



ISSN 2455-7544
www.daathvoyagejournal.com

Daath Voyage : An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in English

A UGC Refereed Open Access Journal

Vol. 3 No.2 June 2018

Editor : Saikat Banerjee

Editor: Dr. Saikat Banerjee
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
St. Theresa International College, Thailand.



Daath Voyage

: An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in English
A UGC Refereed e- Journal no 45349

ISSN 2455-7544

www.daathvoyagejournal.com

Vol.3, No.2, June, 2018

Women Empowerment and Gender Positioning: Critically looking at an Indian Speech by Smriti Irani and an American speech by Hillary Clinton

Sayantn Mukherjee

Ph.D. Student in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics
Department of English, Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281
United States

Contact: smukhe27@asu.edu,
sayantn.muukherjee@gmail.com

Abstract: This study employs a broader critical discourse analytic framework (CDA) to understand the similarities and differences between two public speeches by Smriti Irani and Hillary Clinton on the general issue of women empowerment. These two speeches are situated at different points in recent history. While the speech by Smriti Irani took place in 2014, Hillary Clinton's speech took place in 2010. Despite their difference in timeline, both speeches serve as a potential dataset for analyzing the issue of women empowerment as more than a topic of gender equality. Due to the fact that these two speeches are available on YouTube, their availability bolsters their currency on the crucial issue of women empowerment that transcends the boundaries of two different countries.

Keywords: CDA, power, agent of change, identity, nation, culture, empowerment, India, United States.

Introduction

This study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyze two public speeches by two political figures addressing the women empowerment issue as a whole. One of the speeches is by Smriti Irani, Minister of Information and Broadcasting (since 2016, and former Minister of HRD, in office 2014-2016) of Government of India, on the occasion of International Women's Conference 2014. The other speech is by an extremely famous public figure and politician Hilary Clinton (67th United States Secretary of State, in office 2009-2013) at TED Women 2010. These two speeches serve as potential researchable data due to their apparent levels of similarities and differences. How two hugely different public figures in two different continents address similar issues in different



manners is worth something to investigate further. This study aims to investigate how the analysis of these two speeches will inform the field of CDA in terms of issues like women empowerment in different geographic and sociocultural contexts, public figures (women) defining or redefining their roles as agents of change, and how typical lexical usage facilitates their oratory.

Theoretical Background

CDA is a dynamic field and is enriched by the works of many scholars and proponents of the field.

Critical Discourse Analysis explores the connections between the use of language and the social and political contexts in which it occurs. It explores issue such as gender, ethnicity, cultural difference, ideology and identity and how these are both constructed and reflected in texts. (Paltridge 186)

In general CDA as a school or paradigm is characterized by a number of principles: for example, all approaches are problem-oriented, and thus necessarily interdisciplinary and eclectic. Moreover, CDA is typified as a research paradigm which is interested in “demystifying ideologies and power through the systematic and retroductable investigation of semiotic data (written, spoken or visual)” (Wodak and Meyer 2009). CDA has never been and has never attempted to provide one single theory or a single methodological approach. By the virtue of being CDA it is rather a convergent point of different kinds of methodologies. In the field of CDA the studies derive from different theoretical backgrounds and are oriented towards different data and methodologies. The definitions of the terms like ‘discourse’, ‘critical’, ‘ideology’, and ‘power’ are so multi-faced that CDA always demands to specify which research orientation these terms are relating to when given in a context. To give an exhaustive survey of all the research that has been done under this name of the field is beyond the scope of this paper of mine. Thus, a very short nut-shell survey of the literature focusing on the three major scholars of CDA, Fairclough, Wodak, and van Dijk, is provided below.

Norman Fairclough is one of the most renowned scholars in CDA. He takes a grand theoretical position in his approach to CDA. His approach is also called the Dialectical-Relational Approach (DRA). Fairclough focuses on social conflict in Marxian tradition and emphasizes on



detecting its linguistic manifestations in discourses. In so doing, he focuses on particular elements of dominance, difference, and resistance. According to his approach, every social practice has a semiotic element. For example, productive activity, the means of production, social relations, social identities, cultural values, consciousness, and semiosis are dialectically related elements of social practice. He understands CDA as the analysis of dialectical relationships between semiosis (including language) and other elements of social practices. Ruth Wodak is another major name in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis. Her approach is said to be one of the most linguistically oriented approaches in CDA. Her approach to CDA is called the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). In this approach, she explicitly tries to establish a theoretical premise of discourse by establishing a connection between fields of action (Girsh 1996), genres, discourses, and text. Although DHA is aligned to Critical Theory, general social theory plays a minor role compared with the discourse model and the emphasis on historical analysis.

Teun van Dijk marks a new critical paradigm as a corrective to more traditional approaches to discourse analysis. This approach to CDA is called the Socio-cognitive Approach. This approach is on the side of the socio-psychological side of the CDA field. This framework serves as “systematizing phenomena of social reality” (Wodak and Meyer 25). The approach is in the tradition of social representational theory (Moscovici and Duveen). In this framework, the focal triad is interpreted between discourse, cognition, and society. Discourse is seen as a communicative event, including conversational interaction, written text, as well as associated gestures, face-work, typographical layout, images, and any other semiotic or multimedia dimension of signification. Van Dijk, through this framework, understands linguistics in a broad ‘structural-functional’ sense. In so doing, he argues that CDA should be based on a theory of context. He insists that researchers in CDA should examine the ways structures and strategies of text and talk are conditioned by and also condition social, political, cultural processes, and structures; and should address issues of power, domination, inequality, resistance and many others.



Methodology and Data Collection

As it has been articulated in the literature that no one model is sufficient for CDA, it would be wise to incorporate more than one approach to obtain the criticality of any research. In this research, CDA will serve as the broader methodological paradigm. In a general sense, CDA will be used to investigate the data drawing upon different approaches within the diverse analytical tools of CDA. This qualitative study of the data will be carried out by broadly incorporating models suggested by Fairclough, Wodak, and Van Dijk. The data will be investigated for relevant lexical items, phrases, repetition of words and these will facilitate the unpacking of the ideologies, value-systems, social-cultural backgrounds that have been “out of sight” (Hyland 4) rather than overtly stated in the text. How the speeches have been performed, what the underlying use of discourse is, and how all these relate to different views or thought processes are the concerns of this study. The investigation aims at finding out both similarities differences in ideologies, power structures, and social dynamics of these speeches by the two very different public figures at hand.

The data that will be analyzed are general (mostly sentence by sentence English, see the appendix section) transcriptions of two small segments (for Irani, it is 0:31-5:52 seconds and for Clinton, it is 0:31- 6:28 seconds) from the two public speeches occurred on two different occasions and in two very different geographic contexts. The reason behind choosing the segments and not the whole speeches is that these small segments are the most identifiable relevant portions as far as their focus on women empowerment is concerned. Both the speeches are available on YouTube. I will use the excerpts from those transcriptions wherever necessary. Entire relevant segments have been transcribed and attached in the appendix section of the paper. In this research the public speech by Smriti Irani is on the occasion of International Women’s Conference in India, in 2014; and the speech by Hilary Clinton is at the conference called TED Women in 2010, in Washington DC, USA. Since both of these speeches have occurred at different points of time in the contemporary history and the speakers are presenting their talks in their own ways, I will use my own discretion to represent the segments that are potentially comparable.

As far as some background information is concerned, Smriti Irani is the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in India, and formerly, she was a model and actress in Hindi film



industry. Although she has been a follower of BJP's political ideology, in 2014, it was recently that she had become the HRD minister after the historical victory of BJP (Bharatiya Janata Party) over INC (Indian National Congress). Hilary Clinton, on the other hand, is a veteran politician and an activist regarding women empowerment issues in the United States. During the speech analyzed in this paper, she was serving as the 67th Secretary of States in the USA. She has always been a very good orator, and there are many more videos available on YouTube where she talks about the issues related to women empowerment.

Analysis and Discussion

I will broadly talk about the similarities and the differences in terms of their format of speeches, their choice of certain lexical items, their use of intertextuality, their portrayal of women empowerment issues, their representation(s) of individual national identity, their representation of "self" and their identity as woman, their use of rhetorical elements, their depiction of themselves as agents of change, their manifestation/acknowledgement of their political career, and their worldview of power.

Both of them use the general format of addressing the audience and thanking the organizers in the beginning. After that, they draw upon women empowerment issues by using quotes, stories, and narratives from their experiences. They talk about the issue being a global one. They talk about the benefits of empowering women for the bigger benefit of humanity, safety, and the prospect of the nation and world. These are things that give these two speeches an even ground, apart from the fact that both of them are talking on occasions of women empowerment. However, Irani and Clinton mark a difference at the very beginning of the speeches. Irani is not using any notes on paper for the speech and is addressing the audience drawing upon (possibly) immediately preceding speakers' talks and also her reflection on those. However, Clinton seems to be using some written notes to perform this oratory on stage. I am not sure in the case of Clinton whether or not she is preceded by any other speakers on that conference, but Irani is definitely preceded by some and she uses elements from those speaker's speeches to make the talk a response or continued "conversation" at times.

Although the topic or the broader issue both of these speakers are addressing are similar,



there is hardly any match in terms of the content words that they use. The only five major words that are found closely comparable are “women”, “world”, “country”, “nation”, and “cause.” An interesting side of the story is that Irani uses the word “nation/national” much frequently to convey the sense of the country, whereas it the label is “country” for Clinton. The key words or phrases that Irani uses are, to mention some of those, “constructively heard”, “speak/speaking up”, “nation(s)”, “pursuit”, “culture”, “humanity”, “India”, “cause”, “conflict”, “politics/political”, “ideology”, “race”, “unnatural”, “ownership”, “resources”, “globally”, “infant death” and so on. On the contrary, some of the content keywords (or even phrases) by Clinton are “decision was made”, “change”, “agents”, “women and girls”, “cause”, “controversy”, “friends”, “government”, “policy”, “equality”, “prosperity”, “fairness”, “country”, “agenda”, “rights”, “men”, “opportunity”, “world”, “American”, “dramatically”, “children”, “threat”, and “subjugation.”

These words can denote a myriad of configurations about the positions of the speakers. In Irani’s speech, there are no such strong agentive words as it the case in Clinton’s repertoire here. Words that are loaded with socio-political meanings are there in Clinton’s speech; for example “government”, “policy”, “agenda”, “rights”, “subjugation” etc. These words alone say that Clinton is confident about her political identity. She never mentions the term “politics” in her speech, but these other terms convey her strong political identity in a very conspicuous manner. Moreover, “men” and “friend” are the two words that are not at all present in Irani’s speech. This can also imply certain things about her discomfort on visualizing gender equality with the presence of “men”, or even, embracing camaraderie with a heterogenous group consisting of both “men” and “women” “friends.” Clinton can recognize many faces in the crowd and addresses them as friends. This discursive gesture suggests that Clinton is a veteran activist in this arena of befriending anyone and everyone whenever needed. However, when Irani addresses anyone during the speech, she uses ‘Ms.’ or ‘the lady’. It can either mean that she is not yet at a stage where she has made many friends in this arena, or it can also denote that, being an Indian, she maintains the decorum of addressing anyone in a more formal manner, hence creating a slight distance between her and the others. The word “men” can be a problem when one is talking about “women empowerment.” Even Clinton uses it only once just to sound neutral, and Irani never even tries that. Clinton, most of the time,



says “women and girls” when she is addressing the women issues; However, the chosen label is only “women” for Irani. It suggests that Clinton is overtly segregating girls from women and also dissolving the boundaries whenever the issue relates to any of them.

The element of intertextuality is very frequent when Irani speaks. She alludes to Ramayana, she responds to other speakers who have preceded her, she talks about a study done in 1996. This makes the speech more interactive for Irani since she was new in the domain of politics at that time and could not find the dexterity in talking about her own opinion or agenda as Clinton could. There is no such case of overt intertextuality by Clinton. In Irani’s depiction of women empowerment, the issue is mild and more general in manner. She tries to associate this issue for the benefit of nation and human beings. She says women do not have problem in speaking; however, they have a problem in “being constructively heard.” Here she clearly states that women issues need to be heard and then need to be acted upon. In the case of Clinton, she clearly states that women issues are not just “moral” or “humanitarian” issues; they are broader and more crucial than that. She emphasizes if women issues are neglected, any nation will face obvious threat and danger. Clinton makes it clear that her government includes policies for women equality and empowerment as a cornerstone of government’s foreign policies. Clearly, Irani does not have that authority to either implement or even directly talk about those things in her speech. Thus, she remains mild and more general on those topics.

Both of the speakers project their national identities extremely strongly whenever needed. However, they operate in different manners. Irani talks about Ramayana, Lord Rama (Indian epic and its main protagonist), talks about infusing ‘feminine’ virtues in achieving a national identity, and talks about a lady from Sri Lanka to show a cultural similarity. So, Irani’s way of defining national identity is all about only ideological beliefs and cultural depictions. On the contrary, Clinton resorts to making prevalent that she is from the United States and that she strongly and overtly represents that country on many occasions. She also mentions the name of former (current at the time of this speech) president Obama. In terms of national identity, she renders a different level of indexicality—she unabashedly correlates it with the flourishing of girls and women. She says where girls and women flourish, the value system of a nation is defined. She mentions the



government and American foreign policy several times--that makes her national identity conspicuous in the text.

Both Irani's and Clinton's representations of "self" are different. Irani foregrounds her woman identity on many occasions. She talks about the incident when another lady from a different political party embraces her only because she is a woman. She also mentions that she and the lady from Afghanistan are same despite their geographic and linguistic differences; one of the major reasons for that is they are both women. Towards the end of the segment, she emphasizes her role as a woman and offers her opinion based on that ground. In the case of Clinton, her depiction of "self" is little different from Irani. She foregrounds herself as a "woman" clearly as opposed to a "girl." She foregrounds her woman activist identity whenever she has the chance. She embraces her woman identity more by relating her struggles and her sources of inspiration to the numerous ones who are doing the same. Her very acknowledgement of attending TED Women is the foregrounding of her strong woman "self." She even touches upon the cause of bringing about the change in the scenario because of one potential reason that she has a personal commitment to this as she is a powerful woman.

Both of them are brilliant orators. And oratory is marked by the use of rhetorical elements. Irani draws upon logos (logic), ethos (credibility), and Kairos (spatial temporal context). She uses different resources to strengthen her arguments. She talks about studies and numbers in that, she talks about her woman identity aligning with many others in the crowd, and she also uses the perfect context for bringing in every intertextual element in the discourse. It is clear that she has listened to many of the previous speakers, and her responding to those when she had the dais is a perfect element of Kairos. Also, her not having any written notes adds to her credibility as a good orator. She employs the popular rhetorical technique of using three short speech units to compare and show different aspects related to any issue.

Excerpt 1 (taken from Irani's segment)

44. I know that conflict arises when there is widespread

45. poverty; conflict arises when there is illiteracy; conflict



46. arises when there is a race to take ownership of resources.
47. But we also know that when women are put at the helm of
48. affairs, conflict has this unnatural way of decreasing.

This way of describing also reemphasizes her epistemic stance. On the other hand, Clinton also uses all the three rhetorical elements that have been mentioned in the case of Irani. However, adding to that, she uses emotional appeal (pathos) when she talks about women that carved the projects with their own hands and also when she talks about struggle issues of women. The primary similarity of Clinton to Irani lies in the section where Clinton uses the three comparative phrases to show the gravity of the issue and also to bolster her epistemic stance.

Excerpt 2 (taken from Clinton's Segment)

49. Because women's equality is not just a moral issue, it's
50. not just a humanitarian issue, it is not just a fairness
51. issue; it is a security issue, it is a prosperity issue,
52. and it is a peace issue.

This is one of the areas where Clinton outweighs Irani. In her speech, Irani never tries to foreground herself as an agent of change. She keeps on talking about how she takes pride in her women identity like many others, but never ever depicts herself as an agent that can bring about change in the scenario. Clinton portrays herself as an active agent in this struggle. She identifies herself with all the women who have brought about change in some manner or the other. She explicitly foregrounds herself as one of the "agents of change." She also highlights her duty as an agent of change by talking about the rights and roles that she, along with her government, has brought into American government policies.



Excerpt 3 (taken from Clinton's segment)

20. ...as
21. Secretary of State with the great honor of representing the
23. United States, I have made clear that the rights and the
24. roles of women and girls will be a central tenet of
25. American foreign policy.

As it has become evident by now from the preceding discussion, Clinton never overtly states the term "political" or "politics" in her entire speech; however, Irani does that twice: First time when she talks about another lady from a different political ideological school, and the second time when she talks about the lady from Afghanistan. She is new in the field of politics, and like many other speeches, she does not want to lose an opportunity to mention her (professional) political side of the career to redefine her identity as a politician. Clinton does not have to do that because she is already a veteran politician and serves at one of the highest levels in the U.S. government. Thus, in spite of overtly mentioning a political identity, Irani is not that impactful as Clinton in this regard. Another explanation might also be inferred that this is not the right place and situation to become overtly political. The situation demands a solidarity in women's empowerment movement, which Clinton does perfectly and confidently. However, Irani, being a seemingly novice candidate in the field (at least, up until the time of this speech), still counts upon her political identity as a convincing standpoint for situations like this.

The overt mention of power is there in Irani when she talks about the resources being claimed by only one group ("race"). There is no other mention of power in the speech by Irani; whereas Clinton conveys the notion of power through the issues of safety, security, threat, and economic growth. She also alludes to the notion of power by depicting the lady in Kirgizstan who is the President there. It shows the power, according to Clinton, is when one achieves a position in the hierarchy and has the ability to implement rules or run a government. She also foregrounds her ability to implement rules or bring about changes of any sort on women empowerment issues when she depicts herself as the Secretary of State. This is not at all the case with Irani. Although she



serves at an honorable position in Indian government body, she lacks the ability to redefine and project that power in her speech.

Conclusions and Future Implications

The critical analysis of the data unpacks some crucial issues in the relevant context. Both Irani and Clinton try to portray themselves as women who have authority to speak and have the power to influence. That is why they are both invited speakers. However, along with some major differences there are some similarities in their speeches--both of them are talking about change, and both of them are trying to connect themselves with the audience that comprises other activists, political figures, and followers. Thus, the impact upon these audiences defines and is defined by the speakers' personalities as public figures. However, being a veteran politician and activist, Clinton can count upon her credibility and talk about her authority in public space like this TED talk. On the contrary, as a newcomer in the field of politics, Irani cannot do that. Since she has not gathered that much authority yet, she cannot claim herself to be an agent of change. Moreover, the political ideology she adheres to never explicitly spoke about the agency of women till then (and even now that is far from being one of the main mottos of BJP). Back in 2014, whenever BJP talked about women empowerment, it centered around the notion like giving basic utilities to marginalized women. Embracing the viewpoint on uplifting the hierarchical status of women in India as compared to men, to a certain extent, was yet to find its place in public speeches by BJP leaders.

Although boasting about success in the domain of gender equality has found its currency in recent times, India, in a broad sense, is still an extremely patriarchal society till date. Even if there are rules in the government policies (which are considerably low in amount as compared to those which favor patriarchy) the implementation is anything but well-achieved so far. Thus, coming from the kind of political castle that is in no conflict with the broad patriarchal spectrum of Indian society, Irani becoming an agent of change would be unwarranted and would cause a blow to her burgeoning political career. Yet, she has to talk about women empowerment. That explains why she finds her points hitting the national and cultural identity of India by drawing upon epics and praises of the motherland as heaven. To strengthen her standpoint as a leader who is aware of the factual grounds, she talks about the study that mentions a gradual decrease in infant death over



the past several years. Her soulfully praising the motherhood of women or infusing feminine virtues into our country's/ motherland's identity is ideologically pertinent to the sociocultural belief that a woman is best when she is a mother.

In both of the speeches, there is a tension between depicting themselves as individuals as well as representatives of different countries, ideologies, and socio-political systems at the same time. In the case of Clinton, all these are well-projected, and she is able to ostensibly strike a balance between the individual Clinton and the representative Clinton of several other membership units. Whereas, in the case of Irani, individual Irani is near nonexistent in her speech. She always identifies herself as a woman, and that too, in broad general terms. She cannot exercise her power to act on her own. She is always a representative of a particular country, ideology, and socio-political system. Thus, Irani being a good orator through her marvelous use of rhetorical elements does not help her in becoming an agent of change, neither does the agency of change help her define as a strong individual in her speech.

The future implication of this sort of a study is to be developed into a more robust investigation by corroborating further analyses employing different theoretical standpoints that would sustain methodological eclecticism. Moreover, incorporating other theories of political discourse analysis can help unpack more crucial aspects on the issue of gender equality and women empowerment on a global scale. The study started as a mere investigation for finding similarities and differences in two public speeches by two extremely different public figures. However, at the end of the study, it eventually unfolds into layers of tension, ideologies, membership units, projected identities, and labels for the construction of female gender driven by socio-cultural undertones. The tension between the individual and the membership ideologies is a key factor in any kind of oration by political leaders. It emphasizes the notion of affordance by any social actor on what to embrace, how to embrace, and when to embrace. Although this is a very small-scale comparative study at a much simple theoretical level, it can inform the field of critical discourse analysis, language in action, and political science in India as well as in the United States. While India as a largely socialist country heading towards capitalism needs stronger individuals to be at the political helms, the United States, a capitalist country suffering from economic recession and



worldwide competition, also needs to redefine its political ideologies towards achieving a more homogeneous sustainable national and cultural belief system.

Works Cited

- Adams, Karen L. "Deliberate Dispute and the Construction of Oppositional stance." *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, vol. 9, 1999, pp. 231-248.
- Barnes, Jonathan, editor. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*. Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 259-286.
- Bate, Bernard. "Shifting subjects: elocutionary revolution and democracy in eighteenth-century America and twentieth-century India." *Language & Communication*, vol. 24, 2004, pp. 339-353.
- Barker, Chris. *Cultural studies and discourse analysis: A dialogue on language and identity*. Sage, 2001, pp.62-85.
- Bhatia, Aditi. "Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Press Conferences." *Discourse & Society*, vol. 17, 2006, pp. 173-203.
- Dunmire, Patricia L. "Political discourse analysis: Exploring the Language of Politics and the Politics of Language." *Language and Linguistics Compass*, vol. 6, 2012, pp. 35-751.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. *Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance*. University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Psychology Press, 2003.
- . *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Routledge, 2013.
- . "Critical and Descriptive Goals in Discourse Analysis." *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 9, 1985, pp. 739-763.
- . "Genres in Political Linguistics." *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 5, Elsevier, 2006, pp. 32-38.
- . *Language and Power*. Longman, 1989.
- . *Media Discourse*. Edward Arnold, 1995.



- . "Political Discourse in the Media: An Analytical Framework." Edited by Allan Bell and Peter Garrett, *Oxford: Blackwell*, 1998, pp. 142-162.
- Halliday, Michael AK. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, Edward Arnold, 1985.
- "Hon. Smt. Smriti Zubin Irani - Minister of HRD of Government of India - Speaker, IWC 2014." *YouTube*, uploaded by, Artoflivingwc, 9 May, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2b6Q_8iGF0k
- Hyland, Ken. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum, 2005.
- Johansson, Marjut. "Constructing Objects of Discourse in the Broadcast Political Interview." *Journal of pragmatics*, vol. 38, 2006, pp. 216-229.
- Khalida, Nurseitova, et al. "Language and Gender in Political Discourse (Mass Media Interviews)." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 70, 2013, pp. 417-422.
- Lauerbach, Gerda. "Discourse Representation in Political Interviews: The Construction of Identities and Relations Through Voicing and Ventriloquizing." *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 38, 2006, pp. 196-215.
- Moscovici, Serge, and Gerard Duveen. "Social Representations: Explorations in Social psychology." Polity Press, 2000.
- Paltridge, Brian. *Discourse analysis: An introduction. 2nd ed.*, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012, pp. 186-203.
- Proctor, Katarzyna, I. Lily, and Wen Su. "The 1st Person Plural in Political Discourse—American Politicians in Interviews and In a debate." *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 43, 2011, pp. 3251-66.
- Rai, Shirin. "Class, Caste and Gender—Women in Parliament in India." *International IDEA, Women in Parliament, Stockholm*. [http://www. idea. Int](http://www.idea.int), 2002.
- "TED Talks: Hillary Clinton speaks at TEDWomen (2010)." *YouTube*, uploaded by 2016 Hilary Clinton Watch, 27 Oct. 2013, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UbPtm1_2AnI
- Tree, Jean E. Fox, and Josef C. Schrock. "Basic Meanings of You Know and I Mean." *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 34, 2002, pp. 727-747.



- Routledge, 2013.
- . "Critical discourse analysis." *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by Deborah Schiffrin et al., 2nd ed., Blackwell, 2003, pp. 352-71.
- . "What is Political Discourse Analysis." *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 11, 1997, pp. 11-52.
- . "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis." *Discourse & Society*, vol. 4, 1993, pp. 249- 283.
- . "Discourse and the Denial of Racism." *Discourse & Society*, vol. 3, 1992, pp. 87-118.
- . *Racism and the Press: Critical Studies in Racism and Migration*. Routledge, 1991.
- . "Discourse & Society: A New Journal for a New Research Focus." *Discourse & Society*, vol. 1, 1990, pp. 5-16.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. "Genre and Field in Critical Discourse Analysis: A synopsis." *Discourse & Society*, vol. 4, 1993, pp. 193-223.
- Wilson, John. (2001). "Political Discourse." *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by Deborah Schiffrin et al. Blackwell, 2001, pp. 398-415.
- Wodak, Ruth, and & Michael Meyer, editors. *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Sage, 2009.
- Wodak, Ruth. *Disorders of Discourse*. Longman, 1996.
- . "The Discourse-Historical Approach." *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, sage, 2001, pp. 63-94.
- Wodak, Ruth, editor. (1989). *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse, vol.7* John Benjamins Publishing, 1989.
- . "Mediation between Discourse and Society: Assessing Cognitive Approaches in CDA." *Discourse Studies*, vol. 8, 2006, pp. 179-190.

Appendix

Excerpt 1/ Smriti Irani [0:31-5:52 seconds]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2b6Q_8iGF0k (current at the time of data collection)

1. Well women don't have a problem in speaking, they have a
2. problem in being heard.
3. (Omitted) [Thanks the organization for this conference]
4. So that they can come here and speak up and also be very



5. constructively heard. I had two very senior, and
6. experienced ladies give the worldview with regards to
7. global connect and conflict. While I was listening to one
8. of the pioneers in the women's movement in Europe,
9. I heard her talk about nations in pursuit of protecting the
10. national identities, I heard Ms. Anderson quote Mahatma
11. Gandhi. And when I was reflecting on this pursuit of
12. protecting national identity, my thoughts went to the Lady
13. from Sri Lanka, who is sitting here.
14. We all in our country, that is India, absorb and follow a
15. lot of values from so called epics like Ramayana.
16. Omitted [story from Ramayana]
17. Omitted [Quotes from Ramayana]
18. Lord Rama turned around and said that "my mother land, my
19. mother is so beautiful that she is greater than all the
20. heavens that human beings seek to achieve."
21. It is because India as a culture has infused the feminine
22. virtue in pursuit of a strong nation that we serve as
23. individuals not only at national cause but also at the
24. cause of humanity.
25. Omitted
26. Omitted
27. Omitted
28. Ms. Anderson spoke about conflict, which is one of the
29. worrying factors when people converge on a global platform
30. and talk about nation building, national interest, and
31. interest of humanity.
32. Well to downsize a bit Ms. Anderson, I have been forever
33. (in) conflict with the lady called Rita Bahuguna Joshi, who
34. belongs to a political ideology not similar to mine.
35. But when I walked in she embraced me warmly, and with a
36. wink and a smile she said, "I embrace you not because you
37. are BJP, I embrace you because you are a woman."
38. I then went and when I was about to sit I was warmly
39. greeted by Dr. Gaganfur from Afghanistan, A lady who serves
40. at the Minister of Women Affairs.
41. We don't know each other's language, but we all knew just
42. one thing, that we are culturally connected and especially
43. so because we are both women in the field of politics.
44. I know that conflict arises when there is widespread
45. poverty; conflict arises when there is illiteracy; conflict
46. arises when there is a race to take ownership of resources.



47. But we also know that when women are put at the helm of
48. affairs, conflict has this unnatural way of decreasing.
49. In 1996 a study was put out by Mr. Subbarao and El Raney,
50. which said, and 72 countries were part of this study, that
51. if nations in 1975 had invested in women's higher
52. education, then in 1985 those nations would have seen a
53. decline in infant deaths by 68%; if those same 72 countries
54. had put in all their resources to increase per capita
55. income of every citizen in those 72 countries the impact on
56. infant deaths would have been 0.
57. Today when I stand here as a woman I offer the opinion that
58. if you truly want to globally connect on issues of
59. humanity; if you truly want to reduce conflict then one of
60. the first steps that we as a nation, we as a world need to
61. make is to empower women.

Excerpt 2 / Hilary Clinton [0:31- 6:28 seconds]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UbPtm1_2AnI (current at the time of data collection)

1. If TED Women is in D C, I have got be there and be part of
2. this.
3. I look out at this audience and I see lots of friends and
4. so many people who have done already such an incredible
5. amount to move forward an agenda for women and girls not
6. just here in our country but around the world.
7. Now I know there is a little bit of controversy over
8. whether there should be a TED Women conference, or not.
9. Because if there were a Ted Women conference what about a
10. TED Men conference.
11. But I think the right decision was made. Because there is
12. still so much that we have to talk about women and men
13. together, about what we need to do to widen the circle of
14. opportunity for women and girls to give those of us who are
15. lucky enough and blessed enough to have so many
16. opportunities in our own life to connect with, network
17. with, contribute to that cause.
18. Because we are already seeing the power of women and girls
19. as agents of change. It's something that I believe in with
20. all of my heart. And as I travel around the country now as
21. Secretary of State with the great honor of representing the
22. United States, I have made clear that the rights and the
23. roles of women and girls will be a central tenet of
24. American foreign policy.



25. Because where girls and women flourish our values are also
26. reflected.
27. Before I go too much further in talking about what we are
28. doing in government and what I would like to challenge you
29. to join us in doing, I want to acknowledge..
30. omitted [talks about the demise of a women activist]
31. omitted [talks about the demise of a women activist]
32. I just came from Kirgizstan where there is a woman
33. president who is not only the first female in
34. a State or Government in post-soviet union central Asia,
35. but she is presiding over the first parliamentary democracy
36. in the entire region. The courage it takes for her is
37. something I draw courage from.
38. Or when I go to visit projects that women have curved out
39. literally with their own hands in places like South Africa,
40. I see in action that sense of resilience and commitment
41. that keep any of us, including me Going.
42. I know so well that there are women as we speak in our
43. country and elsewhere, who will never hear of this
44. conference and certainly could not have imagined attending,
45. but who are living the kinds of life experiences and
46. involvements that bring us here.
47. So the United States has made empowering women and girls a
48. cornerstone of our foreign policy.
49. Because women's equality is not just a moral issue, it's
50. not just a humanitarian issue, it is not just a fairness
51. issue; it is a security issue, it is a prosperity issue,
52. and it is a peace issue.
53. And therefore when I talk about why we need to integrate
54. women's issues into discussions at the highest levels
55. everywhere in the world, I am not doing it just because I
56. have a personal commitment or not just President Obama
57. cares about it, I am doing it because it's in the vital
58. interest of the United-States of America. Let women work
59. and they drive the economic growth in all sectors;
60. send the girl to school even just for one year and her
61. income dramatically increases for life and her children are
62. more likely to survive and her family more likely to be
63. healthier for years to come.
64. Give women equal rights and entire nations are more stable
65. and secure. Deny women equal rights and the instability of
66. nations are almost certain. The subjugation of women is



: An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in English
A UGC Refereed e- Journal no 45349

ISSN 2455-7544

www.daathvoyagejournal.com

Vol.3, No.2, June, 2018

67. therefore is a threat to the common security of our World
68. and to the national security of our country.