Good afternoon. Let me begin by saying that although this has been billed as an anti-war rally, I stand before you as someone who is not opposed to war in all circumstances. The Civil War was one of the bloodiest in history, and yet it was only through the crucible of the sword, the sacrifice of multitudes, that we could begin to perfect this union, and drive the scourge of slavery from our soil. I don't oppose all wars.

 **The main theme of the speech is war. Obama speaks very harshly about wars, considers them bad, but emphasizes that he is not against all wars.**

My grandfather signed up for a war the day after Pearl Harbor was bombed, fought in Patton's army. He saw the dead and dying across the fields of Europe; he heard the stories of fellow troops who first entered Auschwitz and Treblinka. He fought in the name of a larger freedom, part of that arsenal of democracy that triumphed over evil, and he did not fight in vain. I don't oppose all wars.

**In this paragraph, Obama refers to the events of the Second World War, mentions constables, and talks about his grandfather. He explains that in all wars, good fights evil, so he is far from being against all wars.**

After Sept. 11, after witnessing the carnage and destruction, the dust and the tears, I supported this administration's pledge to hunt down and root out those who would slaughter innocents in the name of intolerance, and I would willingly take up arms myself to prevent such tragedy from happening again. I don't oppose all wars. And I know that in this crowd today, there is no shortage of patriots, or of patriotism.

**Obama mentions the terrorist act of 9/11 and condemns everything completely, using a series of nouns. Using such historical moments, he convinces the crowd (the people of the United States) that patriotism and patriots are extremely numerous.**

What I am opposed to is a dumb war. What I am opposed to is a rash war. What I am opposed to is the cynical attempt by Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz and other armchair, weekend warriors in this administration to shove their own ideological agendas down our throats, irrespective of the costs in lives lost and in hardships borne.

**There is a condemnation of a stupid and thoughtless war. Obama also calls the ruling elite "weekend warriors" and condemns their imposition of ideas with the phrase "down our throats".**

What I am opposed to is the attempt by political hacks like Karl Rove to distract us from a rise in the uninsured, a rise in the poverty rate, a drop in the median income — to distract us from corporate scandals and a stock market that has just gone through the worst month since the Great Depression. That's what I'm opposed to. A dumb war. A rash war. A war based not on reason but on passion, not on principle but on politics. Now let me be clear — I suffer no illusions about Saddam Hussein. He is a brutal man. A ruthless man. A man who butchers his own people to secure his own power. He has repeatedly defied UN resolutions, thwarted UN inspection teams, developed chemical and biological weapons, and coveted nuclear capacity. He's a bad guy. The world, and the Iraqi people, would be better off without him.

**He again opposes blunt and sudden war. Using a comparison of terms, he explains that this does not make any sense, and using a number of epithets, he condemns the actions of Saddam Hussein. Obama separates the concepts of "people of the world" and "people of Iraq", thus he wants to emphasize that the elimination of Saddam Hussein will primarily help the citizens of Iraq.**

But I also know that Saddam poses no imminent and direct threat to the United States or to his neighbors, that the Iraqi economy is in shambles, that the Iraqi military a fraction of its former strength, and that in concert with the international community he can be contained until, in the way of all petty dictators, he falls away into the dustbin of history. I know that even a successful war against Iraq will require a U.S. occupation of undetermined length, at undetermined cost, with undetermined consequences. I know that an invasion of Iraq without a clear rationale and without strong international support will only fan the flames of the Middle East, and encourage the worst, rather than best, impulses of the Arab world, and strengthen the recruitment arm of al-Qaida. I am not opposed to all wars. I'm opposed to dumb wars.

**It is explained that there is no direct threat to the USA or neighboring countries. Once again there is a reminder of the condemnation of moronic wars. With the help of nouns and phrases, Obama explains the weight of Iraq on the world stage. There is also a warning about al-Qaeda and possible consequences.**

So for those of us who seek a more just and secure world for our children, let us send a clear message to the president today. You want a fight, President Bush? Let's finish the fight with bin Laden and al-Qaida, through effective, coordinated intelligence, and a shutting down of the financial networks that support terrorism, and a homeland security program that involves more than color-coded warnings! You want a fight, President Bush?

**The phrase is repeated “You want a fight, President Bush?”, also in the imperative mode it is suggested to solve all pressing problems.**

Let's fight to make sure that the U.N. inspectors can do their work, and that we vigorously enforce a non-proliferation treaty, and that former enemies and current allies like Russia safeguard and ultimately eliminate their stores of nuclear material, and that nations like Pakistan and India never use the terrible weapons already in their possession, and that the arms merchants in our own country stop feeding the countless wars that rage across the globe. You want a fight, President Bush?

**Another repetition of the above phrase.**

Let's fight to make sure our so-called allies in the Middle East, the Saudis and the Egyptians, stop oppressing their own people, and suppressing dissent, and tolerating corruption and inequality, and mismanaging their economies so that their youth grow up without education, without prospects, without hope, the ready recruits of terrorist cells. You want a fight, President Bush? Let's fight to wean ourselves off Middle East oil, through an energy policy that doesn't simply serve the interests of Exxon and Mobil.

**Another repetition of the above phrase.**

Those are the battles that we need to fight. Those are the battles that we willingly join. The battles against ignorance and intolerance. Corruption and greed. Poverty and despair. The consequences of war are dire, the sacrifices immeasurable. We may have occasion in our lifetime to once again rise up in defense of our freedom, and pay the wages of war. But we ought not — we will not — travel down that hellish path blindly. Nor should we allow those who would march off and pay the ultimate sacrifice, who would prove the full measure of devotion with their blood, to make such an awful sacrifice in vain.

**The use of metaphors to give color to various phenomena and fight against evil. Recognition of true sacrifice.**

**Also, using "you", "they", Obama emphasizes the residents of the USA and the residents of other countries. In some contexts, the word "they" has a negative meaning, and its synonym can be the word "enemy".**

**Microlevel - strong language, imperative mood**

At the microlevel, the speech can be analyzed in terms of its linguistic features, such as its use of rhetorical devices, metaphors, and emotive language. Obama uses rhetorical questions, repetition, and parallelism to emphasize his arguments and make them more persuasive. For example, he uses the phrase "undetermined length, undetermined cost, undetermined consequences" to emphasize the uncertainty and potential danger of the proposed war. He also uses metaphors, such as the metaphor of the "brutal dictatorship" to evoke images of oppression and cruelty, and emotive language, such as "innocent children" and "graves of our soldiers" to appeal to the emotions of his audience.

**Mesolevel - target audience is the US and Middle East citizens**

At the mesolevel, the speech can be analyzed in terms of its genre, discourse community, and intertextuality. The speech belongs to the genre of political discourse, and is addressed to a particular discourse community - the anti-war movement in the United States. Obama's arguments are influenced by the discourse of the anti-war movement, but he also draws on other sources of intertextuality, such as international law and human rights conventions, to support his arguments. By doing so, he positions himself and his arguments within a broader context of social and political discourse.

**Macrolevel - peace is extremely important now and people should understand this and politicians must provide this**

At the macrolevel, the speech can be analyzed in terms of its social and political context, and its relationship to broader structures of power and ideology. Obama's speech is situated within a context of political polarization and heightened tensions between the U.S. and the Middle East. At the macrolevel, the speech can be seen as a challenge to the dominant discourse of U.S. foreign policy, which emphasized military intervention and unilateral action. By positioning himself as a critic of the status quo, Obama is able to challenge the dominant structures of power and ideology, and to create a sense of solidarity with his audience.