita Barack Obama ja Donald Trump loivat eri ihmisryhmistä virkaanastujaispuheissaan vuosina 2009 ja 2017. Analyysini keskittyi siihen, kuinka presidentit hyödynsivät pronomineja ja metaforia puheissaan luodessaan representaatioita ihmisryhmistä. Toisaalta, arvioin myös, millaisia vaikutuksia näillä representaatioilla oli puheiden tunnelmaan.</p> <p>Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittavat, että presidentit käyttivät kieltä hyvin eri tavoilla ja loivat jopa päinvastaisia representaatioita toisistaan. Obama käytti pronomineja ja metaforia pääsääntöisesti luodakseen ryhmähenkeä ja positiivisia konnotaatioita eri ihmisryhmien välillä. Trump puolestaan loi paljon eroja ihmisryhmien välille kielenkäytöllään ja vahvasti ennestään jo olemassa olevia eroja.</p> <p>Poliitikot käyttävät kieltä luodakseen itseään hyödyttäviä representaatioita maailmasta. Tutkielmani osoittaa, että yksinkertaisilla kielellisillä valinnoilla voi olla suuri merkitys sille, millaisia asenteita puhe nostaa esiin. Koska tutkielmani perustui melko niukkaan materiaaliin, jatkotutkimus aiheeseen liittyen on tarpeen. Jatkotutkimuksissa voisi nostaa esiin esimerkiksi kuinka presidentin poliittinen puolue vaikuttaa hänen kielenkäyttöön tai millaisia vaikutuksia puheilla on erilaisissa yhteiskunnallisissa konteksteissa.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords critical discourse analysis, representations, metaphors, pronouns	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 INTRODUCTION..... 3
- 2 LANGUAGE IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE..... 4
 - 2.1 Critical discourse analysis..... 4
 - 2.2 Metaphors..... 6
 - 2.3 Pronouns 7
 - 2.4 Representations 8
- 3 THE PRESENT STUDY 9
 - 3.1 Research questions 9
 - 3.2 Data 9
 - 3.3 Methods of analysis..... 10
- 4 CREATING REPRESENTATIONS..... 10
 - 4.1 Barack Obama’s speech..... 11
 - 4.1.1 Pronouns 11
 - 4.1.2 Metaphors..... 13
 - 4.2 Donald Trump’s speech..... 15
 - 4.2.1 Pronouns 16
 - 4.2.2 Metaphors..... 17
 - 4.3 Comparing the findings 19
- 5 CONCLUSION 21
- BIBLIOGRAPHY 23
- APPENDICES..... 25

1 INTRODUCTION

Every day language is used in multiple ways, but it is such a natural part of our world that most people do not pay much attention to it. While people disregard the importance of language, they also disregard the value of the representations they create when using language and what kinds of effects these representations might have on other people. Language is not merely a method of communication, but a tool with which you can create or enforce existing representations of people and the world around you. Talented speakers can even influence the audience purposefully on a subconscious level to help gain supporters to their ways of seeing the world. Critical Discourse Analysis is a method often used to study these representations and how they have been created. It specifically focuses on the power aspect of language and how the meaning producer might be enforcing their ideologies and ways of seeing the world upon the addressees with language choices.

Language is undeniably an important factor in influencing people and creating representations that support one person's world view, and that is why it is important to study language in use. It is especially important to do so in regards to political discourse, because politicians are in a position where they can easily influence large audiences. Political discourse has always been a topic of interest for many researchers. Among the most influential researchers in political language and discourse are Chilton (2004), Charteris-Black (2014) and Wodak (1989). Though this is an area of language where much research has taken place, most studies regarding political discourse and speeches have concentrated on the successfulness of the speeches and intertextuality between different speeches.

Regarding political discourse, American presidents are ones that reach arguably the largest audience in the world. New presidents are elected every four years and the presidential campaigns can last for over a year. The elections themselves are of interest all throughout the world. The first speech given by the newly-elected president, the inaugural address, gains a lot of international media attention as well and the speech reaches a large audience through traditional and social media. Even though there has been a lot of research done on political discourse, few have focused on representations about people and different groups of people in inaugural addresses given by American presidents.

The aim of the present study is to look at the two most recent presidents in America and how they use language in their inaugural addresses to create representations about different groups

of people. I will do this by analysing how they use pronouns and metaphors in their speeches and in what kinds of contexts the pronouns and metaphors appear in. I will also be looking at how the speeches might be different from each other in regards to the representations they create and how the differences might affect the overall mood and message of the inaugural addresses.

This thesis begins with the discussion of relevant background theories in Chapter 2 regarding the creation of representations in political discourse, specifically inaugural addresses in an American context, including Critical Discourse Analysis, pronouns and metaphors. In Chapter 3, I am going to present the aim of this study and the research questions in more detail. I will also address the data and methods of analysis in the same Chapter. Chapter 4 is dedicated to the analysis of my chosen data, the inaugural addresses given by Barack Obama and Donald Trump, with the help of my chosen theoretical background, Critical Discourse Analysis. Finally, in the conclusion Chapter I will summarize the results of the study and discuss its implications and possible avenues of future studies.

2 LANGUAGE IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

2.1 Critical discourse analysis

Language is a way of shaping reality and it is integral in the creation of social relations of power (Fairclough 2013: 16). In other words, when people follow socially accepted conventions in interactions, they often enforce already existing power relations and assumptions subconsciously (Fairclough 2013: 16). Assumptions such as these are called *ideologies* and the use of ideological language has become very prominent in recent years when it comes to exercising power, and the ideological nature of language is pervasively present in modern language (Fairclough 2013: 16–17). In the modern world, language is the primary medium when it comes to social control and power.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) sees “language as a form of social practice” (Fairclough 2013: 33). What it means is that language and society are not two separate entities but rather interconnected; language is seen as an irreplaceable part of society. In order to study discourse successfully one must therefore take into consideration the process of production, the process of interpretation and the way in which they both are socially determined, as in how the surrounding society affects the language that is being used (Fairclough 2013: 35). Fairclough (2013) introduces three principal elements of discourse which are text, interaction and context.

According to him (2013: 36), what is important in the study of discourse is to analyse the relationships between these three elements and look beyond the immediate conditions to institutional and social structures that are also involved in creating the situational context for every discourse situation. In addition to recognising that discourse comprises of text, interaction and context, one must take into consideration the three dimensions, or stages, of discourse; description, interpretation and explanation when hoping to apply CDA successfully (Fairclough 2013: 36). Description is the stage that is focused on the formal attributes of the text, interpretation concentrates on the relationship between text and interaction, and explanation focuses on the relationship between interaction and social context.

What sets CDA apart from many other paradigms of discourse analysis is its focus on the contexts surrounding the text itself, “the concept of power, the concept of history, and the concept of ideology” (Meyer and Wodak 2001: 3). What this means is that CDA focuses mainly on the role of discourse when it comes to the production of domination or power abuse and it has a stance, unlike most other research methods, on social injustice (Meyer and Wodak 2001: 96); thus, CDA is biased as it supports “solidarity with the oppressed.” The fact that Critical Discourse Analysis is often used to study power relations means it is ideal for the study of political language, “it is surely the case that politics cannot be conducted without language, and it is probably the case that the use of language in the constitution of social groups leads to what we call ‘politics’ in a broad sense” (Chilton and Schaffner 1997, cited in Dunmire 2012: 735).

To add to Fairclough (2013) and Meyer and Wodak’s (2001) ideas on critical discourse analysis Blommaert (2005, cited in Dunmire 2012: 740) identifies a weakness in CDA. Blommaert argues that CDA produces restrictive and biased data as the researchers adopt a stance, focusing on only certain aspects of context, prior to analysing the data. He feels researchers should perform systematic analysis based on which one can choose relevant contextual features to analyse. He also faults CDA for its overreliance on studying only late-modern and Western societies and institutions as that makes the approach insensitive towards societies not at the “core of the world system” (Blommaert 2005, cited in Dunmire 2012: 740). To a certain extent Blommaert’s arguments are valid even to the topic of analysis in this thesis, however, I still chose to apply Critical Discourse Analysis as it is ideal for the study of political discourse. As Critical Discourse Analysis studies the relationship between the text and its social contexts

representations are crucial for a thorough study, which is why the study of metaphors and pronouns is often implemented when performing Critical Discourse Analysis.

2.2 Metaphors

In this thesis I will mainly be using the term *metaphor* in the meaning that the online Oxford dictionaries (2017) has given it “A figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to an object or action to which it is not literally applicable.” Metaphors are a common tool in public communication, they offer a way for the orator, or speaker, to influence the addressee as metaphors often create unconscious emotional associations to the values shared in communities of mutual cultural and historical background (Charteris-Black 2014: 160).

According to Charteris-Black (2014), there is always an underlying motive behind choosing a specific metaphor, and he identifies seven purposes for political metaphors which are: gaining attention and establishing trust, heuristic, predicative, empathetic, aesthetic, ideological and mythic. The types of metaphor most relevant to my topic of analysis are 1) empathetic: metaphors aimed to arouse favourable feelings towards the speaker, 2) ideological: metaphors that represent political ideologies creating a world view, 3) predicative: metaphors that imply either negative or positive views about something or someone in order to make an argument and 4) metaphors that have the purpose of gaining attention and trust (Charteris-Black 2014: 200-201).

Metaphors of empathetic purpose usually aim to awaken positive emotions of hope and optimism, which is often accomplished with the use of personifications. Personifications can, for example, show nation states as individual people, which encourages the audience to associate the nation and international relations with their personal relationships – positive feelings towards friends and family or negative ones for enemies and criminals (Charteris-Black 2014: 207). Metaphors of ideology are often used systematically in order to create long-term mental associations in the audience. Examples of such metaphors are plant metaphors for economic issues (economic growth and the branches of an organization), not only do they present the issues as manageable, but they also cast politicians as gardeners, though covertly. Another common ideology metaphor is ‘pressure’ metaphor about immigration (strain, burden) which cast immigrants in a negative light (Charteris-Black 2014: 211). Predicative purpose in the use of metaphors refers to offering positive representations of the speaker, their actions, policies and supporters all the while giving negative representations of their political opponents. This is quite often achieved with the use of disease metaphors. As an example of this Hitler

used the term ‘parasites’ when referring to the Jews and concealed any negative features of the death camps by calling them ‘the final solution’ (Charteris-Black 2014: 204-205). Disease metaphors are usually accompanied with a moral argument “once the enemy is effectively demonized by disease metaphors, it becomes a moral obligation to destroy him” (Charteris-Black 2014: 204-205). The general rhetorical purpose of metaphors is to gain the audiences’ trust and attention. Gaining attention from the audience is a prerequisite of a successful speech, and metaphors are often a contributing factor here. Establishing trust is often accomplished by orienting the very beginning of the speech to the speaker to create ethical credentials as in this example from Charteris-Black (2014: 202) “I stand before you today the representative of a family in grief, in a country in mourning before a world in shock.” Using colourful metaphors to get attention also arouses media attention “winds of change”, “rivers of blood” and they can also become catchphrases used by the community at large as happened with “war on terror” (Charteris-Black 2014: 201-202).

2.3 Pronouns

When it comes to recognizing social categories and groupings in text, pronouns are a crucial element. Gustafsson Sendén et al. (2014) argue that pronouns can be divided into two dimensions, the “inclusiveness dimension” as well as the “individual and collective dimension”. The “inclusiveness dimension” is further divided into self-inclusive pronouns (*I, we*) and self-exclusive pronouns (*he, she, they*). As for the other dimension, its division of pronouns is based on whether they reflect categorization of people as groups or individuals. Singular pronouns (*I, he, she*) are individual pronouns and plural pronouns (*we, they*) reflect collective levels. The pronoun *you* is an exception as it can refer to either an individual or a collective depending on the context (Gustafsson Sendén et al. 2014: 51). The way in which these dimensions can be applied to context analysis is by studying in which context the different pronouns appear. What Gustafsson Sendén et al. (2014) found in their study was that self-inclusive pronouns had consistently more positive context than self-exclusive ones. Another finding was that individual pronouns had also a positive context more often than collective ones. The reason why this happens is possibly to decrease or highlight differences between social groups and to enhance the individual, encourage other people to join the individual’s group and support commitment within the group. (Gustafsson Sendén et al. 2014: 63-64).

Another important distinction when it comes to studying pronouns in political contexts is the division between inclusive and exclusive *we* as it can be used to manipulate group membership

(Scheibman 2014: 380). The difference between inclusive and exclusive first person plural is the referent. Inclusive *we* refers to the speaker and the addressees whereas exclusive *we* refers to the speaker and another group or individual that is not the addressee (Scheibman 2014: 378). In the English language there is no morphological difference between these two forms and that offers a possibility to use the pronoun ambiguously. In some specific contexts *we* can simultaneously be inclusive and exclusive, the analysis depends on the addressee (Scheibman 2014: 381-382).

2.4 Representations

With the term representations in the context of this thesis I will rely on the description given by the online Oxford dictionaries (2017) “the description or portrayal of someone or something in a particular way.” When it comes to representations, however, context also plays an important role. According to Chilton (2004: 49), when studying language in politics it is important to realize that there exists a multitude of alternate ways to refer to the same entity and that all the variations can have slight differences in meaning. One useful instrument in the creation of representations is metaphors and they are commonly used for that end in political rhetoric. In political contexts common metaphors include moving from one place to another, journeys of some kind (coming to a crossroads, overcoming obstacles in the way) as well as creating social hierarchies by naming people “outsiders”, “insiders” or as being “on the margins.” These create different kinds of representations that can be used to further the speaker’s agenda, as is common in political discourse (Chilton 2004: 51-52). Chilton (2004) also found that metaphors are often used strategically when the speaker wants to highlight the closeness of a threat of some kind and protect the country’s right to respond even militarily to the threat.

When analysing representations one must always realize that there are only possible mental representations that the text stimulates, the interpretation of language depends on the addressee. The way in which representations are analysed is usually with the help of two methods; actors and processes – who does what to whom, or with the notion of the ‘world’, as in political discourse the actors promote their view of the ‘world’ (Chilton 2004: 50). According to Chilton (2004), in order to represent one’s opponents in a negative way, one must be aware of the community’s value system to create connections between a group of people and something that is considered negative (black people being sexually threatening). The same applies when trying to show a group or individual in a positive light (Chilton 2014: 129-130).

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

3.1 Research questions

The aim of this study is to find out how the inaugural addresses given by Barack Obama (former U.S. president) and Donald Trump (U.S. president at the time of writing the present thesis) differ in their use of pronouns and metaphors as well as what kinds of representations they give of different groups of people. The research questions are:

1. How do the presidents use pronouns and metaphors to create representations of different groups of people in their inaugural addresses?
2. How do the speeches differ in the representations they create and how the representations are created?

3.2 Data

In the United States presidential elections are held every four years and the first official speech given by the newly elected president is called the inaugural address. On January 20th 2009 Barack Obama gave his first official speech as the President of the United States and exactly eight years later Donald Trump had his inauguration (January 20th 2017). The presidents represent different political parties as Obama is a member of the Democratic Party and Trump is a member of the Republican Party. In comparison to all the inaugural addresses held in the United States the speeches were both quite average in length (Peters 2017). The speeches have been published online in audio and written form. As the focus of my analysis is on the language they used I focused only on the written documentations of the inaugural addresses. I will be using the speeches from the website of The American Presidency Project (Peters 2017), which has published all the inaugural addresses since George Washington.

For the purpose of this thesis, I chose the speeches given by the two latest Presidents since they are the most relevant and most comparable to each other as there is only eight years of difference between them. Obama and Trump also belong to different political parties which makes studying them interesting. Both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party encompass a wide variety of opinions, while the Republican Party is more unified ideologically. The Republicans advocate reduced taxes and a lessening of government control when it comes to the economy and government-funded programs. When it comes to the private lives of citizens, Republicans oppose, for example, abortions and equal rights for sexual minorities (Britannica 2017). As for the Democratic Party, they support a strong federal government with federally-

funded social security. They also advocate a separation of church and state (Britannica 2017). The parties also differ in their foreign policy: the Democrats support internationalism and multilateralism whereas the Republicans advocate a strong national defence and pursuing the United States' national security interests aggressively (Britannica 2017). The differences in the political parties can also be seen in their supporters. Those supporting the Republicans are predominantly white, whereas the ones supporting the Democrats are more ethnically diverse (Britannica 2017).

I chose to focus on Obama's first inaugural address rather than his second one, because in 2009 he was in the same position as Trump was in 2017, a newly-elected president stepping into office for the first time. The speeches differ in length quite significantly as Trump's speech was 1,433 words compared to Obama's 2,395 words. As this is only a Bachelor's thesis, where the scope is quite limited for an exhaustive analysis of representations in these two speeches, I have only chosen the sections that I feel are best suited for my topic and reflect the views present in the speeches.

3.3 Methods of analysis

I will analyse my data using Critical Discourse Analysis to find out what kinds of representations Barack Obama and Donald Trump create in their respective speeches about different groups of people with their use of language. I will be focusing on the use of pronouns and metaphors. I will especially concentrate on the juxtaposition between individual and collective pronouns, as well as inclusive and exclusive pronouns. As for metaphors I will focus on four types of metaphors: empathetic, predicative, ideological and ones that aim to gain the audience's trust and attention. I found examples of all these types of pronouns and metaphors in the speeches and will focus on those that are most common throughout the speech or ones that relate to a specific group of people in the analysis section of this thesis.

In addition to CDA when analysing the use of metaphors I will also be using critical metaphor analysis. What critical metaphor analysis aims to do is identify which types of metaphors are used, why they may have been chosen and how they help the orator reach their goals and create world views as well as promote their political ideologies (Charteris-Black 2014: 174).

4 CREATING REPRESENTATIONS

In this section, I am going to analyse how Barack Obama and Donald Trump employ pronouns and metaphors to create representations of different groups of people and what kinds of

representations they create. I am going to begin by focusing on the two speeches separately and identifying the most prominent ways the presidents create representations with the help of pronouns and metaphors. I will then conclude my analysis by comparing the representations present in the speeches, and the way in which they were created. Comparing the speeches is very important because it offers insight into how the presidents' views differ from each other and whether they regard minority and other groups of people differently.

4.1 Barack Obama's speech

The first speech I am going to be analysing was held by the first African-American president in the United States, Barack Obama, on the 20th of January 2009 in Washington D.C. Obama was elected president after his successful campaign against Republican John McCain, Obama's campaign slogan was *Yes we can*.

4.1.1 Pronouns

In Obama's inaugural address the most prominent pronouns are, without a doubt, *we* and *our*. They are usually used in a context where they are inclusive (Scheibman 2014: 378) in the sense that all Americans are the addressees, even the ones not physically present in the audience. The value of Obama's use of the inclusive first person plural *we* in the speech is to highlight and encourage group membership within the American people: *We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus and nonbelievers. We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth*. There is, however, one segment in the speech where Obama is using inclusive *we* in order to appeal to other nations in addition to Americans.

- (1) And to those nations like ours that enjoy relative plenty, we say we can no longer afford indifference to suffering outside our borders, nor can we consume the world's resources without regard to effect, for the world has changed, and we must change with it.

In the above example, Obama's use of pronouns can be understood in such a way that he reaches out to other developed countries and urges them to follow America's lead in how they regard the rest of the world and the planet. The first few pronouns refer only to Americans, but the rest can be seen to include a larger group of people, all countries that "enjoy relative plenty." This creates a group-mentality of sorts between people from different nations.

Obama also uses the third person plural *they* in two consecutive paragraphs near the beginning of the speech where the reader can see the juxtaposition between self-inclusive and self-exclusive pronouns, *we* and *they* (Gustafsson Sendén 2014: 51).

- (2) For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and travelled across oceans in search of a new life. For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West, endured the lash of the whip, and plowed the hard Earth. For us, they fought and died in places like Concord and Gettysburg, Normandy and Khe Sanh.
Time and again, these men and women struggled and sacrificed and worked 'til their hands were raw so that we might live a better life. They saw America as bigger than the sum of our individual ambitions, greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction.

In a sense the pronouns *we* and *they* are not opposing groups of people in the example above, rather they are two groups working for the same goal and dream, but in different periods of time. *They* refers to all the previous generations of Americans all the way from European settlers to soldiers in the Second World War, it even includes the African-American slaves who “endured the lash of the whip”. *Us* on the other hand refers to the current generation of Americans. This example creates the imagery that every generation has worked for the betterment of the nation and its people and enforces the idea of group membership within all Americans regardless of when they lived. As the first person plural is repeated in sentence-initial position it gives specific emphasis to the entire message.

The pronoun *they* comes up one more time in Obama’s inaugural address only a few paragraphs after the preceding example.

- (3) Now, there are some who question the scale of our ambitions, who suggest that our system cannot tolerate too many big plans. Their memories are short, for they have forgotten what this country has already done, what free men and women can achieve when imagination is joined to common purpose and necessity to courage.

In the above example the use of the pronoun differs from that in Example 2. In Example 2, *they* and *us* were both Americans working towards a common goal, whereas in Example 3 *they* is an opposing group of people. The pronouns are used in such a way here that they make a clear division between the groups of Americans, those that do believe in a positive future and those that do not.

Throughout the speech Obama mainly uses the first person plural *we* in an inclusive sense, referring to the speaker and the addressees (Scheibman 2014: 378), but there is one paragraph in which it is used in an exclusive sense, as referring to the speaker and a group that is not the addressees (Scheibman 2014: 378).

- (4) The question we ask today is not whether our Government is too big or too small, but whether it works; whether it helps families find jobs as a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified. Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. Where the answer is no, programs will end. And those of us who manage the public’s dollars will be held to account to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day, because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.

In Example 4, the paragraph begins with the first person plural being inclusive and the exclusive *we* appears just after the half-way point of the excerpt. When Obama is talking about “those of us who manage the public’s dollars” he is referring to the government, therefore it is clear that the *we* is exclusive, he and a specific group, that is not the audience, are in charge of decision making. As for the last *we* in this example, it is ambiguous in its use (Scheibman 2014: 381-382). Depending on the hearer, it can be interpreted as referring to just the government, or alternatively to the American people as a whole.

As for the pronoun *you*, it does not appear often in Obama’s speech, as he prefers using self-inclusive pronouns and collective pronouns that exclude the addressees. There are, however, two short paragraphs where the second person singular or plural, depending on the context and interpretation, is employed.

- (5) And for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents, we say to you now that our spirit is stronger and cannot be broken. You cannot outlast us, and we will defeat you.
- (6) To the Muslim world, we seek a new way forward based on mutual interests and respect. To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict or blame their society’s ills on the West, know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy. To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are on the wrong side of history, but that we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist.

A common theme between both those examples is the fact the referent of *you* has mainly a negative connotation. *You* is also used in its plural form and the referent is not explicitly named though “the Muslim world” is mentioned in Example 6, the pronoun *you* is not referring to that group of people, at least directly. The negative connotation of the second person plural comes from the context in which Obama uses it: terror, slaughtering of innocents, destruction, corruption and the silencing of dissent. The negative context creates a juxtaposition between these two groups, Americans and those who wish to oppose them.

4.1.2 Metaphors

When it comes to the use of metaphors in Obama’s inaugural address, I found examples for the empathetic, ideological, predicative and ones that are aimed at gaining the audiences trust and attention in the speech (Charteris-Black 2014: 201). I then further divided them into ones that are somehow relevant to the creation of representations of different groups of people, and those are the metaphors that I will be analysing here.

Obama begins his speech by using metaphorical language to gain the audiences trust and attention.

- (7) I stand here today *humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust you have bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors.*

The purpose of this kind of lead-in to a speech is to place the speaker on the same level as the audience. He is humbled by the task they all share and he is only in this position because of the people and their trust. He also pays respects to those that have come before him. The main goal of this is to establish that the people must come together and unite to reach a common goal.

The most common type of metaphor in Obama's inaugural address is, by far, metaphors of empathetic purpose, which are used quite consistently throughout the speech. They are used mainly in regards to actions that must be taken to ensure a better future.

- (8) *We remain a young nation*, but in the words of the Scripture, the time has come *to set aside childish things*. The time has come *to reaffirm our enduring spirit; to choose our better history; to carry forward that precious gift*, that noble idea, passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve to pursue their full measure of happiness.
- (9) Starting today, *we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking America.*

In Examples 8 and 9 the metaphors aim to create a group-mentality of sorts; all Americans must put in some effort through the same means to better the society. The difference between these two examples is that in Example 8 the group-mentality is created via a shared, religious-based mission, whereas in Example 9 the group-mentality is accomplished via an imagined physical fall that all Americans have endured and must now recover from together. Another way in which Obama employs metaphors of empathetic purpose is when he is referring to past generations of Americans and other nations in positive contexts.

- (10) Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things – some celebrated but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have *carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom.*
- (11) And so to all the other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born: know that *America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity*, and we are ready to lead once more.

The first of the two above examples refers to the past generations of Americans in a positive light and enforces the idea that the current welfare Americans enjoy is only possible because of them and therefore everyone should be thankful for them. The second example also refers to people not in the immediate audience, but instead of referring to the past, it refers to other nations and their people. The metaphor shows America in a positive light and aims to create goodwill towards the nation, this representation is accomplished with the use of personification: America is a friend. It also creates positive connections between the peoples of the world and a

mentality that everyone can have the same possibilities in life regardless of where you were born.

As for metaphors of predicative purpose, there are only two that are relevant to the topic of analysis here. Both metaphors appear in the same paragraph nearing the end of the speech.

(12) To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are *on the wrong side of history*; but that *we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist*.

As can be seen from this example they both refer to non-Americans who are seen as a negative influence. The metaphors themselves aim to bridge the divide between Americans and this group of non-Americans. America is willing to take the first step towards a more positive relationship between nations, if the opposing country is willing to procreate positive changes in their actions. Even though these metaphors enforce the idea of two or more opposing nations, they also show possibility towards co-operation and friendship that is accomplished with the use of personification.

In this inaugural address there is only one example of an ideological metaphor. Ideological metaphors are often systematic in use (Charteris-Black 2014: 211), so even though there is only one in the speech, it is easily recognizable as the terminology used in it is such that is common in rhetorical language use.

(13) To the people of poor nations, we pledge to work alongside you to make your *farms flourish* and let *clean waters flow*; to *nourish starved bodies* and *feed hungry minds*.

Here the context is again positive and it presents America in the role of a farmer, a care-giver and a teacher to those in need and that have a lesser quality of life. The terminology use in the metaphors is close to nature and biology, which is common for ideological metaphors, and helps to emphasize the fact that these are natural, positive and accomplishable goals.

4.2 Donald Trump's speech

The second speech that I will analyse here is the inaugural address Donald Trump gave on the 20th January 2017 when he took office as the 45th president after a successful campaign against the Democratic candidate, Hillary Clinton. The main slogan during his campaign was *Make America great again*.

4.2.1 Pronouns

In his inaugural address Donald Trump employs inclusive, collective pronouns *we* and *our* often when he is referring to the country and the positive changes he ensures will happen in the future: *We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams*, but he also uses pronouns that divide people. In Example 14 he makes a clear division between American politicians and the citizens.

- (14) For too long, a small group in our Nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of Government while the people have borne the cost. Washington flourished, but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered, but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our Nation's Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land.

The division between politicians and the American people is created with the use of pronouns *they* and *you*. The third person plural *they* is used to refer to the politicians and it is given a very negative connotation in the context, whereas *you*, or the American people, are seen as a rather passive entity separate from the politics. In the above example Trump not only makes a division between politicians and the people, but he also makes it clear that he himself belongs to neither group as the pronouns he uses are both self-exclusive (Gustafsson Sendén et.al 2014: 51). The only instance in this example where he uses self-inclusive pronouns is when he refers to “our Nation's Capital” and “our country.” This is not the only time during the speech where President Trump excludes himself or makes a division between himself and the people as you can see in Examples 15 and 16.

- (15) That all changes here and now, because this moment is your moment: It belongs to you. It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America. This is your day. This is your celebration. And this, the United States of America, is your country
- (16) You came by the tens of millions to become a part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before. At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves.

In Example 15 Trump uses the pronoun *you* and in addition to himself, he uses the pronoun in such a way that it excludes everyone who is not either physically present at the inauguration or watching it unfold on television. As for Example 16, Trump uses second person plural and third person plural to refer to all Americans. As the pronouns are self-exclusive the interpretation is that the president himself is not a part of the group he is referring to. It creates a feeling of detachment, which sets this example, and Example 16, apart from the rest of the speech, as usually when Trump is referring to the entire nation of Americans, not making divisions between politicians and the people, he uses self-inclusive pronouns.

When Trump is talking about foreigners in his inaugural address he is using a mixture of self-inclusive and self-exclusive as well as individual and collective pronouns. The choice of pronouns stems from the context and who the actor is in each situation.

- (17) We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength. I will fight for you with every breath in my body, and I will never, ever let you down.
- (18) We will seek friendship and goodwill with the nations of the world, but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first. We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example – we will shine – for everyone to follow.

The first of the two examples begins with the first person plurals *we* and *our* used in an inclusive sense when Trump is using language to separate Americans and foreigners, but quickly changes to *I* and *you* when he is referring to only Americans. Here Trump is the active participant and the people are passive as the first person singular is the actor and the second person singular/plural is the one acted upon. This again makes Trump seem somewhat separate from the people as he is the one working towards something rather than all Americans working together. What Example 18 shows, is that even when the context is positive in regards to other nationalities, Trump uses inclusive pronouns. What should be noted, however, is that the inclusive pronoun *we* refers to only Americans and foreign nations are referred to with the third person plural *they*. This use of pronouns sets the United States and other nations apart.

4.2.2 Metaphors

I will be focusing on the same types of metaphors when analysing Donald Trump's inaugural address as I did with Barack Obama's inaugural address: empathetic, ideological, predicative and those that aim to gain attention and trust from the audience (Charteris-Black 2014: 201). The only one of these metaphor-types that was not used in the speech to create representations of different groups of people is the metaphors that aim to gain attention and the audience's trust, and therefore none of them will be analysed here. It is, however, noteworthy that these kinds of metaphors were not present in the speech.

In Trump's inaugural address the number of different types of metaphors is much more even than in Obama's speech as he does not seem to favour one style of metaphor over the others. One significant aspect to note is how Trump uses metaphors of empathetic purpose almost solely in a negative context, which is unusual for this type of metaphors (Charteris-Black 2014: 207).

- (19) But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: mothers and children *trapped in poverty* in our inner cities, rusted out factories *scattered like tombstones* across the landscape of our nation
- (20) We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength and confidence of our country has *dissipated over the horizon*. One by one, the factories shuttered and *left our shores*

The negativity in these examples comes from the terminology that is used in the metaphors and the context in which they are used. Example 19 highlights the fact that some Americans have a lesser quality of life than others, there is poverty and a lack of jobs as the factories have been closed. Here Trump creates a division between the wealthy and the poor, while in Example 20 the division is between America and other nations. When comparing this example to the rest of the speech, here America is shown as the weaker one, whereas the rest of the speech promotes American's greatness above other nations.

There is only one example of an empathetic metaphor used in a positive context:

- (21) We will *seek friendship and goodwill* with the nations of the world – – *We will shine for everyone to follow*.

In Example 21 the context is positive and refers to other nations. The metaphors do, however, show Americans and other nations as two separate entities, America will reach out in friendship to foreign countries and lead by example. Even though the foreign countries are shown in a positive light here as there is a possibility for a good relationship, the idea of American exceptionalism still shines through here. The concept of American exceptionalism first comes from the Puritan settlers, who saw themselves as a moral example to the rest of the world “a city upon a hill”, today it refers to America being unique and essentially different from any other country (Du Pont 2017: 119-120).

Ideological metaphors are present in only one paragraph in Trump's inaugural address and the connotation behind them is quite negative.

- (22) For too long, a small group in our nation's capital has *reaped the rewards of government* while the people have borne the cost. *Washington flourished*, but the people did not share in its wealth. *Politicians prospered*, but the jobs left and the factories closed.

Here the metaphors make a clear division between the government and the American people. The first metaphor in this example is clearly negative as the verb *reap* is often used in relation to death and cutting something down. The following two metaphors could, in themselves, be interpreted as positive, as they relate to nature and successfulness, but the context is what makes the connotation negative. The riches and successes helped only a few whereas the masses suffered.

In Trump's speech all the metaphors of predicative purpose are found near the end of the speech. They are also used to create a separation between two groups of people, but whereas with ideological metaphors where the division was between politicians and the people, here it is between Americans or "the civilized world" and other nations.

- (23) We must *protect our borders* from *ravages of other countries* making our products, stealing our companies and destroying our jobs.
 (24) We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones, and *unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism*, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the world.

Examples 23 and 24 both show foreigners in a very negative light and Example 24 further specifies who the predicative metaphor is referring to in such a negative way. The first of the two examples implants the idea that foreigners are ravages that Americans must be protected from and they are hindering the economic growth in the United States as they are responsible for companies and jobs relocating to other countries. The second example creates a division between America and its allies, and Islamic terrorists, which is a very specific group. In this metaphor Trump claims that all civilized nations will band together to face a common enemy.

4.3 Comparing the findings

The aim of this section is to compare my findings in the two inaugural addresses when it comes to the use of pronouns and metaphors in the creation of representations about groups of people. I will also try to shed light on how these factors affect the mood of the speech, and what kind of influence the presidents may have hoped their respective speeches would have on their audience.

When comparing the use of pronouns in the two inaugural addresses, it is clear that the amount of self-inclusive pronouns is particularly divergent. Also the number of inclusive first person plural *we* varies significantly. It should, however, be taken into account that the speeches differ in length, therefore one should not focus solely on comparing the speeches with each other but rather compare the amount of different pronouns within the respective speeches. In the below table I also added ambiguous second person pronouns into collective pronouns rather than individual pronouns which affects the numbers specifically in regards to Trump's speech.

Table 1. The pronouns

	individual pronouns	collective pronouns	self-inclusive pronouns	self-exclusive pronouns	inclusive <i>we</i>	exclusive <i>we</i>
Obama	2	172	155	42	147	3
Trump	7	142	103	41	100	0

Even though there are many similarities in the number of different types of pronouns in the speeches, what is maybe more significant in the analysis of representations, is the context in which the pronouns appear and their connotations. As is apparent in my analysis, Obama uses self-exclusive pronouns mainly in regards to foreign nations and in positive contexts. Trump also employs self-exclusive pronouns when referring to foreign nations, but also in reference to different groups of Americans. He refers to Americans several times with the second person plural and even juxtaposes that with the third person plural, which refers to politicians. As for the connotations of self-exclusive pronouns in Trump's speech, they are negative more often than in Obama's speech. These differences in the use of pronouns affect the moods of the speeches significantly. Obama makes the United States seem more cohesive and he enhances group membership even with foreign nations whereas Trump sets himself apart from the rest of Americans and creates divisions between the people.

The two presidents use metaphors with very different connotations in their inaugural addresses, but both use them mainly in regards to foreigners. Obama uses empathetic, ideological and predicative metaphors to create positive representations about foreigners and their relationship with Americans. Even when there is clear division between two groups, the metaphors are used to help bridge the divide and enforce positive discourse. In comparison, Trump mainly uses empathetic, ideological and predicative metaphors in negative contexts to make the divisions between people more enhanced. He creates divisions between Americans, the wealthy and the poor as well as people and politicians, but also between Americans and other nations. Even when he is using metaphors to promote friendship and goodwill between nations the idea of American exceptionalism is present (Du Pont 2017: 119-120). There are also a few metaphors referring only to Americans in both speeches. In Obama's speech there are empathetic metaphors that refer to past and present generations of Americans in positive contexts. The metaphors referring to Americans in Trump's speech are also empathetic but the context is negative.

These differences in Obama and Trump's inaugural addresses might reflect their personal attitudes, but also their political party backgrounds. This is especially apparent in the representations these speeches create about foreigners. The Democrats support multilateralism and internationalism (Britannica 2017) and following that ideology Obama created almost solely positive representations about foreign nationalities. The Republicans on the other hand advocate a strong national defence and the aggressive pursuit of America's interest (Britannica 2017) and that is reflected in Trump's speech as he creates more negative representations about foreigners and enhances a division between America and other nations.

5 CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to recognize the importance of creating representations in presidential inaugural addresses in the United States. In accordance with my two research questions I attempted to explore possible differences between Barack Obama and Donald Trump's inaugural addresses in how they create representations of different groups of people with the help of pronouns and metaphors. I focused on specific types of metaphors and the differences in use between inclusive and exclusive pronouns as well individual and collective pronouns.

The findings of my analysis were rather conclusive in the sense that I found clear differences between the two inaugural addresses, but there was also consistency within both respective speeches. Obama used both pronouns and metaphors mainly to encourage group membership and positive connotations towards different socio-economic groups and foreign nationalities. In Trump's speech the pronouns and metaphors were quite often used in such a way that they enforced existing divisions between groups of people based on their status in the society, nationality and also between himself and the people. Based solely on the speeches Trump seems more distant whereas Obama is more at one with the people. My results regarding the use self-inclusive pronouns in mainly positive contexts confirmed the findings of Gustafsson Sendén (2014). As for metaphors in Trump's speech, and especially the way he used metaphors of empathetic purpose, however, differed from what Charteris-Black (2014) says about the subject, as Charteris-Black states that empathetic metaphors are mainly used in positive contexts.

The inaugural addresses of American presidents are circulated widely throughout the world and can therefore have a noticeable impact on the everyday lives of people. Therefore, and as my study indicates, politicians should be mindful of their language choices. Even simple choices, such as the decision between a self-inclusive and a self-exclusive pronoun or the context where

you decide to place a metaphor, can have a significant impact on the representations you create. These representations can, even unintentionally, portray a specific group of people in a very negative light and therefore affect peoples' attitudes towards that particular group. This kind of 'dividing' use of language should be considered carefully before employed. The findings of this study can be applied to other discourses as well and should be taken into consideration when planning a public speech or other form of discourse that can be expected to reach a wider audience.

The restricted scope of a Bachelor's thesis did not allow for a comprehensive study of representations in inaugural addresses given by presidents of the United States as I could only focus on two speeches given by two different presidents. This, however, opens the way for possible future research on the topic. An interesting aspect to study would be to include more inaugural addresses in the scope and see whether any conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the presidents' political party. It would also be interesting to analyse how the speeches in this thesis were received by the public or in the social media.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Obama, B. (2009) *Inaugural address* [online]

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=44> (10 August, 2017)

Trump, D. (2017) *Inaugural address* [online]

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=120000> (10 August, 2017)

Secondary sources

Britannica (2017). <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Democratic-Party#toc233982> (11 November, 2017)

Britannica (2017). <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Republican-Party> (11 November, 2017)

Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Dunmire, P. L. (2012). Political discourse analysis: Exploring the language of politics and the politics of language. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 6 (11), 735-751.

Du Pont, O. (2007). But we're American... the presence of American exceptionalism in the speeches of George W. Bush. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 3, 119-136.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Language and power* (2nd ed ed.). Harlow, Eng. : New York: Longman.

Gustafsson Sendén, M., Lindholm, T. and Sikstrom, S. (2014). Selection bias in choice of words: Evaluations of 'I' and 'we' differ between contexts, but 'they' are always worse. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 33 (1), 49-67.

Inside Gov (2017). <http://us-political-parties.insidegov.com/1/2/Republican-Party> (11 November, 2017)

Oxford dictionaries (2017). <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/metaphor> (20 August, 2017)

Oxford dictionaries (2017). <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/representation> (20 August, 2017)

Peters, G. (2017). *The American Presidency Project* [online]. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California (hosted), Gerhard Peters (database). Available from World Wide Web: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/inaugurals_words.php (20 August, 2017)

Scheibman, J. (2014). Inclusive and exclusive patterning of the English first person plural: Evidence from conversation. [online] 377-397.
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.489.5456&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Wodak, R. (Ed.). (1989). *Language, power, and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

Wodak, R., Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: SAGE.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Barack Obama's inaugural address

My fellow citizens, I stand here today humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust you have bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors. I thank President Bush for his service to our Nation, as well as the generosity and cooperation he has shown throughout this transition.

Forty-four Americans have now taken the Presidential oath. The words have been spoken during rising tides of prosperity and the still waters of peace. Yet every so often, the oath is taken amidst gathering clouds and raging storms. At these moments, America has carried on not simply because of the skill or vision of those in high office, but because we the people have remained faithful to the ideals of our forebears and true to our founding documents.

So it has been; so it must be with this generation of Americans.

That we are in the midst of crisis is now well understood. Our Nation is at war against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred. Our economy is badly weakened, a consequence of greed and irresponsibility on the part of some, but also our collective failure to make hard choices and prepare the Nation for a new age. Homes have been lost, jobs shed, businesses shuttered. Our health care is too costly. Our schools fail too many. And each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet.

These are the indicators of crisis, subject to data and statistics. Less measurable but no less profound is a sapping of confidence across our land, a nagging fear that America's decline is inevitable, that the next generation must lower its sights. Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real. They are serious, and they are many. They will not be met easily or in a short span of time. But know this, America: They will be met.

On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord. On this day, we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn-out dogmas that for far too long have strangled our politics.

We remain a young nation, but in the words of Scripture, the time has come to set aside childish things. The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit, to choose our better history, to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea passed on from generation to generation: the God-

given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness.

In reaffirming the greatness of our Nation, we understand that greatness is never a given. It must be earned. Our journey has never been one of shortcuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the fainthearted, for those who prefer leisure over work or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame. Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things--some celebrated, but more often men and women obscure in their labor--who have carried us up the long, rugged path toward prosperity and freedom.

For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in search of a new life. For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West, endured the lash of the whip, and plowed the hard Earth. For us, they fought and died in places like Concord and Gettysburg, Normandy and Khe Sanh.

Time and again, these men and women struggled and sacrificed and worked 'til their hands were raw so that we might live a better life. They saw America as bigger than the sum of our individual ambitions, greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction.

This is the journey we continue today. We remain the most prosperous, powerful nation on Earth. Our workers are no less productive than when this crisis began. Our minds are no less inventive. Our goods and services no less needed than they were last week or last month or last year. Our capacity remains undiminished. But our time of standing pat, of protecting narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions, that time has surely passed. Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking America.

For everywhere we look, there is work to be done. The state of the economy calls for action, bold and swift, and we will act not only to create new jobs but to lay a new foundation for growth. We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together. We will restore science to its rightful place and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost. We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age. All this we can do. All this we will do.

Now, there are some who question the scale of our ambitions, who suggest that our system cannot tolerate too many big plans. Their memories are short, for they have forgotten what this country has already done, what free men and women can achieve when imagination is joined to common purpose and necessity to courage.

What the cynics fail to understand is that the ground has shifted beneath them, that the stale political arguments that have consumed us for so long no longer apply. The question we ask today is not whether our Government is too big or too small, but whether it works; whether it helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified. Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. Where the answer is no, programs will end. And those of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day, because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.

Nor is the question before us whether the market is a force for good or ill. Its power to generate wealth and expand freedom is unmatched. But this crisis has reminded us that without a watchful eye, the market can spin out of control. The Nation cannot prosper long when it favors only the prosperous. The success of our economy has always depended not just on the size of our gross domestic product, but on the reach of our prosperity, on our ability to extend opportunity to every willing heart, not out of charity, but because it is the surest route to our common good.

As for our common defense, we reject as false the choice between our safety and our ideals. Our Founding Fathers, faced with perils that we can scarcely imagine, drafted a charter to assure the rule of law and the rights of man, a charter expanded by the blood of generations. Those ideals still light the world, and we will not give them up for expedience's sake. And so to all the other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born, know that America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity, and we are ready to lead once more.

Recall that earlier generations faced down fascism and communism not just with missiles and tanks but with sturdy alliances and enduring convictions. They understood that our power alone cannot protect us, nor does it entitle us to do as we please. Instead, they knew that our power grows through its prudent use. Our security emanates from the justness of our cause, the force of our example, the tempering qualities of humility and restraint.

We are the keepers of this legacy. Guided by these principles once more, we can meet those new threats that demand even greater effort, even greater cooperation and understanding between nations. We will begin to responsibly leave Iraq to its people and forge a hard-earned peace in Afghanistan. With old friends and former foes, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat and roll back the specter of a warming planet. We will not apologize for our way of life, nor will we waver in its defense. And for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents, we say to you now that our spirit is stronger and cannot be broken. You cannot outlast us, and we will defeat you.

For we know that our patchwork heritage is a strength, not a weakness. We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus and nonbelievers. We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth. And because we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation and emerged from that dark chapter stronger and more united, we cannot help but believe that the old hatreds shall someday pass, that the lines of tribe shall soon dissolve; that as the world grows smaller, our common humanity shall reveal itself, and that America must play its role in ushering in a new era of peace.

To the Muslim world, we seek a new way forward based on mutual interest and mutual respect. To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict or blame their society's ills on the West, know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy. To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are on the wrong side of history, but that we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist.

To the people of poor nations, we pledge to work alongside you to make your farms flourish and let clean waters flow, to nourish starved bodies and feed hungry minds. And to those nations like ours that enjoy relative plenty, we say we can no longer afford indifference to suffering outside our borders, nor can we consume the world's resources without regard to effect, for the world has changed, and we must change with it.

As we consider the road that unfolds before us, we remember with humble gratitude those brave Americans who, at this very hour, patrol far-off deserts and distant mountains. They have something to tell us today, just as the fallen heroes who lie in Arlington whisper through the ages. We honor them not only because they are guardians of our liberty, but because they embody the spirit of service, a willingness to find meaning in something greater than

themselves. And yet at this moment, a moment that will define a generation, it is precisely this spirit that must inhabit us all.

For as much as Government can do and must do, it is ultimately the faith and determination of the American people upon which this Nation relies. It is the kindness to take in a stranger when the levees break, the selflessness of workers who would rather cut their hours than see a friend lose their job, which sees us through our darkest hours. It is the firefighter's courage to storm a stairway filled with smoke, but also a parent's willingness to nurture a child, that finally decides our fate.

Our challenges may be new. The instruments with which we meet them may be new. But those values upon which our success depends--honesty and hard work, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism--these things are old. These things are true. They have been the quiet force of progress throughout our history. What is demanded then is a return to these truths. What is required of us now is a new era of responsibility, a recognition on the part of every American that we have duties to ourselves, our Nation, and the world. Duties that we do not grudgingly accept but, rather, seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task.

This is the price and the promise of citizenship. This is the source of our confidence, the knowledge that God calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny. This is the meaning of our liberty and our creed; why men and women and children of every race and every faith can join in celebration across this magnificent Mall, and why a man whose father less than 60 years ago might not have been served at a local restaurant can now stand before you to take a most sacred oath.

So let us mark this day with remembrance of who we are and how far we have travelled. In the year of America's birth, in the coldest of months, a small band of patriots huddled by dying campfires on the shores of an icy river. The Capital was abandoned. The enemy was advancing. The snow was stained with blood. At a moment when the outcome of our Revolution was most in doubt, the Father of our Nation ordered these words be read to the people:

"Let it be told to the future world . . . that in the depth of winter, when nothing but hope and virtue could survive . . . that the city and the country, alarmed at one common danger, came forth to meet [it]."

America, in the face of our common dangers, in this winter of our hardship, let us remember these timeless words. With hope and virtue, let us brave once more the icy currents and endure what storms may come. Let it be said by our children's children that when we were tested, we refused to let this journey end; that we did not turn back, nor did we falter. And with eyes fixed on the horizon and God's grace upon us, we carried forth that great gift of freedom and delivered it safely to future generations.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

Appendix 2: Donald Trump's inaugural address

Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world: Thank you.

We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and restore its promise for all of our people. Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for many, many years to come. We will face challenges, we will confront hardships, but we will get the job done.

Every 4 years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent. Thank you.

Today's ceremony, however, has very special meaning. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one administration to another or from one party to another, but we are transferring power from Washington, DC, and giving it back to you, the people.

For too long, a small group in our Nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of Government while the people have borne the cost. Washington flourished, but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered, but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our Nation's Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land.

That all changes, starting right here and right now, because this moment is your moment: It belongs to you. It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America. This is your day. This is your celebration. And this, the United States of America, is your country.

What truly matters is not which party controls our Government, but whether our Government is controlled by the people. January 20, 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this Nation again. The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. Everyone is listening to you now.

You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before. At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves. These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public.

But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our Nation; an education system, flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge; and the crime and the gangs and the drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential.

This American carnage stops right here and stops right now. We are one Nation, and their pain is our pain, their dreams are our dreams, and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny.

The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans.

For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry, subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military. We've defended other nations' borders while refusing to defend our own and spent trillions and trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay. We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has dissipated over the horizon.

One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions and millions of American workers that were left behind. The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed all across the world.

But that is the past. And now we are looking only to the future.

We, assembled here today, are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power. From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land. From this this day forward, it's going to be only America first. America first.

Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families.

We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength. I will fight for you with every breath in my body, and I will never, ever let you down.

America will start winning again, winning like never before. We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams.

We will build new roads and highways and bridges and airports and tunnels and railways all across our wonderful Nation.

We will get our people off of welfare and back to work, rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor. We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and hire American.

We will seek friendship and good will with the nations of the world, but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first. We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example—we will shine—for everyone to follow.

We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones and unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth.

At the bedrock of our politics will be a total allegiance to the United States of America, and through our loyalty to our country, we will rediscover our loyalty to each other. When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice. The Bible tells us, "How good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity." We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity. When America is united, America is totally unstoppable. There should be no fear: We are protected, and we will always be protected. We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement, and most importantly, we will be protected by God.

Finally, we must think big and dream even bigger. In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving.

We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action, constantly complaining, but never doing anything about it. The time for empty talk is over. Now arrives the hour of action.

Do not allow anyone to tell you that it cannot be done. No challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America. We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again.

We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to unlock the mysteries of space, to free the Earth from the miseries of disease, and to harness the energies, industries, and technologies of tomorrow. A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions.

It's time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are Black or Brown or White, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American flag.

And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the windswept plains of Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator.

So to all Americans in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, from ocean to ocean, hear these words: You will never be ignored again. Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams will define our American destiny. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way.

Together, we will make America strong again. We will make America wealthy again. We will make America proud again. We will make America safe again.

And, yes, together, we will make America great again. Thank you. God bless you, and God bless America. Thank you. God bless America.