
RESEARCH ARTICLE

Translating Obama's Political Discourse from a Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective

Abdeslam Albakri¹ ✉ and Cherif Teimi²

¹A Doctoral Student at the University of Ibn Tofail, English Department, Kenitra, Morocco; EFL Teacher at Ministry of National Education (MEN).

²Professor at Faculty of Languages, Letters and Arts, University of Ibn Tofail, Kenitra, Morocco

Corresponding Author: Abdeslam Albakri, **E-mail:** abdeslam.albakri@uit.ac.ma

ABSTRACT

The present study tackled the effect of ideology on the translators' work, which may intensify when they have a different religion or culture. It was located within the framework of political discourse in the field of Translation Studies. It aimed at analyzing both political discourse and its translation from a critical discourse analysis perspective. The study at hand analyzed both political discourse and its translation taking into account Fairclough's perspective of discourse analysis as a linguistic analysis and texts from contexts in which discourse is produced. Moreover, the study analyzed political discourse from Van Dijk's perspective of critical discourse analysis to find implied meaning either in discourse or in its translation and the translator's intervention in the translation process. It highlighted the power existing in the political discourse by stating that it is loaded with ideology and by proving that translation is considered to be a production of a new discourse and a social, political and cultural act. The study adopted a qualitative approach based on the use of Critical Discourse Analysis approach adopted by Fairclough (1989) and the notion of interpretation. Working within the framework of this approach, the study revealed that many translation strategies were used to achieve a functional equivalence. By using some strategies such as deletion, explicitation, addition, literal translation, the study concluded that translations did not fulfil the semantic and contextual criteria of the "fidelity rule" and the "coherence rule". The study also showed that use of techniques and selection of excerpts to be translated played an important role in monitoring the target culture audience in the sense that translators affect the translation process by producing their own ideology.

KEYWORDS

Political Discourse, CDA, Translation Strategies, Ideology, Culture

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 19 July 2025

PUBLISHED: 03 August 2025

DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2025.8.8.4

1. Introduction

Political discourse relies primarily on language and it is influenced by power structures and historical processes (Wodak, 1995). Language in political discourse has a certain form of 'violence'; words are consciously and politically informed. In other words, languages are not ideology free. In fact, the main concern of Critical Discourse Analysis is the study of the relations between the use of language and social power.

Translating political discourse is a very challenging activity because it goes beyond the syntactic, semantic, lexical, cultural and pragmatic difficulties. It is an investigation on the relationship between language, ideology and power.

Studying political discourse from a translation perspective helps in the understanding of politics and in grasping the ideological and power relations existing inside it. Thus, the study at hand will explore how political discourse analysis as a field can benefit from translation studies.

The goal of the study is to analyze those translations as political discourses. Therefore, the study relies upon Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). When one talks about a goal, he must certainly talk about a certain ideology as a starting point in the process of translating such discourse.

The study uses a qualitative methodology so as to analyze translations in terms of their semantic aspects and on the basis of their cultural and ideological connotations especially in the use of words and linguistic structures from the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective. The study makes use of the main procedures implied in Fairclough's model (1989) which includes three levels of analysis: the text, the discursive practice and the socio-cultural practice then interpretation, which is an important strategy in analyzing political discourse.

The study uses a corpus of different political speeches given by the former American president Barack Obama. The reason behind this choice is that the content of these chosen discourses is mainly political and ideological.

2. Political Discourse

Political discourse, which relies primarily on language is a *"form of social action, always determined by values and social norms, by conventions (as naturalized ideologies) and social practices and always delimited and influenced by power structures and historical process"* (Wodak:1995, p.206).

Political discourse is represented by many communicative means such as treaties, speeches, election campaigns, editorials, commentaries in newspapers, interviews and conferences. Politicians usually use an easy language, direct and mixed with colloquial language as well as indirect communicational strategies like proverbs, metaphors and idioms. These characteristics may take the language of political actors very informal or highly formal. Note also that politicians often use two types of style, a rhetorical style that can include, for instance, the vernacular language, and also the language of politics (Fairclough 2001: p.8).

2.1. Discourse in Critical Discourse Analysis

Fairclough (1992: p.3) points out that discourse refers to both spoken and written language. Therefore, text analysis and discourse analysis are concerned with the properties of dialogue like turn-taking, the structure of conversational openings and closings and the structure of written texts like the structure of a crime report in a newspaper.

Discourses are also organized into a hierarchical structure that makes them coherent and this is what Michael Glanzberg (2002: p.334) stresses by saying that discourses are not just a linear grouping of utterances. They are a set of segments that can be found in paragraphs, in written texts and in any type of spoken discourse.

2.2 Discourse and Context

According to Van Dijk (2008: pp.191-192), any discourse suggests the existence of at least two persons exchanging words between them; one hearer and one speaker. Both 'agents' and speakers are to belong to at least one speech community using of course the same language. So, the communicative situation produces an exchange of utterances between a speaker and a hearer who can become an agent speaker accomplishing many 'actions'. Context for him is also characterized by being dynamic in the sense that its meaning is always changing in time as far as situations are changing. Thus, the context can be regarded as a 'course of events' comprising three main states: 'an initial state', an 'intermediary state' and 'a final state'. The classification of these states depends of course on the conditions that are behind their existence.

So, context for him is defined via time and place, which are key elements in the identification of a particular discourse. 'Possible' or 'actual' contexts are determined by the exchange of utterances between a speaker and a hearer in a period of time and in a definite place. An 'actual context' possesses many other choices or alternatives that are appropriate for the communicative event, which can be normal or just imaginable.

On the other hand, Van Dijk (2009: pp.17-18) argues that people do create 'mental models' of the events they participate in. This is what he calls 'context models'. People belong to a social environment and they obviously represent it through their verbal communication in some social situations whether at home, at school, in shops and in many other situations. The 'context models' or simply contexts refer to all communicative acts that occur in some social situations like the ones mentioned before. This 'context model' is in fact a necessary element for the performance of discourse. He argues that participants in the discourse cannot exchange utterances and grasp the meanings of speech acts. Obviously speaking, participants cannot have a role in a discourse if there is no communicative event. It means that the participants in a discourse cannot exchange utterances, grasp the meanings of speech acts and use the right items, the appropriate style and the right rhetoric. So, speaking and responding require at least certain knowledge of the topic otherwise the discourse cannot be produced.

He also considers context through the 'mental schemata' of the participants. Contexts exist inside people's minds. They are everyone's interpretations of the social event or the ongoing social situation. The participants' own opinions can represent of course the attitudes and opinions of the other participants or the other members of groups. So, different opinions of different participants belonging to different social groups lead to different 'context models'. Conflicts are sometimes the result of incomplete "context models". Moreover, he stresses that the 'context structures' describe the elements of time, location, event, action and participants and they are relevant to a particular use of language. In spite of the fact that many studies have been done on how to organize 'context models' in order to be able to represent communicative situations, more research on the relation between text and context is still needed. It is worth saying that the importance of some categories are time, location, event, action and participants. 'Time' and 'location' are useful for the description and the explanation of the 'pronoun use' and to other forms of politeness. All these categories can be reestablished and reorganized in the form of a schemata that will be useful and can be applied in any discursive communication.

Michael Glanzberg (2002: pp.333-334) argues that the nature of context presents two different conceptions. The first one is what is called 'the index theory of context' which means that each sentence has its own structure suggesting a semantic representation and a corresponding interpretation. The elements of the 'Logical Form' (LF) of the sentence do have semantic values. These semantic values are highly influenced by the social situation and the social context. So, contexts set the parameters that the semantic values have. As for the second conception of context, it is 'the presupposition theory of context', which implies that the context of any utterance is but the outcome of propositions presupposed by participants in a conversation. Context is but a manifestation of content. This theory is regarded as an 'intentional theory of context'. It is possible to identify the context and know how the context functions within a communicative situation.

To explain the important relation existing between discourse and context, Van Dijk (2008: pp.120-121) proposes the example of one of Blair's speeches in the House of Commons as a case study. By examining the contextual control of discourse, he concluded that there are many elements that govern his speech among which the mental model of the communicative situation Blair should have had. The same goes for the audience. In addition, there is the condition of a mutual interaction between the speaker and the participants. So, without these elements, the speech can have no meaning and no discursive impact.

3. Political discourse in translation

Political discourse has been the central concern of many researchers. Fairclough (2003: p.139) stresses that the representation of social and political events requires the making use of the recontextualization method. The elements of a social event are well 'filtered' and the choices are made from a selective basis perspective by including or excluding certain elements and by giving some of them more importance than others.

Mohamed Marouane (2014: pp.143-144) emphasizes that PDA is a branch of CDA. Its main role consists of analyzing the different manifestations of political communication and language. According to the political discourse analysis, discourse is not only influenced by ideology but it is capable of producing it as well. For him, Translation Studies help a lot in explaining how lexical choices may allude to different ideological and socio-cultural values. So, there is a strong interaction between political discourse and translation.

Schaffner (1997: p.26) has proposed a multidisciplinary approach to analyze political discourse, comprising CDA into the Translation Studies. She argues that translation helps a lot in revealing the ideological features of political discourse at both lexical and syntactic levels. She claims then that all translations are ideological because they are governed by interests, aims and objectives of 'social agents'. Ideological features can be depicted from the political discourse at the lexical level by adding or deleting for instance a particular word. They can also be revealed at the grammatical level by the use of passive structure in order to avoid an expression of agency.

Mona Baker (2006: p.92) discusses the ethical issue of translation saying that both translators and interpreters are confronted to a capital ethical choice between preserving the same ideological device as produced in the text or utterance and refusing the translation of a text or utterance where ideology seems to be a serious problem in that particular context. Besides, translators and interpreters may opt for other strategies to reduce the impact of the ideological nature of the texts or of the utterances to translate. In fact, she wants to shed light on the fact that the translations, mainly those of political discourse are but sorts of narratives proposed by a translator or by an institution.

In fact, Alvarez & Vidal (1996: p.5) assert that translation may be highly influenced by ideological background of the translator. The intervention of the translators can be seen in the careful choice of words, in the ways of placing them in the sentence. All the translation strategies used by the translator as deletion and addition for instance are to implement his own culture and more precisely his own ideology.

Nord (2003: p.11) emphasizes that the translator's decisions are governed by ideological reasons. Lefèvre (1992: pp.13-16) maintains the importance of the role played by ideology and patronage in the translation process. According to their ideological, social and cultural beliefs, translators may come up with a translation that is totally different from the source text and from the speaker's intentions. Translation becomes then a distortion of the political discourse.

Moreover, Mona Baker's (2006) discussion of translation from ideological reasons perspectives is also raised by Christina Schaffner and Susan Bassnet (2010: pp.3-13) but through the important term 'recontextualization'. It is a kind of transformation that relies upon many goals, values and interests. Translations becomes very reluctant to ideological decisions that are determined by translators or sometimes by institutions mainly in the translation of political discourse. So, translation becomes very important in 'the export and import' of political discourse.

Valdeon (2005: p.100) stresses that translators are mediators because they rely upon their knowledge of the political, ideological and socio-cultural issues of the political discourse in order to produce a translation that is easily understood by the TL audience. Translators interpret the ST according to their political, cultural and ideological backgrounds. So, the analysis of the ST and the TT is carried out through the foregrounding of the connections between transnational, linguistic and ideological features existing in political discourse. The translator has to acquire a big knowledge of both the culture of the SL and that of the TT.

Schaffner (2004: pp.127-128) emphasizes that the translation of political discourse informs the target audience about a communicative act already implied in the source text. Translation is then an intercultural activity and many elements may influence it as the situation, the audience, the function of the political discourse in the TL community. The functions of the ST and the TT determine the strategies and methods. The function of the ST is persuasive whereas the function of the TT is informative. This means that the SL and the TL communities do not share the same knowledge.

It is worth noting the difficulties that translators face in translating the ideology of the political discourse published in the media. Venuti (1995: pp.18-19) for instance affirms that translation can be called a cultural political practice because it constructs 'critiquing ideology-stamped identities'. It is highly recommended to decide whether to 'domesticate' or to 'foreignize' the text. If ever there is any mistranslation, some cultural and ideological codes will serve the ideology of the target culture.

Faiq (2004: p.2) stresses that many theorists take the element of ideology as a starting point in their research mainly because the act of translating includes 'manipulation', 'subversion', 'appropriation' and 'violence'. As Norman Fairclough (1995: p.71) stresses, ideologies reside in texts and it is impossible to read texts without taking into consideration the element of ideology. Meanings are produced through interpretations and discourses are open to different interpretations which are in turn based on different ideological positions.

Consequently, Hatim and Munday (2004: p.200) point out that equivalence is no longer important in the act of translation. To translate from a language into another language is never innocent. The process of translation is sometimes ideologically manipulated. Ideological considerations play nowadays an important role in the translation process.

3.1 Ideology

The notion of ideology was invented first by the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy (1797). In his letter addressed to young people, Destutt de Tracy (1801: p.2) proposes the main elements that may constitute the basis of ideology. People must possess ideas to defend. In other words, to defend one's ideas, which may appear to others as absurd or unclear is a way to take a position and it is as a matter of fact an ideology that one may have. To have one's ideas means to express them in a very clear way and to combine them in a very easy and organized manner. Therefore, he defines ideology in general as a 'Science of Ideas'.

This is in fact what Van Dijk (2013: p.6) emphasizes by noting that ideologies are a system of ideas that are shared by a social group or a social movement. These shared ideas engender social, political and religious dimensions. Examples of some famous ideologies are socialism, liberalism, feminism, sexism, pacifism, fascism, militarism and antiracism. These ideologies can be regarded as being positive or negative according to people's points of view and according to people's own ideas and perceptions. Members of groups rely upon their ideology and their own ideas in order to interpret different events and control their social practices.

Terry Eagleton (1991: pp.1-2) argues that ideology does not have one meaning and one definition. For him, among the most circulated definitions of ideology are the set of ideas which lead to legitimate a dominant power, identity thinking and the conjuncture of discourse and power.

Ideologies were considered according to Engles and Marx (1970) as 'forms of false consciousness.' Ideology was indeed defined in a very broad way and was discussed from a negative perspective. In this respect, Van Dijk (1998: p.8) criticizes the traditional conception of ideology as being a 'false consciousness'. The Marxist ideology implies that groups sharing the same ideas may fail objectively speaking in defending their interests. A group of workers may defend the ideology and the interests of the upper class, the elites or simply the managers of the company they work for. This 'false consciousness' or ideology is caused by ignorance, manipulation, indifference and compliance.

Capitalist and Marxist ideologies are two different and opposing social, economic and political theories. Capitalism is based on the principle of economic individualism and the freedom to own a private property and make economic decisions. Marxism was a reaction against the liberal-capitalist society. It enhanced its existence through the writings of Karl Marx and Fredrick Engles in the 19th century. It is based on the theory of the class struggle or conflict. The main concern of Marxist ideology is the establishment of a society where people will be able to possess the means of production. Marxist ideology is the voice of the working class whereas liberalism is the political theory of the capitalist class. The Marxist ideology stresses that the human development results from the forces of production.

The Marxist Gramsci (1971: pp.328-333) came up with a new conception of ideology, which is a little bit different from the Marxist theory. He proposed the notion of hegemony in order to discuss the concept of ideology. Hegemony for him is a form of rule in which subordinate groups consent to the exercise of power or domination. Ideology is linked to dominance because the ruling class and individuals in position of power and influence use hegemonic discourse in order to gain domination over the subjugated classes. The ruling classes achieve domination by the manipulation of language, culture, morality and common sense. 'Common sense' is a view that guides people and leads them to understand the world. He stresses that the main concern of the dominant social groups is to find ways to preserve a kind of 'ideological unity' so as to secure the consent of the governed.

Terry Eagleton (1991: p.13) emphasizes that Gramsci's hegemony is not only a good type of ideology but it is also a conception that can refer to different ideological, cultural, political and economic aspects. Hegemony is linked to the way the power-struggles are maintained.

On the other hand, Norman Fairclough (1995: p.76) affirms that it is Lenin who invented first the concept of hegemony that Gramsci (1971) used later in an elaborated form in his analysis of Western Europe. Hegemony for him is "leadership as well as domination across the economic, political, cultural and ideological domains of society".

Hegemony is a notion that attracted the attention of Louis Althusser (2014: p.245) who emphasized that a state power cannot be asserted by a ruling class for a long time 'without at the same time exercising its hegemony over and in the Ideological State Apparatuses'.

According to Van Dijk (2006: p. 729), ideology cannot be related only to 'Dominant groups' but also to 'Dominated groups' who may have their own ideologies of 'resistance and opposition'. Therefore, he defines ideology as being the establishment of social embodiments, ideas or representations shared by a particular social group. The shared ideas by social groups may be perceived by other social groups as being negative or positive. In fact, ideologies have to be positive in order to assert their dominance.

According to Althusser (2014: pp.75-78), the ruling class controls the superstructure through two types of apparatuses: the Repressive State Apparatuses and the Ideological state Apparatuses. The state makes use of the repressive apparatuses as the courts, the government, the police, prisons and armed forces in order to assert its dominance over the working class. The Ideological State Apparatuses on the other hand comprise the media, the educational and cultural institutions, the political groups, religious institutions, etc. In all ideological state apparatuses, the set of ideological discourses at work are always dominated by the ruling ideology. He emphasizes that Repressive State Apparatuses do make use of both direct and indirect physical violence whereas the Ideological State Apparatuses function 'not as violence but as ideology'.

Van Dijk (2013: p.8) emphasizes that there are some 'non-dominant' ideologies which are most often considered to be 'negative' like some religious groups or 'right-wing extremists. Critical analysis is to shed light on all manifestations of power abuse, dominance and on the ideological foundations of this dominance. Indeed, he proposes a new conception of ideology playing the role of interface between what he calls 'social embodiments' that members of a group share together.

In this respect, ideologies enable group members to establish an organized framework of opinions and points of view on different cases and events and of course make them capable of acting according to their shared social and ideological beliefs. Ideologies can also be a means for the changing of beliefs and points of view of group members on different issues and matters

especially if these are set for the welfare of the group. So, ideology can represent the epistemological basis for any explanation or any understanding of the world in general.

Therefore, ideology is not only linked to a particular social group sharing the same beliefs but it is also related to knowledge. Thus, he argues that ideologies are not only 'systems of beliefs or ideas' that try to understand the world from a particular perspective but they are also a representation of 'social practices.' For instance, sexist and racist ideologies are regarded as the ground of inequity and discrimination. Ecological ideologies are concerned with the leading of manifestations and actions against pollution. Most often, ideologies are but a product or a consequence of conflicts between different social groups that have different interests, different beliefs and contradictory points of view.

Althusser (2014: pp.191-192) proposes the notion of interpellation or hailing so as to stress that ideologies hail people and offer them an identity which they accept as something 'natural'. Therefore, the ruling class exercises its dominance and power over individuals. This kind of dominance does not make use of physical violence. By the notion of interpellation, he emphasizes that there are no individuals but only subjects. Individuals are always 'interpellated by ideology as subjects.' Individuals are 'always-already' subjects even before they are born.

Van Dijk (2013: p.9) stresses the importance of language use and discourse because they represent the framework of any ideology. Language use and discourse influence also the perception and the understanding of other ideologies. Knowing other ideologies can be asserted through television, school books, advertising, newspapers, novels and verbal communication with friends and colleagues. Other discourse genres help in teaching ideologies to group members and followers among which 'political propaganda', 'catechism' and 'indoctrination' or persuasion.

One cannot speak about ideologies as being strictly individual beliefs because the fact of having personal ideas or beliefs may suggest that ideology is related to an individual. In fact, ideologies are a set of shared beliefs between groups of people. In this respect, Van Dijk (2013: pp.11-24) explains that there are not individual ideologies as far as there are not individual languages. Ideologies are not individual points of view but social beliefs that members of a social group share between each other. These social beliefs revolve around important social and political issues. Ideologies propose points of view on life, birth, death, health and suggest solutions for poverty and unemployment. Ideologies focus on issues like gender, ethnicity, redistribution of wealth, social classes, race, racism and anti-racism.

Speaking about ideologies as being 'basic systems' of beliefs means to speak on how a group is organized and how it manages its attitudes toward other groups with contradictory ideologies. He points out that ideology, which can be defined as 'basic system of beliefs' is to organize prejudices and attitudes on particular issues or cases. For instance, an ideology, which is said to be 'a racist ideology' establishes preconceptions or prejudices and racist views or positions. These attitudes or prejudices focus on the negative features of the other ideologies. Therefore, ideologies represent the framework of organized and coherent beliefs that are shared by members of a group. Ideologies are to distribute points of view on different issues and cases among members of groups and among other people. New institutions and new events urge ideologies to have new points of view, attitudes and positions. In the discussion of the 'mental representations', which are linked to 'social memory', Van Dijk makes emphasis on the importance of 'norms' and 'values' in the process of evaluation of the different ideologies. 'Norms' and 'Values' are to formulate and organize estimations. Their function is to establish the main objectives to look for by individuals, groups and societies. Therefore, there is a strong link between ideologies and values in the sense that they are both of them essential for the social memory. Yet, ideologies concern groups and their conflicts whereas values have a general function because they can be valid for people belonging to the same culture. Thus, 'The common ground' is represented by an organized system of 'sociocultural norms' and 'values.' These norms and values are shared not only by an ideological small group but by people of the same culture in general.

However, even if all ideologies have their own norms and values, they can differ in dealing with a particular value because they possess their own judgements, their own prejudices and their own attitudes. He argues that 'norms' and 'values', which have a general facet can be useful for different fields. When 'norms' and 'values' are applied in contradictory fields, they function as basic ideological beliefs.

Freedom for instance can be defended from different perspectives and from different angles by relying upon an ideological basis. Thus, liberal ideology fights for the freedom of the market; the professional ideology of journalists defends the freedom of the press and so on. Though, contradictory ideologies can share the same values like 'equality' for example. Therefore, ideological beliefs of a particular group are based on its particularities, its interests and its values.

To discuss the concept of ideology means to link it to power. In fact, there is a dialectic relation between ideology and power mainly at the levels of dominance, legitimization and control. Thus, Van Dijk (2013: p.35) emphasizes that generally speaking, ideologies were always associated to the legitimization of power particularly by ruling class or by the elite groups. Therefore, power means in this sense control of a particular group over another group and ideologies function as cognitive or 'mental' basis of this kind of control. In other words, ideologies establish the main principles, rules and procedures by which a group or a class can maintain power over another group or class. So, ideologies represent the 'source' and 'goal' of a group practice and its power of course.

According to Fairclough (1992: p.87), ideology is a 'construction of reality' in the sense that it serves as a translation of 'discursive practices' which become later on forms of 'common sense'. The reality that ideology constructs refers to the 'social relations', the 'physical world' and the 'social identities'. These different dimensions of the discursive practices participate in the propagation of domination relations.

On the other hand, John Schwarzmantel (2008: p.11) discusses the concept of ideology in its strict connection to another important concept which is politics stressing the fact that major theories of ideology can be called 'political ideologies'. In this respect, he gives examples of many works that illustrate this conception of ideology among which that of Gramsci (1971).

4. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis is an interdisciplinary approach to language from a critical perspective. It examines the relationship between dominance, power and control as represented in language.

Jaworsky and Coupland (1999) claim that the emergence of CDA was in late 1980's and was represented by scholars like: Norman Fairclough (1989, 1992, 2003), Ruth Wodak (1995, 1997, 1999), Teun van Dijk (1981, 1995, 2013) and others. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) aims at analyzing "opaque" as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (Wodak: 1995 p.204).

More specifically, CDA "studies real, and often extended, instances of social interaction which take (partially) linguistic form. The critical approach is distinctive in its view of (a) the relationship between language and society, and (b) the relationship between analysis and the practices analyzed" (Wodak: 1997 p.173).

Generally speaking, CDA is a critical approach to the study of language which enhances its existence through social theory. Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000) argue that CDA gives great importance to the theories of power and ideology by making reference to the works of Foucault (1971;1977); especially his formulations of 'orders of discourse' and 'power knowledge' as well as the notions of 'hegemony', 'concepts of ideological apparatuses' and 'interpellation' (see also Althusser, 1971). CDA shows the close and great connection between discourse and power (pp.451-452). Any discussion of CDA touches on the works of Fowler, Hodge, Wodak, Fairclough, Teun Van Dijk and Simpson. CDA depicts the relevance of such aspects of discourse as implication, modality, mood and transitivity options. The theory demonstrates that a dominant social group may choose specific lexis and grammar to persuade a dominant group in terms of power.

Fairclough (1992: p.73) views discourse as the manifestations of the relationship existing between the text and social practice.

He proposes the following three main dimensions of discourse:

- a) Discourse as text: that is to say the study for instance of the linguistic features of discourse, lexical choices, vocabulary (wording, metaphor), grammar (transitivity, modality), cohesion, coherence;
- b) Discourse as discursive practice: he shares in fact the same view of Foucault (1971) in considering discourse a discursive practice. Thus, the study of discourse is done through its dialectic relationship to all practices of society and ;
- c) Discourse as a social practice : the analysis of discourse is done within its ideological effects by making emphasis on the works of Gramsci (1971) and Althusser (1971).

From the above-mentioned discussion, one could argue that Fairclough (1989) is refuting the Saussurean 'parole' which is according to his theory incapable of giving a full definition of discourse mainly in being a social practice. He notes *"my view is that there is not an external relationship between language and society, but an internal and dialectical relationship. Language is part of society; linguistic phenomena are social phenomena of a special sort, and social phenomena are (in part) linguistic phenomena"* (Fairclough:1989, p.19). So, for him, society and social practices exist inside language because an idea or a statement is not uttered or produced from a linguistic perspective but from a social prospect as well. Fairclough's point is corroborated by Jan Blommaert's (2005) discussion of discourse. He believes that discourse cannot be studied outside society,

culture and politics by noting *"Discourse is what transforms our environment into a socially and culturally meaningful one"* (p.4). He makes a connection between discourse and other external aspects like the social, the historical and the cultural contexts of situation. For him, discourse is but a manifestation of language or what Hanks (1996, cited in Blommaert, 2005) calls 'language-in-action'. Thus, the study of discourse needs to give great importance to both language and action. He explains that the new theories of discourse are a result of the developments achieved at the level of linguistics and pragmatics (p.2).

Fairclough (1989: p.26) distinguishes three dimensions of Critical Discourse Analysis:

- Description: it focuses on the formal features of the text;
- Interpretation: is concerned with the relationship between text and 'interaction';
- Explanation: focuses on the relationships between 'interaction' and social context.

Fairclough (1989: pp. 110-129) proposed a model for critical discourse analysis, based upon the three stages mentioned previously. The description stage focuses on vocabulary, grammar, textual structures, pronouns, expressive values of words, nominalization, modality, sentences (simple or complex, positive or negative, passive or active etc.) and types of process and participant in terms of transitivity.

In this study, the meaning of texts is interpreted in terms of their semantics and ideological implications.

For the interpretation stage, Fairclough (1989: pp. 141-147) argues that it is concerned with the meaning existing in the text and the knowledge of the interpreter. Interpretation procedure revolves around the analysis of the situational context, the intertextual context, the meaning of utterances, the local coherence, the text structure and the discourse type.

Interpretation is an important facet of CDA approach, but it has to be detached from 'common sense understanding'. Thus, interpretations of discourse always rely on the assets of members, it is highly recommended to avoid 'reproduction' in critical discourse analysis because it is the disliked consequence of interpretations, which are established on common-sense understandings. The assets of members may be sometimes damaged and misrepresented by relationships of domination and ideological intentions.

Among CDA's preferred topics are political discourse, racism, economic discourse, education, gender and ideology. In fact, one cannot discuss CDA without the mention of ideology mainly because ideologies exist in discourses, in communication, in pictures, in movies and in photographs. Critical discourse analysts view ideologies as dealing with 'interpretation frameworks' which organize sets of social attitudes.

Norman Fairclough (1992: p.88) shares Van Dijk's point of view (2013) in associating ideology with language. Ideology relies upon language in many ways and manners. Ideology is not only a product of events but of language as well. So, the most important thing to do is to grasp this dialectic relation between structures or language and events.

Even if he discusses ideology within the framework of discourse, Fairclough (1992: p.91) argues that ideologies do not reside in all discourses. In fact, ideologies exist most often in societies where relations of dominance are based on class, culture and gender. Therefore, this conception rejects Althusser's (1971) definition of ideology in being a form of 'social cement' that cannot be detached from society. Even if all kinds of discourse cannot flee away from the impact of ideology, the degree of influence may not appear very high to some types of discourse.

Thus, any serious explication of political discourse must depict its ideological implications; a successful way to do this is to emphasize how ideology informs and is informed by a text's peculiar syntactic, pragmatic and semantic structures, as well as issues relating to word order, lexicon and rhetoric. Also, as noted by Van Dijk (2001: pp. 17-18), one has to bear in mind the overall context of a political speech/text context given the considerable impact context has on the process of expressing ideology. Context (or context models) as Van Dijk refers to is an essential element of any political communication. He amplifies this point by noting that *"People not only form mental models of the events they talk about, but also the events they participate in, including the communicative event of which their ongoing discourse is an inherent part"*. That is, people subjectively represent the social situation in which they now verbally participate: a chat with a family member at home, a lesson at school, reading a newspaper at the train, participating in a meeting, or a service encounter in a shop, among many others. These subjective, mental representations of the communicative event and the current social situation as it constrains current discourse will be called context models, or simply 'contexts'.

In fact, most of the theories of discourse argue that discourse cannot be performed or analyzed without taking into consideration the importance of context. Terry Lock (2004: p. 18) for instance points out that meaning is to be obtained through the relationship between dictionary and the social structures. Therefore, there is a strong link between discourse and context. In this respect, Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (1985: pp. 162-166) stress that it is 'the context of situation' or the social context of a particular text which makes meaning exchangeable.

To try to interpret this 'context of situation', they suggest the following three concepts: the 'field of discourse', which concerns the participants in the discourse, their relationships with each other and the types of speech they are undertaking and finally the 'mode of discourse' which concerns the function of language within a particular discourse be it a spoken discourse or a written one and also the 'rhetorical mode' of the discourse whether it is persuasive, expository, or didactic.

Concerning the explanation stage, they point out that it means to interpret the discourse as part of a social process and a social practice. Therefore, the focus will be on the social determinants shaping the discourse, the ideologies underlined in the discourse and the relation powers presented in the discourse.

In addition, Schaffner (2014: p.152) emphasizes that Critical Discourse Analysis is a good approach to be adopted in the evaluation of the translation activity. This approach proposes concepts and procedures to analyze translated texts, to identify the translation strategies and to depict the transformations (in) the processes of recontextualization that were made on the source text when they were circulated via mass media.

5. Methodology

This study aims at studying both political discourse and its translation from a critical discourse analysis perspective. This is because CDA is considered to be a cornerstone in discourse analysis. This approach is one of the most distinguished interdisciplinary studies that fit the linguistic as well as ideological and cultural studies. Moreover, it provides high importance to social changes and is closely related to context.

This study tries its best to analyze both the political discourse and its translation taking into account Norman Fairclough who does not only consider discourse analysis as a linguistic analysis but it also includes discursive social interaction i.e. analyzing texts from contexts in which discourse is produced. Moreover, the study at hand will seek to analyze political discourse from Van Dijk's perspective who is known by his approach of critical discourse analysis.

Generally speaking, the adopted methodology pursues the following steps: first, it analyzes political discourse and its translation. Second, it contextualizes political discourse in its time and space. Third, it seeks find implied meaning either in discourse or in its translation. Finally, it seeks to show the difference between both source and target text which can result in the translator's intervention in the translation process.

Through this analysis, the present study tries to clarify the ultimate goal that the translator aims to achieve from translating the political discourse which differs from those goals pursued by the producer of the original text. Moreover, it will highlight the power existing in the political discourse by stating that it is loaded with ideology and by proving that translation is considered to be a production of a new discourse and a social, political and cultural act. Finally, it will show that the translator's ideology affects the translation process.

Obama's speeches have been translated on the official website of the [U.S. Department of State Archive](#). The site includes information on U.S. foreign policy, American culture is maintained by the State Department's Office of Foreign Information Programs.

It is noticed that taking samples of the American political discourse, are distinguished from the discourses of other countries due to the sovereign role of the United States in various fields, especially economic and political ones, which was reflected in the pivotal role it has played and is playing in shaping international politics. The American political discourse promotes the idea that the United States is one of the forces of good in the world and has the responsibility of maintaining world peace and security. Moreover, the United States of America considers itself a source of civilization and progress.

6. Results and Discussion

The study uses qualitative research. The choice of the qualitative research is based on the fact that the general aim of the present study is to explore and to understand the meanings of individuals, groups and institutions producing or translating political discourse from English into Arabic. The analysis is based on Fairclough's (1989) Critical Discourse Analysis framework. The study makes also use of another important tool in Critical Discourse Analysis, that of interpretation.

The methodology developed for this study is guided by the objective of exploring and grasping the influence of ideological considerations in translation. Therefore, the methodology was informed by the following theoretical and conceptual framework of critical discourse analysis.

6.1 Examples of ideological perspectives in political discourse

• Example 1

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
" Hamas does have support among some Palestinians, but they also have to recognize they have responsibilities. To play a role in fulfilling Palestinian aspirations, to unify the Palestinian people, Hamas must put an end to violence, recognize past agreements, recognize Israel's right to exist.	"إن تنظيم حماس يحظى بالدعم من قبل بعض الفلسطينيين ولكن على تنظيم حماس أن يدرك المسؤوليات التي عليه أن يتحملها، ويتعين على تنظيم حماس أن يضع حداً للعنف دوره في وأن يعترف بالاتفاقات السابقة وأن يعترف بحق إسرائيل في البقاء حتى يؤدي تلبية طموحات الفلسطينيين وتوحيد الشعب الفلسطيني."

In this excerpt from Obama's speech in Egypt, it is remarked that the translator has added the word "تنظيم" to "حماس" which is not mentioned in the source text. It is worth mentioning that word "تنظيم" includes a pejorative connotation which evokes a network of people who are characterized by rigidity and dictatorship. The word "تنظيم" in Arabic refers to 'organisation', in Western political discourse in particular, a group of people which is neither governed by a specific law nor is it governed by laws or ideals. Therefore, the Western political system uses the word 'organisation' widely so as to convey a particular ideology such as Al Qaeda organisation, Hamas organisation, etc. Thus, the word "تنظيم" that the translator has added in the target text carries an ideological meaning which was implicit in the source text.

• Example 2

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
"The situation in Afghanistan demonstrates America's goals, and our need to work together. Over seven years ago, the United States pursued al Qaeda and the Taliban with broad international support. We did not go by choice; we went because of necessity. I'm aware that there's still some who would question or even justify the events of 9/11. But let us be clear: Al Qaeda killed nearly 3,000 people on that day."	"يبين الوضع في أفغانستان أهداف أمريكا وحاجتنا إلى العمل المشترك. وقبل أكثر من سبع سنوات قامت الولايات المتحدة بملاحقة تنظيم القاعدة ونظام طالبان بدعم دولي واسع النطاق . لم نذهب إلى هناك باختيارنا وإنما بسبب الضرورة. إنني على وعي بوجود البعض الذين لا يزالون يشككون في أحداث 11 سبتمبر أو حتى يقومون بتبرير تلك الأحداث. ولكن دعونا أن نكون صريحين: قام تنظيم القاعدة بقتل ما يوازي 3000 شخص في ذلك اليوم."

As mentioned earlier, in this excerpt the word "تنظيم" i.e. 'organisation' indicates in the Western political discourse a collection of people who are not subject to any particular law, nor are they subject to any laws or principles such as Hamas organisation or the former ISIS organisation. Moreover, 'organisation' suggests the lack of pillars of a modern state which is based on constitutional institutions and authorities which control each other, such as legislative, executive and judicial authorities. This is because, the unique way to power is through fair and transparent elections as required by democracy. Therefore, Western political discourse uses the word "organisation" widely to refer to a particular ideology that is inconsistent with the one adopted and defended by this discourse. Moreover, the word 'organisation' suggests that those in charge of it are characterised by dictatorship, rigidity and all that would suppress individual and collective freedoms. In this regard, Western political discourse widely employs the term "organisation" to convey the implicit message that the prevailing rule in a particular country is characterised by dictatorship, as is the case with the Iranian and South Korean regimes, in a similar manner as was previously the case with Saddam regime, the Taliban regime, the Gaddafi regime, the Assad regime and other regimes. Thus, when President Obama spoke in his Cairo speech about the existing political government in Iraq, he referred to it as a "government" and not as an "organisation". What's more, he described that government as democratically elected in order to leave no room for doubt. In this vein, he states: "That is why we will honor our agreement with Iraq's democratically elected government to remove combat troops from Iraqi cities by July, and remove all of our troops from Iraq by 2012." (applause)

The reason why the existing government in Iraq has received support from the United States is because it was an American made government although Obama describes it as having been elected in a democratic style. Therefore, it can be said that the word "organisation" in this context expresses a hidden ideology carried by the political discourse. Although this word did not appear in the source text, the translator added it in the target text, thus emphasising the translator's role in conveying ideology.

• Example 3

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
"A little bit earlier this evening, I received an extraordinarily gracious call from Sen. McCain ."	"قبل وقت قصير هذا المساء، تلقيت اتصالاً كريماً استثنائياً من السناتور ماكين ."

It is worth noting that despite the existence of other political parties in the United States of America, the political arena is dominated by two main parties competing for the presidency, the first is the Democratic Party headed by Obama, while the second is the Republican Party headed by McCain, who represented the political opposition and therefore was considered to be the rival to Obama.

On the translational level, this excerpt which is taken from election night victory speech entitled "Chang has come to America" on November 4th, 2008, both the source and the target texts are equivalent to some extent semantically speaking.

On the discursive level, it is worth mentioning that both the source and the target text, political discourse emphasizes the power relations and the influence that the parties in the political field can have on each other, which justifies some of the political discourse purposes. This is proven by the existence of two competing political parties that are not mentioned, the Democratic Party and the Republican one. In addition, there are two different hidden ideologies embodied in the ideas connected to these two parties.

It can be implicitly inferred, then, from both texts, as well as from the call Obama received from his rival McCain, an implicit recognition of the legitimacy of the election, which illustrates the role of the political discourse in legitimization. On the other hand, this is a clear implicit reference that the United States, above the narrow partisan differences, is one united country despite the difference between the two programs and the different ideologies they represent.

• Example 4

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
"Violent extremists have exploited these tensions in a small but potent minority of Muslims ."	"لقد استغل المتطرفون الذين يمارسون العنف هذه التوترات عند أقلية صغيرة من المسلمين بشكل فعال ."

According to Oxford's Learner's Dictionary the word "potent" is an adjective meaning "powerful" which is an equivalent to 'قوي' , 'أقلية فعالة' in Arabic. The adjective 'potent' was mentioned before the noun 'minority' to describe it as "أقلية فعالة". Therefore, the sentence "Violent extremists have exploited these tensions in a small but potent minority of Muslims." in the original text which should be translated as follows:

"لقد استغل المتطرفون الذين يمارسون العنف هذه التوترات عند أقلية صغيرة غير أنها فعالة من المسلمين"

It is remarked from this excerpt that the level of sentence structures and vocabulary order in both the original and the target text caused a lack of meaning. This was a clear evidence of the lack of impartiality of the translator's work. While the original text indicates that 'it is the Muslim minority that is powerful', the target text indicates that 'tensions have been effectively exploited by extremists'.

The point is that in the target text, the translator undermined the minority of Muslims that the extremists exploited the tensions to say that the Muslim minority is powerful to defame them.

• Example 5

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
"For we have learned from recent experience that when a financial system weakens in one country, prosperity is hurt everywhere. When a new flu infects one human being, all are at risk. When one nation pursues a nuclear weapon, the risk of nuclear attack rises for all nations. When violent extremists operate in one stretch of mountains, people are	"لقد تعلمنا من تجاربنا الأخيرة ما يحدث من إلحاق الضرر بالرفاهية في كل مكان إذا ضعف النظام المالي في بلد واحد. وإذا أصيب شخص واحد بالأنفلونزا فيعرض ذلك الجميع للخطر. وإذا سعى بلد واحد وراء امتلاك السلاح النووي فيزداد خطر وقوع هجوم نووي بالنسبة لكل الدول. وعندما يمارس المتطرفون العنف في منطقة جبلية واحدة، يعرض ذلك الناس من وراء البحار للخطر. وعندما يتم نهب

endangered across an ocean. When innocents in Bosnia and Darfur are slaughtered, that is a stain on our collective conscience. (Applause.) That is what it means to share this world in the 21st century. That is the responsibility we have to one another as human beings."

الأبرياء في البوسنة ودارفور، يسبب ذلك وصمة في ضميرنا المشترك. (تصفيق.) هذا هو معنى التشارك في هذا العالم بالقرن الحادي والعشرين، وهذه هي المسؤولية التي يتحملها كل منا تجاه الآخر كأبناء البشرية."

It is crystal clear from this excerpt that Obama drew on his life experience to conclude that humanity represents a single entity and that harming one of its members represents harming the entire human entity.

He reinforced his idea with a real-life example, highlighting the role of arguments, which is one of the characteristics of political discourse, and explaining that whether the financial system in a country is weakened, or a person is infected with the flu, or nuclear weapons are acquired by a country, or innocent people are massacred in a region such as Bosnia or Darfur, or extremists practice violence on a mountain, this is a violation of all human beings.

Obama was inspired by the famous African American militant Martin Luther King, both in terms of style and even the idea itself, when he considered that humanity constitutes a single entity, and that harming one of its members in any way represents harming another individual in another way, as he represents an integral part of humanity.

In a letter written by Martin Luther King, Jr. from his cell in "Birmingham City Jail" on 16 April 1963, he defends the strategy of non-violent resistance against the racial discrimination practised by whites against blacks:

"Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. ...We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly."

The common theme between Martin Luther King Jr. and Obama is that humanity is a single entity and that any threat or harm to one of its members in a certain way is a threat or harm to another member of humanity in another way. The hidden part of the discourse, the hidden ideology that the two speeches seek to expose, is different in the two speeches. In his letter, Martin Luther aimed to defend blacks who were subjected to the ordeal of racial discrimination and the resulting loss of their civil rights in the United States of America.

As for Obama, although he listed many examples to prove the unity of humanity, such as the weakness of the financial system in a country, the infection of the flu by one person, or the slaughter of innocent people in areas such as Bosnia or Darfur, the essence of the idea he was defending is evident in the two other examples that represent a violation of the unity of humanity and the highest threat to its security and safety, namely the possession of nuclear weapons by a country and the practice of violence on a mountain.

The country in question, which the Obama was hinting at possessing nuclear weapons, is not Russia, France or England, but Iran. This is confirmed by several texts and statements contained in the US political discourse, which have been mentioned in other places, including what the US President mentioned in his speech in Berlin:

"My country must stand with yours and with Europe in sending a direct message to Iran that it must abandon its nuclear ambitions."

The Iranian regime, with its Shiite ideology, is, according to US political discourse, a clear threat to US interests in the Middle East and to its classical ally Israel.

It is concluded, then, that the US president does not care as much about the collapse of the financial system in a particular country, or the infection of a particular person with the flu, or who was slaughtered in Bosnia or Darfur, as he does care about the Iranian nuclear threat, which reflects the conflicting ideologies of the two regimes.

• Example 6

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
"On this National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day, we also reaffirm our commitment to carrying on their work—to keeping the country we love strong, free and prosperous. And as today's wars in Iraq and Afghanistan come to an end and we welcome home our 9/11 Generation, we resolve to always take care of our troops, veterans and military families as well as they've taken care of us. On this solemn anniversary, there can be no higher tribute to the Americans who served and sacrificed seventy years ago today."	"وفي هذا اليوم بمناسبة الذكرى الوطنية لبيرل هاربور، نعيد التأكيد على التزامنا بالاستمرار في إنجاز ما عملوا من أجله- المحافظة على البلاد الذي نحبه قويا، وحرًا، ومزدهرًا. ومع دنو حربي اليوم في العراق وأفغانستان من نهايتهما، وإذ نرحب بعودة جيل 11 أيلول/سبتمبر إلى الوطن، عاقدين العزم على العناية الدائمة بجيوشنا، ومحاربينا القدامى، وعائلات العسكريين تمامًا كما اعتنوا هم بنا. وفي هذه الذكرى المهيبة نقدم أعلى درجات الإجلال للأميركيين الذين خدموا الوطن وضحوا بحياتهم قبل سبعين سنة من هذا اليوم."

This excerpt from Obama's speech on the 70th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, delivered on December 11, 2011, refers to two important events that marked the history of the United States: the Pearl Harbor attack and the September 11, 2001 attacks, reflecting the historical dimension, which is one of the most important features of political discourse. The first event refers to the Pearl Harbor attack, and this historical event represents the attack launched by Japanese aircraft against the US naval base at Pearl Harbor in the Pacific Ocean on December 11, 1941, which was the direct cause of the United States' entry into World War II and its declaration of war on Japan and its allies Germany and Italy.

The second event refers to the attacks on the United States of America on September 11, 2001, which were caused by the Al-Qaeda organization led by Osama bin Laden, according to Obama's official speech. The significance of this date is that the war on terrorism took a global dimension that the United States of America declared officially and publicly based on these attacks. What can be noted is that there are many hidden ideologies such as terrorism, Nazism and fascism that are not mentioned either in the source text or in the target text. Moreover, the choice of words plays a role in conveying ideas and ideologies in the political discourse, which is remarked from the preposition "in" in the source text "today's wars in Iraq and Afghanistan".

The choice of 'the preposition 'in' instead of 'the preposition 'on' in the original text suggests a war between two armies that are often equal in numbers and strengths, while 'the preposition 'on' suggests injustice and aggression against the other party as well as the unequal nature of the two armies.

• Example 7

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
"We salute the veterans and survivors of Pearl Harbor who inspire us still. Despite overwhelming odds, they fought back heroically, inspiring our nation and putting us on the path to victory. They are members of that Greatest Generation who overcame the Depression, crossed oceans and stormed the beaches to defeat fascism , and turned adversaries into our closest allies."	"نحيي المحاربين القدامى والناجين من بيرل هاربور الذين لا زالوا يزدوننا بالإلهام. فعلى الرغم من الصعوبات الجمة، قاتلوا ببطولة للرد على ذلك الهجوم، ملهمين بذلك بلادنا ووضعونا على طريق النصر. إنهم أعضاء ذلك الجيل العظيم الذي تغلب على الركود لدحر الفاشية ، وحولوا الركود الاقتصادي الكبير، واجتازوا المحيطات، وهاجموا الشواطئ أعداءنا إلى أوثق حلفاء لنا."

This excerpt from the Obama's speech on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, delivered on 11 December 2011, refers to the existence of the ideology of fascism in both the original text and the target text. This ideology, which was prevalent in Italy led by Prime Minister Benito Mussolini, was characterised by colonialism and expansionism and contributed significantly to the outbreak of World War II.

The verb 'to defeat' means according to Oxford Advanced Dictionary to win against somebody in a war. It is the equivalent to 'يَهْزِمُ' according to AL-MAWREED AL-HADEETH. Therefore, the expression 'to defeat fascism' should be translated as 'لانتصار على الفاشية', instead of 'لدحر الفاشية'. Although the word 'دحر' replaces 'لهزم', its impact is more severe because of the meaning of exclusion and expulsion. This implies the translator's extreme hatred and hostility towards the ideology of fascism, which confirms the role of word choice in conveying ideology, and the idea of the translator's lack of neutrality, which Peter Newmark (1991) emphasised by stating: "In particular in respect of political texts, the translators' neutrality is a myth".

• Example 8

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
"This is the moment when we must build on the wealth that open markets have created , and share its benefits more equitably. Trade has been a cornerstone of our growth and global development . But we will not be able to sustain this growth if it favors the few, and not the many. Together, we must forge trade that truly rewards the work that creates wealth, with meaningful protections for our people and our planet. This is the moment for trade that is free and fair for all ."	"هذه هي اللحظة التي يتعين فيها علينا أن نبني على الثروة التي أوجدتها الأسواق المفتوحة ، وأن نتقاسم منافعها بشكل أكثر تكافؤاً. وقد كانت التجارة حجر الزاوية لنموننا وللتنمية العالمية . ولكننا لن نكون قادرين على المحافظة على هذا النمو إذا كان يخدم مصلحة الأقلية وليس الأكثرية. ويتعين علينا معاً أن ننشئ تجارة تكافئ بالفعل العمل الذي يولد الثروة، مع حمايات ذات معنى لشعوبنا وللعالم. وهذه هي اللحظة التي يتعين فيها أن تكون التجارة حرة وعادلة بالنسبة للجميع ."

In this excerpt from the Berlin speech on 24 July 2008, we notice that the first sentence **"This is the moment when we must build on the wealth that open markets have Created"** has been translated as **"الثروة التي أوجدتها الأسواق المفتوحة"**. Although the verb: 'to create' means 'خلق' in Arabic, the translator left the verb 'to create' to the Creator and opted for another equivalent in the form of 'أوجد' through which he was able to convey the meaning of the original text.

At the discourse level, the word **'wealth'** is translated as **'الثروة'** and **'open markets'** is translated as **'الأسواق المفتوحة'** and **'trade that is free and fair for all at'** is translated as **'التجارة حرة و عادلة بالنسبة للجميع'**.

These expressions reflect a hidden ideology that is neither mentioned in the original text nor in the target text. This ideology is 'capitalism' which is the basis of the economy of Western European countries. Through the historical context of the development of the capitalist system, capitalism can be defined as: 'a general ideological theory that encompasses all aspects of political, economic, cultural and social life. It crystallises a certain pattern for the way society lives, which includes freedom of action in economy and politics without restriction, making individuals and society in full openness. It is a philosophy that seeks individual economic freedom and calls for free trade and free movement of people and capital without political, commercial or geographical restrictions."

Therefore, political discourse acts as a means of promoting this ideology of capitalism as the basis of the global economy, dominating other ideologies, especially socialism.

• Example 9

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
"Look at Berlin, where the determination of a people met the generosity of the Marshall Plan and created a German miracle; where a victory over tyranny gave rise to NATO , the greatest alliance ever formed to defend our common security."	"أنظروا إلى برلين حيث توافق تصميم شعب مع سخاء مشروع مارشال وخلقوا معجزة ألمانية، حيث أوجد الانتصار على الطغيان حلف شمال الأطلسي (الناتو) ، الذي هو أعظم تحالف تم تشكيله في التاريخ للدفاع عن أمننا المشترك."

This is an excerpt from the Berlin on 24 July 2008, in which the following points can be noted. First, at the level of translation, the word 'tyranny' means, according to Al-Mawred Dictionary، **حكم الطغيان، الحكم الاستبدادي، استبداد، طغيان، حكومة استبدادية**.

As for the acronym 'NATO' which stands for 'North Atlantic Treaty Organization', it has been translated in the target text as "منظمة حلف شمال الأطلسي". The translator also added the word (الناتو)، which is considered to be an addition for clarification or explication purposes. Second, the expression 'a victory over tyranny' is translated as **'الانتصار على الطغيان'**. In this case, the translator relied on literal translation. This type of translation preserves the meaning in the target language.

At the level of discourse, to uncover hidden ideologies, the historical dimension of this passage can be referred to as one of the most important features of political discourse as it addresses the periods of the Second World War and its tyranny, the Cold War, and the pivotal role played by NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation). Although NATO has had different missions and embraced different members throughout history, its main role at the time of its establishment in 1949, at the height of the Cold War, was to fight communism and seek to contain it through military force.

Communism was the most dangerous ideology for Western countries at the time, and the hidden face of this political discourse was the Warsaw Pact, the alliance that protected this ideology. In addition, the word 'tyranny' also hides an ideology, in both the original or the target text. The word 'tyranny' alludes to the Axis powers, or modern dictatorships, which went too far in their tyranny and triggered the Second World War. These powers are represented by Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, as well as the Japanese dictatorship, and their policies have been described as tyranny because they adopted an expansionist colonialism that went beyond borders. Therefore, the word tyranny hides different ideologies, the most important of which are Nazism, which was adopted by the extreme right-wing party of German President Adolf Hitler, and Fascism, which was led by Italian Prime Minister Benito Mussolini.

• Example 10

Original Discourse	Arabic Translation
" This is the moment when <u>we must defeat terror and dry up the well of extremism that supports it.</u> This threat is real and we cannot shrink from our responsibility to combat it."	"هذه هي اللحظة التي يتعين فيها علينا أن نهزم الإرهاب وأن نضع حدا للتطرف الذي يدعمه. إن هذا التهديد حقيقي ولا يمكننا أن نتهرب من مسؤولية محاربته."

This is an excerpt from Obama's Berlin speech on 24 July 2008 titled "A World Standing United". It is remarked that the phrasal verb "dry up" is translated as 'جف' in the target text. Therefore, the expression 'dry up the well of extremism' means to make something like a well or a source of a water become completely or excessively dry. "Dry up the well of extremism" The translator, however, refrained from a literal translation because the expression "تجفيف بئر التطرف" is unable to convey the meaning of the original text because it does not reflect the Arab culture. This led the translator to resort to another equivalent in the target language, namely the sentence: "وأن نضع حدا للتطرف" meaning "and put an end to extremism" which means fighting extremism and eliminating it.

The hidden meaning of the phrase 'dry up the well of extremism' indirectly refers to the way in which extremism is fought, namely by drying up its wells or sources, which is not mentioned in the target text. What is meant by "drying up the well of extremism" is to put an end to everything that could feed it, whether in terms of financial, logistical or even moral support, and more importantly, to eliminate all ideas that support it, whatever their source. There is no doubt that talking about ideas means ideology they carry.

It is worth noting that the sentence 'dry up the well of extremism' in the original text has a cultural dimension, and the sentence 'نضع حدا للتطرف' that the translator came up with did not fully convey the meaning, as it did not indicate how this is done. Indeed, the closest equivalent in Arabic culture to that in the original text is 'تجفيف منابع التطرف'.

This sentence has the same meaning as the original text, both in terms of fighting extremism and the indirect way in which it is fought. Therefore, the above sentence can be translated as follows: 'هذه هي اللحظة التي يتعين فيها علينا أن نهزم الإرهاب وأن نجفف منابع التطرف الذي يدعمه'.

As for the term 'terror' or terrorism, which gained popularity after the 11 September 2001 attacks on New York and Washington, D.C, the slogan of the war on terrorism became the most important feature of the United States' foreign policy. The phenomenon of terrorism has taken on a global ideological dimension and has often been used by the West as a scarecrow to achieve special purposes, such as interfering in the internal affairs of other countries.

After presenting various examples of US President Barack Obama's speeches, comparing some of them with other speeches as required by the context, and analyzing the of the selected samples, it can be concluded ,then, that political discourse is characterized by a set of goals such as legitimization that the speaker seeks to achieve.

It has become clear that political discourse is indeed a discourse of power and seeks to emphasize power relations. Political discourse is ideologically loaded and often carries implicit meanings and hidden ideologies that largely reflect the political orientation of the speaker and the state he heads.

As for the translation, the method that generally prevailed in the translation of the selected samples was the literal translation since the most appropriate method to capture the meaning as stated in the original text. Therefore the literal translation was often successful in performing the intended meaning. Since the cultural factor that characterized President Obama's speeches had a strong impact on the translation process, the translator often had to abandon the literal translation strategy to find other equivalents in the Arabic language.

While the translator had great success in finding appropriate equivalents in Arabic culture at times, his success in this regard was relative at other times, as these equivalents did not always live up to their semantic, aesthetic, and semantic expectations.

It is worth noting that the translator had a prominent role in the translation process by adopting various strategies, mainly deletion or addition, which sometimes amounted to adding entire sentences or explicitation, as well as the method of equivalence, which was the main feature of translation in a particular cultural context. Most importantly, the translator's intervention affected the target text in one way or another by transmitting his ideology, which is often implicit.

7. Conclusion

It is concluded, then, that political discourse is one of the types of discourse which encompasses different areas of life. This is because its scope expands from simple conversations that preoccupy the minds of lay men to those complex discussions that are dealt with by politicians in an effort to find solutions to different life issues. Thus, the rhetorical situation plays a leading role in politicizing any type of discourse so as to make it political.

Political discourse is closely linked to power, and therefore politicians use it as the most effective means to maintain power and thus legitimize it. Thus, it seeks to attract the largest possible number of people to persuade them to adopt ideas by influencing them, using argumentation. Moreover, political discourse is laden with ideology due to its strong connection to politics and is a mirror that reflects the culture of the politicians who speak it.

Language is one of the most effective means employed in political discourse. It does not only aim to express knowledge, but it is also employed to serve goals with political dimensions. The language of political discourse is a political tool par excellence, and through which political authority is imposed. It is not an explicit language, but rather a complex and ambiguous language in which meanings, connotations and references are numerous. This language tends, in most cases, towards persuasion, camouflage and illusion, and always works to justify the political reality through interpretation, which is used as an alternative to explanation and justification.

Political discourse is also characterized by the interactive dimension. This is because it requires the participation of several parties, namely the sender, receiver, message and context. Pragmatics is concerned with all these elements without neglecting one of them at the expense of the other. The value of political discourse lies in the message it wants to convey, which is often implicit and can be interpreted between the lines. This message is considered the fundamental difference that can distinguish political discourse from literary discourse, whose value lies in its artistic and aesthetic aspect.

It can be also concluded that discourse analysis (DA) is capable of providing an explicit and organized description of the linguistic units under study. This description includes two basic dimensions: First, the text, which is represented by the internal structure of the discourse, including its vocabulary, structures, and sentences. Second, the context, which includes both the linguistic context, which is related to the internal structure of the text, and the non-linguistic context, which includes all the circumstances and influences that led to its production.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA), then, is considered to be the backbone of discourse analysis (DA) that can be used both as a theory and a method in social scientific research, as this method is compatible with linguistic, ideological and cultural approaches to translation.

While Fairclough combines the linguistic analysis of the text with its social analysis, Van Dijk proposes an integrative approach that connects grammatical, linguistic, narrative and cognitive aspects in the study of the text. According to critical discourse analysis (CDA), translation can be considered a social, political and cultural act. This approach can be used to analyze the original text, which, according to the subject of our study, is political discourse, as well as to analyze its translation.

Translation, structures and vocabulary it requires are not done in an arbitrary or spontaneous manner, but rather reveal ideological choices and cultural motives that aim to spread and defend them. More importantly, it is an interpretive process that involves reproducing another new discourse. It is therefore a purposeful political communication act accompanied by conscious and intentional selection that sometimes reaches the level of distortion and falsification, in order to serve political, ideological and cultural purposes in the target language.

Funding: This study received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers

Acknowledgements: Thank you, Dr. Cherif Teimi, for your guidance and support.

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6721-2035>

References

- [1] Althusser, L. (2014). *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. (G.M. Goshgarian, Trans.). London: Verso.
- [2] Alvarez, R. & Vidal, M.C. (Eds.). (1996). *Translation, Power, and Subversion*. Philadelphia : Multilingual Matters.
- [3] Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A Narrative Account*. London & New York: Routledge.
- [4] Blommaert, J. & Bilecan, C. (2000). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. *Annual Rev. of Anthropology*, 29, pp. 447-466.
- [5] Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Destutt De Tracy, A.L.C (1801). *Éléments d'Ideologie*. Première partie. *Ideologie proprement dite*, par le cit. Destutt de Tracy. Paris : Coursier.
- [7] Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. New York: Verso.
- [8] Faiq, S. (2004). *Cultural Encounters in Translations from Arabic*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- [9] Fairclough, I & Norman F. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- [10] Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London and New York: Longman.
- [11] Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [12] Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- [13] Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. London and New York: Longman.
- [14] Glanzberg, M. (2002). Context and Discourse. *Mind & Language*, 17 (4), pp. 333-375. Doi.org/10.1111/1468-0017.00204
- [15] Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. (Q. Hoare and G.N. Smith, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.
- [16] Halliday, M.A.K., & Hassan, R. (1985). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- [17] Jaworski, A and Coupland, N. (2014). *The discourse reader* (3rd ed.). New York, London: Routledge.
- [18] Lefèvere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Frame*. London: Routledge.
- [19] Locke, T. (2004). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum Research Methods Series.
- [20] Marouane, M. (2014). The Impact of Translation on The Moroccan Political Discourse. *Arab World English Journal*, 5 (2), pp. 142-152.
- [21] Marx, K and Engels F. (1970). *The German Ideology*. CJ Arthur (Trans.). New York: Int. Publ.
- [22] Newmark, P. (1991). *About Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [23] Nord, C. (2003). Function and Loyalty in Bible Translation. In Maria Calzada Perez (Ed.), *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology-Ideologies in Translation Studies* (pp. 89-112). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- [24] Schaffner, C. (2004). Political Discourse from the point of view of Translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(1), pp. 117-150.
- [25] Schaffner, C. (2014). Unknown agents in Translated Political Discourse. In Brems, Elke, Meylaerts, Reine, Van Doorslaer and Luc (Eds.), *The Known Unknowns of Translation Studies* (pp. 131-153). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [26] Schaffner, C. (4 Dec 1997). Skopos Theory. In Mona Baker (Ed.). *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 235-238). London: Routledge.
- [27] Schaffner, C and Bassnett, S. (Eds.). (2010). *Political Discourse, Media and Translation*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- [28] Schwarzmantel, J. (2008). *Ideology and Politics*. London: Sage.
- [29] Valdeon-Roberto A. (2005). The Translated Spanish Service of the BBC. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 6(2), pp. 195-220.
- [30] Van Dijk, T. A. (1981). *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- [31] Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Discourse, Ideology and Context. *Folia Linguistica*, 30(1-2), pp. 11-40.
- [32] Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Context. A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach*. In Ruth Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (pp. 62-86). London: Sage.
- [34] Van Dijk, T. A. (2013). Ideology and Discourse. In Michael Freedon, Lyman Tower Sargent & Marc Stears (Es.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies* (pp. 175-196). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [35] Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse Analysis. In Wenden, A. and Schaffner, C. (Eds.), *Language and Peace* (pp. 17-33). Dartmouth: Dartmouth Publishing.
- [36] Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- [37] Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, Ideology, and Discourse. In Brown (Ed.). *The Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics* (pp. 728-740). Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press.
- [38] Van Dik, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power: Contributions to Critical Discourse Studies*. Hound Mills: Palgrave.
- [39] Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility*. London: Routledge.
- [40] Wodak, R. (1995). Critical Linguistic and critical discourse analysis. In J. Verschuren, J.O. Ostaman & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics- Manual* (pp. 204-210). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.