

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF KEY CONCEPTS IN OBAMA'S STATEMENT: CUBA POLICY CHANGES

The paper analyzes the key concepts in the US President's speech announcing the reestablishment of relations with Cuba in December 2014 from a critical discourse point of view. His arguments make a clear distinction between what America represents (Us) and what Cuba lacks (Them), glorify the half-a-century-old blockade and acknowledge its failure. Obama's words also reflect the policy change is a one-sided dialogue, a one-lane road, ignoring the needs and hopes in the island when he neglects or only vaguely mentions important areas that are undoubtedly within the Cuban national interests. When read in different geopolitical contexts, the speech, built around the same arguments the US has been using for more than fifty years, envisions a change in Cuba through empowering given population sectors to achieve the same historical objectives.

Key words: Obama, Cuba, policy, changes, democracy, human rights, empowerment, color revolution.

1. Introduction

After two years of secret negotiations on December 17, 2014, the Presidents of Cuba and the United States, Raul Castro and Barak Obama, announced in separate statements the reestablishment of diplomatic relations broken by D. Eisenhower in the early 1960s. That day The BBC reported "US President Barack Obama has hailed a "new chapter" in US relations with Cuba, announcing moves to normalize diplomatic and economic ties... frozen since the early 1960s, when the US broke off diplomatic relations and imposed a trade embargo after Cuba's revolution led to communism [1]." Gladly received by most in Cuba and the almost two million-Cuban community living in the United States as well as by the American business sector and public in general; the news marked, hopefully, the beginning of the end of the Cuban-United States dispute.

On the other hand, US congressional members of Cuban origin Marcos Rubio, Ileana Ross-Lehtinen and Ted Cruz among others in the Republican Party considered the move counterproductive. The first has on several occasions promised to reverse the steps taken if he is able to get into the White House as republican presidential hopeful for the next elections. Neither Rubio nor Cruz has ever been in Cuba; the former's parents left Cuba long before the revolution; the second's father left Cuba in 1960 and Cruz was born in Canada. Ross-Lehtinen abandoned the island with her parents in early January 1959. Therefore, it is pertinent to wonder what these US legislators know about the reality in the island, apart from what they hear from the US-paid "dissidents".

About the US President and his foreign policy, Mr. Rubio declared, "I don't know what his intentions are. His foreign policy is at a minimum naive, and perhaps even truly counterproductive to the future of democracy in the region [18]." However, is the United States foreign policy really so obscure and naïve as Senator Rubio believes,

or rather, as a senior official in the establishment wants to make us think he believes? Does it really endanger the future of “democracy”, as conceived in the US establishment, in Latin America?

The following article will answer the above questions based on the critical discourse analysis of Obama’s speech on Cuba policy changes and argue that such policy changes have very clear intentions as their implementation shows; are not naïve at all and, in no way endanger democracy in the region.

To achieve the above, first, I will look into the context the speech is produced; then, the clauses containing some of the most relevant aspects will be analyzed from above; that is, as a message, exchange and representation deriving from distinct functional components or metafunctions in systemic linguistic theory. At this stage, key concepts outlined in each clause will be examined in the light of history and intertextuality. Finally, an outline of a future scenario for Cuba will be described and how subsequent actions by the US government after Dec. 17, 2014 fit nicely in the White House announcement.

2. Critical Discourse Analysis

“Critical Discourse Analysis” (CDA) is a general term with its origins in critical linguistics, critical semiotics and socio-politics aimed at the study of talk and text. It is problem-oriented and any theoretical and methodological approach is adequate if the study effectively reveals relevant social problems. No CDA schools actually exist and its work draws on concepts from different disciplines. Language may be analyzed at discourse and text levels and in many occasions includes how the different systems of the language are realized in a text. Power, dominance and inequality relations are of special interest for CDA practitioners [8].

CDA’s father, Norman Fairclough, claims that ideologies reside in texts from which they are impossible to be ‘read off’ allowing for diverse interpretations of the same text because “Ideologies are closely linked to language, because using language is the commonest form of social behavior, and the form of social behavior where we rely most on ‘common-sense’ assumptions [9, 2].”

From the point of view of CDA, the study of Obama’s speech is characterized by the use of simple words and sentences in easy to understand colloquial language that help him shorten the distance between him and the audience [22]. At the same time, it shows the dual character of America’s perceived exceptionalism “favoring *active* US foreign policy, based on *soft power* instruments and *multilateralism*, as something that makes America exceptional [12].” American political discourse is a reflection of the good Washington represents against the bad to justify foreign policy; that is ‘Us’ against ‘Them’ and their role as world policeman. For instance, Sarfo and Agyei-waa’s study [19] illustrates how in their speeches to justify American war on terror, Bush and Obama projected terrorism negatively while they projected anti-terrorism positively by carefully selecting emotionally charged vocabulary and expressions. Other common features of their speeches were the notion of power as form of mind and context control. In reference to domestic policy, according to Horvat, [11], the use

of words such as *nation*, *new*, *America* together with ideologically embedded concepts and quotes from the *Bible* helped the second to strengthen the notion of unity in his first inaugural address.

3. The context of the 17.12.2014 speech

Obama's speech on Cuba policy changes must first be read not only as part of the almost-lost American grip on Latin America and the Caribbean, but also within the context of huge geopolitical changes at a global scale.

The retake by Russia of the role played by the former Soviet Union and the rise of China as an economic power as well as their union in the Shanghai group, founded in 2001, and the Eurasian Economic Union pose an unquestionable political, economic and military challenge to US hegemony in Asia. Andrei Bezrukov, a Russian political analyst, asserts, "Separately from each other, Russia and China are vulnerable. Russia and China together are invulnerable [21]."

On the other hand, BRICS of which Russia and China are also part extends its influence to Africa and Latin America. The five BRICS countries representing almost three billion people, with a combined nominal GDP of \$16 trillion and an estimated \$4 trillion in combined foreign reserves is a huge challenge for US imperial ambitions. Undoubtedly, the US is worried about Chinese investment and trade in Brazil, Chile, and Africa from where it has been replaced as largest partner and Cuba's close ties with Russia.

At the regional level, Cuba never exported revolutions as she was often accused of; it did, however, become an example for Latin American have-nots subdued for centuries, first from the colonizer and then by oligarchs. It also support by all possible means the revolutionary guerrillas and was a secure home for the thousands of refugees fleeing away from the US-backed dictatorships and fascist regimes that proliferated in the continent from the 70s to the 80s. Prior in 1962, Cuba had been suspended from the Organization of American States, founded in 1848 under Washington's leadership to strengthen the peace and security of the continent, promote and consolidate representative democracy, as well as to encourage economic, social, and cultural cooperation within the Americas. Except for Mexico and Canada, all countries in the region severed diplomatic ties with the island that very year.

In 2009, the suspension was lifted, but Cuba has repeatedly expressed its lack of interest in an organization patronized from the US Department. Instead, Cuba is actively involved in many regional organizations such as the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas, and the Association of Caribbean States among others. The Cuban integration to its natural Latin American context has been the result of patient diplomatic efforts. On the other hand, Cuban solidarity with the peoples of the region and other parts of the world has yielded fruitful harvest. In fact, the island nation has more health-care workers providing health care in foreign countries than all the G8 nations. Cuba is a resource-poor country with insignificant economic growth and limited foreign investment mostly as a result of the American blockade.

The historical conflict with the US did not exactly begin in 1959 after Fidel Castro ousted Batista's government. American overt interests in the island can be traced back to 1823 with the formulation of Monroe's Ripe Fruit Doctrine. In the instructions sent by the then Secretary of State Quincy Adams to the American ambassador in Spain, US plans for Cuba were unambiguously expressed:

It could be taken for a fact that Spanish domination over the American continents, northern and southern, have irrevocably ended. But the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico remain nominally... are natural appendages of the North American continent, and one of them, the isle of Cuba... has become for a number of reasons of the uppermost importance for the political and commercial interests of our Union... the annexation of Cuba to our Federal Republic will be indispensable to the continuation of the Union and its integrity... Cuba, forcibly disjoined from its unnatural connection with Spain and inescapable of self-support, can gravitate only toward the North American Union [15, 23–24].

The rest is history. The United States intervened in the Cuban Independence War in 1898 to protect their interests in the island and “help” the in the struggle against the crumbling Spanish Empire, when the war was practically over. In that way, the more than 400 hundred years Spanish colony became an American neo-colony as a result of which domestic and foreign policy were dictated in English until 1959.

After 1959, as **tumultuous** and **confrontational** could the bilateral relations between the two countries only be described. Among the most important events are the nationalization of all American properties and business in 1960, the failed Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961, and the no-less-outstanding missile crisis of 1962, when the world was on the brink of a nuclear war. At the same time, hundreds of plans to assassinate Fidel Castro and aggressions from the base in Guantanamo, including the killing of young Cuban draftees by American snipers, are also part of the Cuban historical memory.

It cannot be forgotten Cuba was also accused of developing biological weapons in 2002, an action which prompted the island's invitation to ex-president Carter and American scientists to visit all the laboratories in the island without any restrictions. It seemed Bush had the idea to make of Cuba another Afghanistan. In 2006, the Texas ex-governor urged Cubans to work for democratic change after Fidel's obliged retirement for health reasons and transfer of power to his brother Raul, who in 2007 indicated once more he was open to relations with the US without preconditions.

The disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1992 brought with it a bleak future for Cuba. Many in the West, and especially the Miami Cuban community, expected a similar event in the island to the extent that, it is said, hundreds packed their suitcases to return to the land they had left in January 1959. A 1992 *Seattle Times* headline editorial [20] read “Cuba's impending implosion — Castro's economic props are gone; the end is near.”

Morales and Prevost [Ibid., 8] identify these five key variables as the ones defining American-Cuban relations after the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1992.

- a) The internal Cuban situation after the collapse of the Soviet Union;
- b) Power relations in the US Congress related to Cuba;

- c) Internationalization of the blockade and international resistance against it;
- d) The attitude of the US executive branch and that of various actors inside the American establishment;
- e) Society and economic interests.

It is in this context that in February 2008, Raul Castro officially took over as president. Washington called for free and fair elections, and said its trade “embargo” would remain. On November 4, 2008, Barack Obama was elected US president and a poll in December of that year suggested a majority of Cuban-Americans living in Miami wanted an end to the US embargo against Cuba. In April 2009, President Obama lifted restrictions on family travel and remittances to Cuba. Unfortunately, at the end of the year US citizen Alan Gross was arrested in Cuba, accused of spying for Washington, and jailed for taking internet equipment into the country. At the end of 2011, Cuban agent Rene Gonzalez was freed as scheduled from a Florida jail. Gonzalez was part of the ‘Cuban Five’, who were given long terms sentences in 2001 in the US after being convicted of spying. Havana had repeatedly called for the men to be freed. At the same time, The US again called for the release of Alan Gross. Cuba’s refusal to free him froze relations for months. On September 2012, Cuba suggested it was ready to negotiate with Washington on finding a solution to the Gross case.

4. Today’s Cuban context of situation

Since becoming president, Raul Castro has taken a series of measures with impact in the social, political and economic areas. Among them, the 2013 emigration law and the possibility for Cubans to spend their vacations in national resorts paid in hard currency, the sale of houses and cars among others were decreed. At the same time, some socio-educational programs such as that of social workers, schools working in the countryside in agricultural tasks as well as the every-weekend voluntary work were cancelled. The last congress of the Cuban Communist Party renewed a great percentage of the cadres including the political bureau and approved the guidelines for a new economic model with a strategic vision until 2030 including the authorization for small private businesses. However, neither the 2012 new politics on agriculture that promotes the transfer of the state’s uncultivated lands to private hands as a means to boost food production, nor the 2014 foreign investment law aimed at attracting hard currency, for instance, have yet solved the situation as expected.

In his latest address to National Assembly (the Cuban Parliament) in July 2015, the Cuban president spoke about the challenges still ahead among them the elimination of the dual currency – which affects the real salary of the Cuban worker, the expected GDP growth from 1 % in 2014 to 4 % in 2015 and the drought [4]. He also mentioned severe financial restrictions due to the US blockade still in place despite the establishment of diplomatic relations and the world’s overwhelming opposition on twenty-two occasions. It should also be noticed that Raul Castro more than once has acknowledged the combination of the blockade effects calculated in 116.8 billion US dollars and “our own insufficiencies” as the two main factors affecting Cuban economic performance [3].

5. General features of Obama on Cuba policy changes speech

In 116 sentences with a lexical density of 33.6237, the President of the United States explains ‘his unilateral decision’ to establish diplomatic relations with the Republic of Cuba [16]. The first personal pronoun is repeated twenty-four times and ‘we’, thirty-seven. The policy change was presented as a collective agreement of the administration: *we will end... we will begin to normalize... we intend... we lifted restrictions... we are taking steps... we welcome...* . In other words, made-in-the-White House material and mental processes. Only twice, ‘we’ includes the Cuban government: *we can advance... where we disagree...* . Because this move is part of Obama’s legacy, the many ideas related to his policy change are presented in the first person: *I promised... I have been prepared... I’m now taking steps... I’ve instructed... I believe...* .

In Obama’s speech, the most often repeated concepts in the speech were “democracy”, 4 times; “democracy and human rights”, 3; “empower” always referring to the Cubans, 3; “change”, 11; “freedom” 3; “embargo” and ‘civil society’ 2 times each. However, words out of the environment in which they occur say nothing.

6. Going inside Obama’s speech on Cuba policy changes

The methodology to analyze the chosen clauses is based on Halliday’s Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). The analysis covers the clause as a message. As such the **Theme** is the point of departure, the element the speaker selects for ‘grounding’ what he is going to say, the **psychological subject (PS)**. The clause as an exchange analysis sees such message as a transaction between the speaker, the **grammatical Subject (GS)**, and listener. The clause as representation entails some process in ongoing human experience; the **Actor** is the active participant and **logical subject (LS)** in the clause [10, 64–280]. Each of the three forms part of a different functional configuration, making up a separate strand in the overall meaning of the clause; each occurs in association with other functions of the same strand of meaning.

Yesterday, I spoke with Raul Castro				to finalize Alan Gross’s release and the exchange of prisoners, and to describe how we will move forward
Theme PS Time adjunct	Rheme			
	Subject GS	Past Finite Positive polarity	Nominal	Purposive clause complex
	Actor LS	Verbal Process	Participant	Circumstance

The message is about what happened the day prior to the announcement. The US president wants his listeners to know he has also been involved in the talks and what

he did that day. However, how the clause is built not only suggests the idea that it was Obama the one who phoned, but also the imperial character of the statement as if he were talking to a vassal: “I am going to do this and you do this” alongside with the Cuban president silence, just listening carefully to the instructions.

The ways in which the following clauses are built also suggest that it is the United States the one who will have the commanding voice in all the normalization process.

First, I've instructed Secretary Kerry		to immediately begin discussions with Cuba to reestablish diplomatic relations that have been severed since January of 1961		
Second, I've instructed Secretary Kerry		to review Cuba's designation as a State Sponsor of Terrorism		
Theme PS	Rheme			
	Subject GS	Perfect finite Positive polarity	Nominal	Purposive clause complex
	Actor LS	Verbal process	Participant	Circumstance
Third, we are taking steps		to increase travel, commerce, and the flow of information to and from Cuba		
Theme PS	Rheme			
	Subject GS	Progressive Finite Positive polarity	Nominal	Purposive clause
	Actor LS	Material Process	Goal	Circumstance

The three clauses above outline what the US government will do to change its policy; this explains why the PS is enumeration grounded. However, the GS and Actor in the first two is the same. This, in the author's opinion, means Obama wants to be seen as decision-maker delegating on others (Sec. Kerry) the fulfillment of his policy. One wonders what was discussed during the two-year talks prior to the announcement. The third clause changes the GS and Actor, which now includes different US bodies including the Departments of Treasury and Justice as well as Congress. The first two actions have already been fulfilled; for the third Obama has had to use presidential powers to put some in effect because of a Republican dominated congress and the labyrinth of laws into which the Cuban question is embedded.

Nevertheless, some of the most interesting aspects of Obama's speech are in the field of discourse. That is, what he talked about and how his key ideas for the change were put into text, the mode of discourse.

Proudly, the United States has supported democracy and human rights through these five decades				
Theme PS Comment adjunct	Rheme			
	Subject GS	Finite perfective Positive polarity	Nominal group	Prepositional time expression
	Actor LS	Material process	Goal	Circumstance

In the above clause Obama justifies US policy towards Cuba in the last five decades. The comment adjunct “proudly” in which such justification is grounded makes of him another accomplice. Obama self-glorifies the US for 50 years of undeclared war against Cuba, but this has had “...little effect. Today, Cuba is still governed by the Castros and the Communist Party...” the negative side of Cuba that justifies the need for a new approach because, “Neither, the American, nor Cuban people are well served by a rigid policy that is rooted in events that took place before most of us were born”. It seems that for him not only the Cuban have been victims but also the Americans. This clause may look like repentance, but is actually a populist one when put together with other ideas in the text.

Democracy and *human rights*, two of the key concepts in Obama’s speech are worth examining because of their real meaning in US politics. On a short explanation of what they mean, Prof. Noam Chomsky asserts *democracy* has the official meaning “of letting people run in their affairs” but also a technical meaning that implies democracy is run by the business classes, especially if these “support US interests; if not, it is not a democracy [6].” Consequently, neither Cuba nor China or Russia, for instance, is a democracy.

The Universal Declaration of Human rights, on the other hand, has been used as a tool to promote civil unrest in Cuba as in other parts of the world. More often than ever before, ‘democracy’ and ‘human rights’ appear as *natural collocations* in American political language and public diplomacy to the extent that they portray the US as the *World Champion* on these two issues. In fact, as Professor Chomsky asserts, “US policy... has sought to destroy human rights, to lower living standards, and to prevent democratization, often with considerable passion and violence (blockades, aggressions, propaganda) [4, 8]” of which Nicaragua is only one example [5]. Overall, the repetition of these two key concepts: ‘democracy’ and ‘human rights’ reflect not only Obama cannot disengage himself from these topoi so standardized in American discourse towards Cuba; but also his ignorance of the Cuban people and its reality, of whom and which visitors to the country are usually shocked by when they confront them with their propaganda-fed image.

At the same time in his speech, Obama takes no responsibility and distances himself from the state of affairs between Cuba and his country, which is logical because he apparently wants to project himself as the image of justice. “I was born in 1961 – just over two years after Fidel Castro took power in Cuba, and just a few months after

the Bay of Pigs invasion, which tried to overthrow the regime.” Nonetheless, the fact he has lifted some restriction since 2009 in no way means the ideological and economic barriers have been eased; rather, they have been raised. For instance, the support for promoting a ‘rapid peaceful transition to democracy, helping develop civil society and human rights activists’ was \$40 million in 2009 and 2010 [13, 147]. Economically, the extraterritorial application of US blockade laws has increased in the form of fines. For instance, in June 2015, the Italian bank Intesa Sanpaolo was fined almost 3 million dollars by the Office for Foreign Assets control (OFAC) for handling 53 transfers to Cuba from 2004 to 2008. On November 8 2015, once more the overwhelming majority of the UN General Assembly (191 countries) voted against the blockade with two notable exceptions: Israel and the US.

In his speech, Mr. Obama identifies several areas where both governments can advance: “health, migration, counterterrorism, drug trafficking, and disaster response.” However, the US president fails to mention other areas such as bilateral commerce, American credits and investment he knows very well are part of Cuban national interests. In other words, the rope around the neck of Cuban economy, the embargo [blockade] is positioned so far away in the text and given so little prominence, that the change Obama offers is not exactly what Cuba needs.

However, a 2009 analysis on the real costs of the embargo asserts such policy is damaging America at least as much as Cuba. America loses approximately between \$1.2 and \$4.155 billion annually, according to estimates carried out by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Cuban Policy Foundation [17]. It is doubtful the present American administration did not analyze the economic pros and cons of approaching Cuba at this specific moment.

We believe that you			should be empowered to live with dignity and self-determination		
Theme PS	Rheme	Clause: Theme	Rheme		
Subject GS	Present finite Positive polarity	Senser	Modality passive	Material process Positive polarity	Purposive clause
Actor LS	Mental process	Phenomenon			

This clause is unmarked; that is, the psychological, grammatical and logical subject is the same. Said by Obama just after, “Today, I am being honest with you. We can never erase the history between us, but...”, the clause addresses unambiguously the Cubans living in the island – a very important part of his audience – and has the implicit promise to do away with all their suffering that is nothing more, from the American point of view, than the government and social system. Furthermore, Obama is trying to represent himself as positively as possible to the Cuban people, as their savior.

The combination of “empower” with another semantically charged word: “change”, repeated three and seven times respectively at different points in the text alongside with their actors lead to similar readings. How these key concepts, participants as agents or objects of change and the processes to be carried out within it allow to infer

that the claim for **change is of method while historical objectives remain the same**. That is clearly stated, “We will end an outdated approach that, for decades, has failed **to advance our interests**, and instead we will begin to normalize relations [to advance our interests, our democracy and our human rights].” The change of method, but not objectives, is also suggested by the repetition of strikingly similar ideas in other parts of the speech.

“But I believe we can do more to support the Cuban people and promote our values **through engagement**”.

“This is fundamentally about freedom and openness, and also expresses my belief in the power of people-to-people engagement”.

“But I am convinced that through a policy of engagement, we can more effectively stand up for our values and help the Cuban people help themselves as they move into the 21st century”.

Engaging the foe’s population is nothing new in politics. Historically, there has always been general agreement within the establishment about the effectiveness of engagement policies in Cuba. Carter and Clinton, just to cite two, did it long before Obama. A *Christian Science Monitor* editorial reports Lee H. Hamilton (D-In.) advising in 1991, “We should also permit travel to Cuba and a wider range of personal exchanges. If we hope to influence change in Cuba, we need to increase our dialogue and engagement with the Cuban people, especially the youth [7].”

When the American president says, “our sanctions on Cuba have denied Cubans access to technology that has empowered individuals around the globe”, the author imagines him thinking, ‘Now we will give access to that technology. It worked in Libya and in all the Arab Spring; why not in Cuba?’ Hence, the policy change seemingly consists of giving the Cubans the means to promote regime change through a ‘color revolution’. This and no other seems to be the message of Obama’s policy change.

7. A very likely future scenario

Hitherto, money to Cuba has flown limitlessly as Obama promised on December 17 2014, “...more resources should be able to reach the Cuban people. So we’re significantly increasing the amount of money that can be sent to Cuba, and removing limits on remittances that support humanitarian projects, the Cuban people, and the emerging Cuban private sector.” In other words, flooding Cuba with dollars seems to be the chosen method to build kind of a social infrastructure. When he refers to the Cuban people, Obama is talking about the ones who receive remittance from the US, roughly a third of the population, and the ‘emerging private sector’ is that part of the population with small profitable businesses, which, at some time in the near future, would like to expand but are still restrained by the actual legislation. At the same time, as a result of the thawing, tourism coming from the USA, specially Cuban Americans, has surged facilitating people-to-people engagement and the flow of information envisioned by Obama. That is, the variables having a direct influence on color revolutions as a particular type of socio-political event: ideology, finance, social infrastructure, training, information, and media [14, 78–86] are all present in

one way or another in Obama's statement and present some stage of development in the Cuban society nowadays.

The development of all these variables has been promoted in Cuba in the last few years. First, the moral and, most of all financial, support of small dissident groups and particular individuals, some even awarded with international awards, is no secret. Many of them have been trained in the US former Office of Interests in Havana in the use of IT technology and are today bloggers and 'independent journalists' who are in charge of the information war against Cuba. Now, as Obama said, the moment to 'empower people' with the use of social media has come. The building of the social infrastructure is the pending task.

According to Korybko [14], the social infrastructure comprises a core, the people and institutions set in to bring about the change; cohorts, people in charge of administrative or recruiting tasks who are the face of the organization; and civilians, the ones who the latter get in touch with. This Russian political analyst asserts:

Civilians may or may not enter into the Physical Infrastructure (i. e. participate in marches of solidarity with the Color Revolution), but when they do, they provide a valuable soft power advantage. Media footage of thousands of civilians partaking in a Color Revolution rally may influence other civilians to also take part in such activities. As with the Cohorts, a single Civilian is a pawn, but large amounts of them are a 'weapon' [Ibid., 84].

Though it may look like science fiction, in Obama's mind the social infrastructure may well be composed by a core (dissident groups), cohorts (the emerging private sector) and civilians (those connected to the private sector, have never wanted to work with the government, and many others who, for some money, will join the group. In other words, the US government seems to be working to strengthen an already existing social class to subvert the present social order from within. In other words, Obama's policy change is aimed at achieving the same historical objectives, 'the Cuban disease' but this time, with a fifth generation antibiotic.

The likelihood of a US-led 'color revolution' hypothesis may be reinforced by the idea that the Cuban president has announced his retirement will take place in March 2018. Due to the advanced age of the core of the government, the Revolution Generation, the future replacement is unlikely to follow confrontation politics with the US. At the same time, a new constitution or changes in the existing one are also expected and, with it, limits in the period to be at the head of the government and the impossibility to hold two government posts among others. Besides, the island's socioeconomic situation (low salaries, dual currency and poor economic performance) at one time or another will increase the demand, fueled from outside, for some type of accommodation in the social contract. Thereby, American historical objectives in the Pearl of the Antilles, as Cuba is also called, may be achieved by a combination of internal contradictions between the mode of production and the productive forces, the objective side of the conflict, that once matured could be sparked by subjective factors (discontent, ideologically-focused propaganda) funded from the United States. It seems the American government has been studying Historical Materialism.

At the time of publishing this paper, Obama became the second president in office and the first to have visited Cuba in eighty-eight years. The joint press conference with Raul Castro as well as his public speech given in a crowded theater where Castro and other government officials were present, elicited different reactions. The official press has inferred and, since the very moment of his departure, warned about a hidden American agenda to disrupt the existing order. Alternative mass media, on the contrary, has reflected the positive impact Obama's visit and words have had on ordinary Cubans.

8. Conclusions

From the CDA point of view, Obama's Cuba policy changes speech revolves around the same old Washington topoi: the lack of democracy and human rights in the island. The new policy, as envisioned by the present administration, is to bring about the desired changes through the empowerment of the incipient private sector and engagement with the population planting the seeds for a regime change, apparently, through soft power methods. Consequently, the move is neither obscure nor *na ve* as Cuban-American congressional representatives have been vociferating since December 2014; at the same time, it by no means endangers the future of 'democracy' in the region for it is the answer claimed by all Latin American countries, a region the US considers its backyard and wants to keep as calm as possible. Finally yet importantly, a friendly Cuba may also serve as a trustful mediator between conflicting parties as it has shown in the Colombian case. The route map conceived in Washington, and revealed by how the ideas were put into text, apparently, consists of a one-lane road where neither the people nor the Cuban government will have much to decide in the one-sided relations that America wants to impose. In other words, the new policy is neither friendly nor sincere.

Unarguably positive though the Cuban-American approach may seem, too many expectations have been raised to the extent that many think the end of the problems in the island has started. However, the very nature of those problems as well as what is tacitly offered in Obama's speech point to more ideological and cultural confrontation. The Cuban government knows this. How they will accommodate and take advantage of the new situation to advance the Cuban society wisely solving the internal situation is probably the biggest unprecedented political challenge it has ever faced.

1. BBC World News. Obama hails 'new chapter' in US-Cuba ties [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-30516740> (accessed: 20.04.2016).

2. *Castro R.* Speech to the national assembly, July 23, 2014 [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.cubaminrex.cu/es/discurso-pronunciado-por-el-general-de-ejercito-raul-castro-ruz-primer-secretario-del-comite-central> (accessed: 20.04.2016).

3. *Castro R.* Speech to the national assembly, July 15, 2015 [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.cubadebate.cu/noticias/2015/07/15/raul-castro-se-ha-revertido-la-tendencia-a-la-desaceleracion-de-la-economia-cubana-fotos-y-video/> (accessed: 20.04.2016).

4. *Chomsky N.* Turning the tide. US intervention in Central America and the struggle for peace. Boston, 1985.

5. Chomsky N. Detering democracy. L., 1991.
6. Chomsky N. The real meaning of democracy [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w4dMV65UEms> (accessed: 20.04.2016).
7. Christian Science Monitor. Through peaceful means we can help ease Castro out. Editorial. 1991. Oct. 10.
8. Dijk T. A. van. Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis. Japanese Discourse. 1995. Vol. 1(17–27).
9. Fairclough N. (1996). Language and power. 10th Ed. N. Y., 1996.
10. Halliday M. A. K., Mathiessen Ch. An introduction to functional grammar. 3rd Edition. L., 2004.
11. Horváth J. Critical discourse analysis of Obama's political discourse. 2011 [Electronic resource]. URL: http://www.pulib.sk/elpub2/FF/Ferencik2/pdf_doc/6.pdf (accessed: 20.04.2016).
12. Hrnjaz M., Krstic M. Obama's dual discourse on American exceptionalism. 2015.
13. International Business Publications. USA. Cuba: Foreign policy Guide, 2011. Vol. 1: Strategic information and development.
14. Korybko A. Hybrid wars. The indirect adaptive approach to regime change. M., 2015.
15. Morales E., Prevost G. United States-Cuban Relations. A critical history. N. Y., 2008.
16. Obama B. On Cuba policy changes [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/12/17/statement-president-cuba-policy-changes> (accessed: 20.04.2016).
17. Pepper M. The costs of the embargo. In Dollar & Sense. 2009 [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.dollarsandsense.org/archives/2009/0309pepper.html> (accessed: 20.04.2016).
18. Real Clear Politics. Marcos Rubio on Cuba deal "Obama the worst negotiator since Carter" [Electronic resource]. URL: http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2014/12/17/marco_rubio_on_cuba_deal_obama_the_worst_negotiator_since_carter.html (accessed: 20.04.2016).
19. Sarfo E., Agyeiwaa E. Language at war: a critical discourse analysis of speeches of Bush and Obama on terrorism. International J. Soc. Sci. & Education. 2013. Vol. 3(2). P. 378–390.
20. Seattle Times: Seattle, WA. March 4. 1992. P. A10.
21. Sputnik International. War Waged Against Russia Now Being Waged Against China — Russian ex-Spy [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://sputniknews.com/politics/20150906/1026663159/russia-china-geopolitics-forecast.html> (accessed: 20.04.2016).
22. Wang, J. A critical discourse analysis of Obama's speeches. Language Teaching and Research. (2010). Vol. 1, № 3. P. 254–261.

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 3 июня 2016 г.

Р. Ф. Фортеса Фернандес

КРИТИЧЕСКИЙ ДИСКУРС-АНАЛИЗ КЛЮЧЕВЫХ КОНЦЕПТОВ В ЗАЯВЛЕНИИ Б. ОБАМЫ: ИЗМЕНЕНИЕ ПОЛИТИКИ В ОТНОШЕНИИ КУБЫ

В статье анализируются основные концепты в речи президента США, прозвучавшей в декабре 2014 г. и ставшей толчком для повторного установления отношений США с Кубой. Методологической основой исследования является критический дискурс-анализ. Автор приходит к выводу, что слова Б. Обамы отражают изменение политики США в отношении Кубы, но представляют собой односторонний монолог, где не обращается внимание на потребности и надежды, существующие на острове, что проявляется в пренебрежении и замалчивании важных кубинских национальных интересов. При погружении в различные геополитические контексты выясняется, что речь президента США строится вокруг одних и тех же аргументов, которые США использовали в течение более пятидесяти лет. Несмотря на изменившуюся ситуацию

не только в Латинской Америке, но и во всем мире, США предсказывают сценарий изменений на Кубе для достижения тех же целей, что и в прошлом.

К л ю ч е в ы е с л о в а: Обама, Куба, политика, изменения, демократия, права человека, расширение прав и возможностей, цветная революция.

После двух лет секретных переговоров 17 декабря 2014 г. президенты Кубы и Соединенных Штатов Америки — Рауль Кастро и Барак Обама — в своих заявлениях анонсировали восстановление дипломатических отношений между двумя странами, разорванных Д. Эйзенхауэром в начале 1960-х гг. В разных странах это событие было воспринято как эпохальное не только для Кубы и США, но и для всего мира. Однако члены Конгресса США кубинского происхождения М. Рубио, И. Росс-Летинен и Т. Круз, среди прочих членов республиканской партии, сочли движение по восстановлению дипотношений контрпродуктивным. М. Рубио заявил, что внешняя политика президента наивна и ставит под вопрос будущее демократии в регионе. Но действительно ли внешняя политика Соединенных Штатов так неясна и подвергает опасности будущее демократии в Латинской Америке?

В данной статье автор постарается ответить на поставленный выше вопрос, проанализировав с помощью критико-дискурсивного анализа речь Б. Обамы об изменении политики в отношении Кубы. В методологическом плане автор опирается на одно из ключевых положений критико-дискурсивного анализа, а именно, что идеология, будучи связанной с языком, всегда прослеживается в текстах. С этой точки зрения выступление президента США об изменениях политики в отношении Кубы прежде всего должно быть прочитано в рамках контекста огромных геополитических изменений в глобальном масштабе.

Начиная с 1959 г., после того как с Кубы было изгнано правительство Батисты, конфронтация между Кубой и США только нарастала. Свообразными вехами этой конфронтации стали такие события, как национализация всей американской собственности и бизнеса на Кубе в 1960 г., неудавшееся вторжение американцев в Залив Свиней в 1961 г. и грандиозный Карибский кризис 1962 г., когда мир был на грани ядерной войны.

Среди множества сегодняшних событий, которые влияют на ситуацию в Латинской Америке, необходимо отметить повышение экономической мощи Китая, союз Китая и России в Шанхайской группе, основанной в 2001 г., Евразийский экономический союз. Эти явления ставят под вопрос политическую, экономическую и военную гегемонию США в регионе.

Уже в самом начале своего президентства Рауль Кастро принял серию мер по изменению в социальной, политической и экономической сферах. Однако, например, ни новая, 2012 г., политика в сельском хозяйстве, которая способствовала передаче невозделанных государственных земель в частные руки, ни закон об иностранных инвестициях 2014 г., нацеленный на привлечение твердой валюты, не улучшили, как ожидалось, сложную экономическую ситуацию.

Сам факт, что начиная с 2009 г. некоторые санкции США по отношению к Кубе были отменены, никоим образом не означает, что идеологические и экономические

барьеры между двумя странами были ослаблены. Например, по официальным данным, на поддержку «быстрого мирного перехода к демократии и помощь в развитии гражданского общества на Кубе» США было выделено 40 млн долларов в 2009 и 2010 гг. Но с этого же времени применение американских законов о блокаде, наоборот, ужесточилось за счет увеличения штрафов, налагаемых, например, за экономические операции с островом. Так, в июне 2015 г. итальянский банк Intesa Sanpaolo был оштрафован почти на 3 млн долларов Ведомством по контролю за иностранными активами (ОФАС) за 53 доказанных перевода денег на счета на Кубе с 2004 по 2008 г. 8 ноября 2015 г. на Генеральной Ассамблее ООН 191 страна (что составляет подавляющее большинство) проголосовала за снятие экономического эмбарго с острова. Исключение составили два голоса, принадлежавшие Израилю и США.

Идеи цветных революций внедрялись на Кубе в последние несколько лет через моральную и финансовую поддержку малочисленных диссидентских групп и отдельных активистов. Многие из них были обучены в бывшем американском «офисе интересов» в Гаване использованию IT-технологий и являются сегодня блоггерами и «независимыми журналистами», которые отвечают за информационную войну против Кубы. Сейчас, как сказал Обама, наступил момент, чтобы предоставить людям возможности изменить свою жизнь с помощью социальных медиа. Кубинский президент Р. Кастро объявил о своем уходе на пенсию в марте 2018 г. «Поколение революции» сменяется новым поколением, владеющим новыми технологиями и использующим социальные сети.

«Демократия» и «права человека» — два этих ключевых понятия в речи Обамы стоит пристально рассмотреть из-за их реального значения в американской политике. Профессор Н. Хомский утверждает, что ключевое значение демократии заключается в том, чтобы «позволить людям совершать их дела», но есть также и другое значение, которое подразумевает, что демократией управляют бизнес-классы, особенно если они поддерживают американские интересы. В противном случае все деяния рассматриваются США как недемократические. С этой точки зрения ни Куба, ни Китай, ни Россия не являются странами с развитой демократией. Понятия «демократия» и «права человека» столь часто используются американской властью, что начинают восприниматься как естественные словосочетания в американском политическом дискурсе.

Автор приходит к выводу, что с точки зрения критико-дискурсивного анализа заявление Б. Обамы об изменении политики США в отношении Кубы строится вокруг тех же тем, что и последние пятьдесят с лишним лет: отсутствие демократии и нарушение прав человека на острове. Новая политика, как предполагается нынешним американским правительством, состоит в том, чтобы вызвать желаемые изменения посредством расширения возможностей зарождающегося частного сектора, действуя методами мягкой силы. Следовательно, изменение политики США в отношении Кубы не является ни неясным, ни наивным, как об этом заявляют кубинско-американские представители Конгресса начиная с декабря 2014 г. Это изменение никоим образом не подвергает опасности будущее «демократии» в латиноамериканском регионе, который до сих пор

рассматривается США как «задний двор», ситуацию на котором необходимо сохранять как можно более спокойной. Важно и то, что дружественная США Куба может служить посредником между конфликтующими сторонами, как это произошло в случае с Колумбией.

Однако, несмотря на то что восстановление дипломатических отношений между двумя странами многими было воспринято как начало решения экономических и социальных проблем на острове, критико-дискурсивный анализ заявления президента США позволил выявить сохраняющуюся идеологическую и культурную конфронтацию. Как кубинское правительство воспользуется новой ситуацией для решения внутренних проблем страны, является, вероятно, самым беспрецедентным политическим вызовом, с которым оно когда-либо сталкивалось.