A Discursive Comparison of Trump's and Al-Kazemi's Speeches: Investigating Terrorism from Two Perspectives

Seyed Ali Jamil; Foud Motevali

Institute of Higher Education, University of Baghdad, Iraq

E-mail: jamalnour23@gmail.com

Abstract

Considering the prevalent use of political discourse in the politicized world today, especially the ever-existing east and west polarities, any attempt to conduct a critical discourse analysis can be worth considering. Knowledge of the underlying thoughts and intentions of politicians in the discourse they present to one or more nations can be interesting and useful to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners too, as they are supposed to be prepared to face authentic text types. In the present research, the samples of the speeches made by two political leaders talking about terrorism were analyzed. One speaker was Donald Trump, the president of the U.S. and the other was Al-Kazemi, the prime minister of Iraq. These two could very well represent the two opposing perspectives to terrorism, the western and the eastern. For this purpose, Van Dijk's theoretical framework was used which originally consists of 40 strategies, among which 12 were analyzed in this research. Among these strategies, some were more commonly used to influence the audience than the others (e.g. repetition). The qualitative analysis also showed that both parties attempted to exempt the *self* from the prevalent terrorism and instead blame the *other* for promoting terrorism. The western party even showed instances of putting part of the blame on his political rival in the U.S. (Hillary Clinton) for the promotion of terrorism. Finally, the findings were discussed in further detail and several conclusive remarks were made. Suggestions for further research followed the conclusion.

Keywords: *Critical Discourse Analysis; Discourse Analysis; Political Discourse; Van Dijk's Model*

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Discourse Analysis (DA) is a widespread scope that is concerned with the use of the contextualized language. As it was stressed by Tistcher *et al.* (2000, p. 42), "discourse is a broad term along with diverse definitions, that 'integrate a whole scope of meanings". DA takes into account different theoretical and methodological approaches such as linguistic, anthropology, philosophy, psychology and sociology. The nature of language is closely related to the demands that we make on it and the functions it has to serve.

In the most concrete terms, these functions are specific to a culture. "The particular form has taken by the grammatical system of language is closely related to the social and personal need that language is required to serve" (Halliday, 1978, p. 142).

Therefore, one of the important features of DA is to study authentic texts and conversations in the social context. The early DA is related to the internal structure of texts. Halliday's systematic functional linguistics is a new evolution against internal structure of texts. According to Halliday (1978), texts should encode both personal and social processes. In other words, texts should be generated, comprehended and put into a social context. Discourse analysis is based on micro and macro levels. Therefore, both linguistic and social analyses are deemed necessary. Discourses are interpreted as communicative events because discourses between people convey messages beyond that of what is said at directly. What is important in such discourse is the social information which is transferred allusively.

Indeed, in politics, language plays a significant role. According to the theorists, the close relationship between language and politics is inevitable. For instance, Fairclough (1989) indicates, more precisely, the relation between language and power as well as language use and unequal relations of power, chiefly in the modern world.

 Exploring the politicians' remarks and comments is of an utmost importance to uncover the underlying ideologies and intentions that are not always stated obviously and overtly. As it is cited in Nordlund (2003, p. 8), "it is easy to resist a peculiar viewpoint or ideology when you know it is being offered to you, but not so difficult to tolerate when the viewpoint or ideology is concealed".

Therefore, through discursive research, it is possible to study the strategies of manipulation and legitimation that are implicitly and carefully utilized throughout text and talk. The present research will aim to provide a discursive analysis of some releVant speech/comments provided by both political figures President Trump, and Al-Kazemi, the Iraqi prime minister concerning terrorism by adopting an ideology analysis framework of Van Dijk in CDA. The aim was to explore the hidden ideologies behind the use of political language.

As stressed by Wodak (2007), language is the basic social communication tool and, thus, even in the freest and most democratic communities, language is connected to power by nature. Hence, scrutinizing language, which is itself a means of power, is a potent way of examining ideological structure (as cited in Van Dijk, 1985, p. 29). Moreover, ideologies, attitudes and feelings are conveyed through language (in diverse forms, spoken or written), and through the analysis of the speakers' thoughts and emotions about a certain event.

In this regard, the present study aims to study terrorism from the viewpoint of two political figures: Trump who symbolizes the Western powers' attitudes and Al-Kazemi symbolizing the Middle-Eastern, Moslem countries' attitude towards the war-seeking, fierce faction, which has falsely been associated with Islam. Besides, the focus of the present study is on discursive analysis of their speeches in terms of Van Dijk's CDA ideology.

Considering the purpose of research, the following research questions are addressed:

  RQ1. How is Terrorism manifested in Trump's discourse according to Van Dijk's theory?

  RQ2. How is the United States presented in Trump's discourse (i.e., representation of "self")?

  RQ3. How is the Iraqi government manifested in Trump's discourse (i.e., representation of "other")?

  RQ4. How is terrorism represented in Al-Kazemi's discourse?

Therefore, it seems essential to study the political discourses for a better understanding and interpretation of the goals and intentions of politicians. This study aimed to at least heighten the consciousness of the way both power and ideology are added in language specifically, and the relation between both language and society generally. Besides, the study increases a voice in approval of applying and adVancing systemic functional grammar in doing linguistics research.

2.   Review of the Related Literature

Discourse analysis' (DA) initially was used by Zallig Harris (Jaworski & Coupland, 2002). They proposed the notion as "a method for the analysis of connected speech (or writing) … continuing descriptive linguistics beyond the limits of a single sentence at a time … correlating 'culture' and language", and expanding the concept to cover also "some early studies approaches of well-defined speech events, such as classroom interlocutions and doctor-patient interviews, with particular grammatical models in mind" (Jaworski & Coupland, 2002, p.15). According to Harris, DA is a 'method' by which a unified speech or writing is created, one with interrelated parts and as attempts made to connect society and language.

2.1. Definition of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) can be defined in various ways and from different aspects. Mostly, CDA is not a method or a theory, but "a theoretical movement – with very different - scholars who focus on social issues and not primarily on academic paradigms (Van Dijk, 2006). More specifically, CDA is a special approach to the study of text and talk that emerged from Critical Linguistics, critical semiotics and, generally, from a socio-political way of analyzing language, discourse and communication (Van Dijk, 1995). Fairclough (1995) is concerned with studying language in its relation to power and ideology, as termed Critical Discourse Analysis.

Indeed, CDA is also defined as a highly context-sensitive, democratic approach that analyzes discourse with an ethical stance that focuses on social issues and aims to improve society (Huckin, 1997). It deals with written and spoken discourse to uncover the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias in social, political, historical and economic contexts (Van Dijk, 1988; McGregor, 2003). CDA strives to uncover power imbalances, non- democratic practices and other injustices so as to stimulate recipients to corrective action (Huckin, 1997). Wodak and Reisigl (2001) points out, in this respect, that it is concerned with analyzing vague as well as clear structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In short, CDA is analyzing discourse with a stance.

Correspondingly, CDA is defined as an interdisciplinary approach to language study with a critical point of view for the purpose of studying language behavior in natural speech situations (Wodak and Ludwig 1999). Discourse analysis can critically evaluate communication within socio-cultural context (Van Dijk, 1986). CDA treats language as a kind of social practice among other types of practices, such as visual images, gestures, music, etc. (Kress, 1989). Indeed, CDA is itself anchored in a discourse, a way of constructing the process of meaning-making in society (Locke, 2004). Such meaning-making is critical, interdisciplinary and context-sensitive (Van Dijk, 2011; Wodak, 1997). After defining CDA, one can give a historical account of CDA and highlight the most important founding ancestors that developed this field.

2.2. Van Dijk's socio-psychological approach

Van Dijk concentrated on the socio-psychological side of CDA. He relies on a socio-cognitive theory and approaches linguistics from a structural and functional stance (Wodak and Meyer, 2001). CDA should be based on a theory of context, along with different disciplines, hence CDA should be

essentially diverse and multidisciplinary (Van Dijk, 2001). With a focus on its critical perspective, CDA is defined as discourse analysis with an attitude (Van Dijk, 2001). Cognition is given a great importance in the analysis of interaction, communication and discourse (Van Dijk, 2001). Like the discourse-historical approach, the socio-cognitive approach is problem-oriented. Indeed, it focuses on social problems and the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse and dominance (Van Dijk, 2001).

Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach to discourse is multidisciplinary. Since social problems are complex, CDA needs a historical, cultural, socio-economic, philosophical, logical or neurological stance, contingent on what one wishes to know (Van Dijk, 2001). Van Dijk and Kintsch's (1983) point out that the study of discourse needs an interdisciplinary background and different scientific views: linguistic analysis, psychological laboratory experiments, sociological field studies, computer understanding of text and so on. Indeed, a range of analytic methods, involving textual, pragmatic and cognitive approaches, has been applied to political discourse and the critique of racist discourse in media and other areas (Van Dijk, 1986; Chilton & Shäffner, 1997). Moreover, CDA has to take into account some structures, strategies and functions of text and talk, such as grammatical, pragmatic, interactional, stylistic, rhetorical, semiotic, narrative, etc. (Van Dijk, 2001).

More specifically, the socio-cognitive approach stresses the cognitive dimension of CDA. Indeed, this approach enhances the idea that modern power has a primary cognitive dimension (Van Dijk, 1993). The management of the public mind is conceptualized in terms of social cognition. Socially shared representations and mental operations, like interpretation, thinking, arguing, learning, determine social cognition (Van Dijk, 1993). According to Schank and Abelson (1977), knowledge plays a crucial role in such cognitive processes via knowledge structures or 'scripts' (as cited in Van Dijk, 1993). A little, however, is known about the structures and operations of social cognition, like opinion, ideologies, attitudes, norms and values (Van Dijk, 1993).

Finally, Van Dijk's theories of ideology and knowledge, based on the discourse analytical approach, are multidisciplinary. They are manifested within a conceptual triangle that links society, discourse and cognition in the framework of critical discourse analysis. At this level, one has to explain the main principles on which CDA is based. These principles are clarified in the following section.

2.3. Language and Politics

Language plays an important role in manifesting political wills and accompanying political actions (Gelabert, 2004). Politics and language are inextricably intertwined. Just as political activity needs Language oral or written as its vehicle, language maintains structures of domination and resistance.

In fact, the power and dominance of groups can be measured by their control over and access to discourse. In addition, as always, the most effective form of dominance is when the minds of the dominated can be influenced in such a way that they accept it, and act in the interest of the powerful out of their own free will. Geis (2012) has noticed as well that language is a main preoccupation for politicians, who take great care in their linguistic choices during electoral campaigns. Even once elected, language will become one of their main preoccupations: public opinion and the media scrutinize and criticize any lack of fulfillment of electoral promises, each formulated verbally. Politicians are ridiculed for their lack of linguistic command or praised for their skill. Decades later after their death, Winston Churchill in Great Britain or John F. Kennedy in the United States are still remembered for their brilliant oratory skills (as cited in Gelabert, 2004). So from all the above, it can be seen that language is closely related with politics. On the other hand, politics is expressed in the society through language. Therefore, in the study of world politics, language is a vital component

.

3. Methodology

In the present study, a discursive-based analysis was conducted and analyzed based on the Van Dijk's (2000) strategies. Besides, the talks and speeches of any political figures can be analyzed from Van Dijk's viewpoints. This chapter elaborates on the details of the methods involved.

3.1. Materials of the Study

The materials analyzed in the current study were adopted from several newspapers (the archives) representing the speeches provided by two known political figures: Trump's and Al Kazemi's political speeches concerning the terrorism. In reality, all the texts were taken from the news websites. The related data were downloaded from the White House Website at www.whitehouse.org as well as the Guardian at www. Guardian.co.uk. Besides, the presentations that were supposed to be selected here were given by the US. President in a span of time from 2016 to 2020. In order to make the research more palpable, the researcher founded this analysis on a sample of comments. Thus, the researcher focused on 4 excerpts of Trump's and Al Kazemi's comments which were randomly selected from 10 of his political speeches and press conferences regarding terrorism in the country of Iraq and the world from 2016 to 2020. Actually, the context of all the speeches was Iraq and the U.S.A but in a variety of situations such as venues such as the U.S Department of State., U.S Congress, the U.S Naval Academy, National Archives Museum and the White House.

3. 2. Analytical Framework

In the present study, the researcher used Van Dijk's (2000) framework of analysis. Van Dijk's (2000) model was used to detect the discursive strategies, and was used by the four newspapers to analyze the discourse of them. This framework was very comprehensive in terms of the strategies included and, thus, was selected as the theoretical framework for analysis in the present study. Hence, forty strategies were explained for better understanding.

Actor description: all discourse on people and action involves various types of actor description. Thus, actors may be described as members of groups or as individuals, by first or family name, function, role or group name, as specific, unspecific, by their actions, or (alleged) attributes, by their position or relation to other people, and so on.

Authority: Many speakers in an argument have recourse to the fallacy of mentioning authorities to support their case, usually organizations or people who are above the fray of party politics, or who are generally recognized experts or moral leaders. International organizations (such as the United Nations, or Amnesty), scholars, the media, the church or the courts often have that role. Moreover, it shows the power and supporting by legal power e.g. the UN, the EU or the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Burden: Argumentation is often based on various standard arguments, or topoi, which represent premises that are taken for granted, as self-evident and as sufficient reasons to accept the conclusion.

Categorization: As we also know from social psychology, people tend to categorize people, especially when others are involved. Once groups have thus been distinguished and categorized (with lexically variable terms), they can be attributed positive or negative characteristics.

Comparison: Different from rhetorical similes, comparisons as intended here typically occur in talk about others, namely when speakers compare in-groups and out-groups.

Consensus: This is a political strategy, which is used especially when out-groups threaten a county, so cross-party and national consensus is used.

Counterfactual: "What would happen, if..." is the standard formula that defines counterfactuals. In argumentation, they play an important role, because they allow people to demonstrate absurd consequences when an alternative is being considered.

Disclaimer: This strategy is used to keep face by stating our positive characteristics first, and then focus on their negative attributes. In other hand, it is used to save face first by stating the writer good will and unbiased opinion of others then focusing on negative attributes of others.

Distancing: A socio-cognitive device, which may, for instance, be employed by the use of demonstrative pronouns instead of naming or describing others.

Dramatization: Together with hyperbolas, dramatization is a familiar way to exaggerate the facts in one's favor.

Evidentially: Claims or points of view in argument are more plausible when speakers present some evidence or proof for their knowledge or opinions. This may happen by references to authority figures or institutions, or by various forms of Evidentially: how or where did they get the information. Thus, people may have read something in the paper, heard it from reliable spokespersons, or have seen something with their own eyes.

Example /illustration: A powerful move in argumentation is to give concrete examples, often in the form of a vignette or short story, illustrating or making more plausible a general point defended by the speaker. More than general truths, concrete examples have not only the power to be easily imaginable (as episodic event models) and better memorable, but also to suggest impelling forms of empirical proof.

Explanation: Social psychology uses the notion "Ultimate Attribution Error," according to which negative acts of in-group members tend to be explained (away), whereas the negative acts of out-group members tend to be explained in terms of inherent properties of such actors (e.g., because they are unreliable or criminal).

Fallacies: Disputes about contested point of view and opinion are riddled with normative breaches of proper argumentation, that is, with fallacies. These may pertain to any element of the argumentative event, namely to the nature of the conclusion, the relations among the premises and the conclusion, the relationship between speaker and recipients, and so on.

Generalization: Most debates involve forms of particularization, for instance by giving examples, and Generalization, in which concrete events or actions are generalized and possibly abstracted from, thus making the claim broader, while more generally applicable.

History as lesson: Sometimes a situation is compared to positive or negative events in history, as either a positive self-presentation or negative other-presentation strategy.

Humanitarianism: Invitation of the readers/ listeners to pay more attention to human rights, or show empathy for the situation of in-group members.

Hyperbole: or exaggerating a device for the enhancement of meaning, for either positive self-presentation or negative other-presentation.

Implication: For many 'pragmatic' (contextual) reasons, speakers do not (need) to say everything they know or believe. Indeed, a large part of discourse remains implicit, and such implicit information may be inferred by recipients from shared knowledge or attitudes and thus constructed as part of their

mental models of the event or action represented in the discourse. Apart from this general cognitive-pragmatic rule of implicitness (Do not express information the recipients already have or may easily infer), there are other, interactional, socio-political and cultural conditions on implicitness, such as those monitored by politeness, face keeping or cultural norms or propriety.

Illegality: A device by which the out-group members are characterized as criminal or law breaker. It is used as a device for the overall strategy of negative other-representation.

Interaction and context: The debate is a form of interaction between the two sides of the debate (here, Iran and the U.S.), so a large part of the properties of this debate can only be described and explained in an interactional framework. Many of the actions are not only political interaction, but also they may be called ideological interaction.

Irony: Accusation may come across as more effective when they are not made point blank (which may violate face constraints) but in apparently lighter forms of irony.

Illegality: Part of the argument is to have recourse to the law or regulations, which is a standard argument.

Lexicalization: Similar meanings may thus be variably expressed in different words, depending on the position, role, goals, point of view or opinion of the speaker, that is, as a function of context features.

Metaphor: Abstract, complex, unfamiliar, new or emotional meanings may thus be made more familiar and more concrete. An example that Van Dijk (2000) gave is using flood-metaphors to refer to refugees and their arrival, symbolizing the unstoppable threat of immigration.

Implication: A piece of information may be left implicit because it may be inconsistent with the overall strategy of positive self-presentation. Negative details about in-groups" actions, thus tend to remain implicit.

National self-glorification: A strategy, which is used by referring to the honorable history of one's country, or by praising its principles and traditions.

Negative other presentation (derogation): the categorization of people in in-groups and out-groups, and even the division between good and bad out-groups, is not value-free, but imbued with ideologically based applications of norms and values.

Norm expression: Anti-racist discourse is of course strongly normative, and decries racism, discrimination, prejudice and anti-immigration policies in sometimes-explicit norm-statements about what we should or should not do.

Number Game: The use of numbers and statistics in the discourse is a means to show that the writers/speakers are objective and that what they are discussing is not just their opinions but facts.

Openness, honesty: speakers suggest that their argument satisfies the positive values of honesty and openness, while at the same time indulging in negative other-presentation or even blatant derogation. This reversal of the anti-racist norm in increasingly more intolerant values is characteristic of contemporary conservative positions and discourses about minorities, race relations and immigration.

Polarization, Us-Them categorization: This is a prevalent semantic strategy, which divides positive self-presentation (semantic macrostrategy). People in two groups of in-group (us) and out-group (them).

Populism (political strategy): The basic strategy is to claim that the people (or everybody) do not support the contested points, which is also a well-known argumentation fallacy.

Presupposition: Van Dijk compares discourses to icebergs, in the sense that most of the meanings of a text are not explicitly expressed but presupposed to be known by the recipients. Presuppositions are used typically to speak about the controversial ideas or to assume the truth of some preposition when such truth is not accepted at all.

Pseudo- ignorance: This strategy may be used to derogate out-groups without any verification. In this case, speakers/ writers do not have specific information about a subject but implicitly put forward that they know about it. This kind of an 'apparent knowledge' generally appears in disclaimers, like: "I do not know, but…"

Reasonableness: A familiar move of argumentative strategies is not only to show that the arguments are sound, but also that the speaker is 'sound', in the sense of rational or reasonable. Such a move is especially releVant when the argument itself may seem to imply that the speaker is unreasonable, or biased. Therefore, the move also has a function in the overall strategies of positive self-presentation and impression management.

Repetition: Repetition as a rhetorical device has a specific function in the general strategy of emphasizing our positive things and their negative ones.

Situation description: Debates are not limited to the description of them in relation to us. In addition, the actions, experiences and whole situations need to describe. Indeed, definitions of the situation are crucial to make a point, because the way they are described may suggest implications about causes, reasons, consequences and evaluations.

Vagueness: Speakers/writers may make use of vague expressions like: few, a lot, very, thing, low, and high in order not to give enough information to the readers/ listeners either as a positive self-presentation or a negative other-presentation.

Victimization: There is a binary us-them pair of in-groups and out-groups. This means that when the others tend to be represented in negative terms, and especially when they are associated with threats, then the in-group needs to be represented as a victim of such a threat.

3.3. Procedures (Data Collection and Analysis)

In the present research, the researcher gathered the presented speeches of two known political figures from two countries with diverse geographical background as well as the cultural and religious backgrounds, the prime minster of Iraq president Trump and Al-Kazemi, and discussed their speeches and discursive remarks about terrorism in the Middle East and the world. Besides, the researcher researched on their comments by utilizing strategies provided by Van Dijk, (2000) qualitatively. Besides, in the present research, the researcher intended to apply framework of analysis suggested by Van Dijk's (2000). Indeed, to discover the discursive strategies, which have been used throughout their speeches as well as newspapers, the discourse of the politicians Van Dijk's (2000) model was implemented. It originally consists of 40 strategies. Thus, the approach taken was qualitative and the method was qualitative content analysis. All results are presented along with extracts and samples for the texts analyzed. Instances are provided for the strategies used by the two speakers (political leaders).

4. Results

4.1. Discursive Analysis of President Trump's Speeches on Terrorism Based on Van Dijk's Framework

In August 15, 2016, the US. president, Donald Trump cast some remarks on terrorism. However, in his speeches about American nation, president Trump resorts to the strategy of *Dramatization*

described by Van Dijk as a familiar way to exaggerate the facts in one's favor. So in the following excerpt of the news reported, this strategy includes some hyperbole that the president uses in favor of the USA:

President Trump described America as an "arrogant," "dismissive" "derisive" and a "colonial power." He informed other countries that he would be speaking up about America's "past errors". He pledged that we would no longer be a "senior partner" that "sought to dictate our terms." He lectured CIA officers of the need to acknowledge their mistakes, and described Guantanamo Bay as a "rallying cry for our enemies."

Thus, the last statement mentioned in the above speeches *He lectured CIA officers of the need to acknowledge their mistakes, and described Guantanamo Bay as a "rallying cry for our enemies*." In other words, *"rallying cry for our enemies*" is also a good example of hyperbole and dramatization which is a semantic rhetorical device to exaggerate one's act based on his or her own favor.

Another strategy concentrated by Van Dijk is the strategy of *disclaimer* that is described as a strategy used to keep face by stating our positive characteristics first, and then focus on their negative attributes.   Using this strategy, the writer's good will and unbiased attitudes toward the others then focuses on negative opinions of others and in fact, first, is used to save face by using this type of strategy. In reality, this strategy has been strongly used in the provided speeches of the president Trump concerning the Terrorism. Thus, see the statement: "In November of 2015, terrorists went on a shooting rampage in Paris that slaughtered 130 people, and wounded another 368. France is suffering gravely, and the tourism industry is being massively affected in a most negative way". Here, in the above excerpt, the president tries to sympathize with and mention the catastrophe which happened in Paris, and urge the American to believe his comments and his policies and provides the positive points in his speeches and shows that his policy is against terrorism and takes actions to stand against it.

Similarly, as the third strategy found in this text, *empathy* is defined in Van Dijk's words as a feeling of *empathy* to in-group members, represented as victims. For example, consider the following speeches of presidents Trump:

A few weeks ago, in Germany, a refugee armed with an axe wounded five people in a gruesome train attack. Only days ago, an ISIS killer invaded a Christian church in Normandy France, forced an 85-year-old priest to his knees, and slit his throat before his congregation.

Logically, the president Trump uses the strategy of *empathy* and *huminatirism* based on Van Dijk's words and sympathizes with the people of Germany and those victims in the church of French and he wants to show that it is a very important point and United States is also after terrorism and the ISIS defeats not only in Germany and French but also all the Middle East.

As the fourth strategy among Van Dijk's strategies, *evidentially* is observed in the words of the president, that is defined as Claims or points of view in argument are more plausible when speakers present some evidence or proof for their knowledge or opinions. Therefore, in his speeches on terrorism, president Trump reports several evidences and resorts to some in order to show that he is not to blame for the rise of Terrorism. To prove the claim*,* president Trump mentions the actions of the US. ex-president and says:

"When President Obama delivered his address in Cairo, no such moral courage could be found. Instead of condemning the oppression of women and gays in many Muslim nations, and the systematic violations of human rights, or the financing of global terrorism, President Obama tried to draw an equivalency between our human rights record and theirs".

Nevertheless, in the above statement, the president mentions that the previous presidents of the US. have been also blamed for the rise of the terrorism in all nations.

Explanation is regarded as the fifth strategy which is in the words of president Trump in his speeches on terrorism known as "Social psychology uses the notion "Ultimate Attribution Error," based on which negative acts of in-group members tend to be explained (away), whereas the negative acts of out-group members tend to be explained in terms of the inherent properties of such actors. However, in his provided speeches, henceforth, it is seen in the statement mentioned by *"Pride in our institutions, our history and our values should be taught by parents and teachers, and impressed upon all who join our society,* based on Van Dijk's definition, the president concentrates on in-group positive aspects and not the negative aspects whereas, many politicians believe that it's an untrue claim and the president Trump is not sincere in this concern.

The *implication* as the sixth strategy mentioned here is evident in the president's argumentations concerning the terrorism and his counterterrorism actions; nevertheless, one aspect of that is that the speaker put the ball in the others' games. Definitely, such implicit information may be inferred by recipients from shared knowledge or attitudes and thus constructed as part of their mental models of the event or action represented in the discourse and a large part of discourse remains implicit. So, both the president and the audiences have a shared knowledge about the terrorism as a terrorist group and it made the audiences ready to accept the negative aspect and points about the terrorism in the president speech. Besides, based on Van Dijkian ideology (1983), in his provided speech on terrorism, president Trump implies that the share of America in doing the counterterrorist actions is very high in comparison with other nations. He also implies that assimilation is not an act of hostility, but an expression of compassion: *Our system of government, and our American culture, is the best in the world and will produce the best outcomes for all who adopt it.*

The *illegality* was found as the next strategy in the speeches of the President Trump. It was frequently highlighted in the speeches made on December 7, 2015 by the president Barack Obama too. Illegality means a device by which the out-group members are characterized as criminal or law breaker. Here, the president calls them criminals in a sentence "*They are criminals and they had stockpiled assault weapons, ammunition, and pipe bombs*". So, analytically speaking, the president calls out-groups amongst all terrorists as the criminal who attacked the America as well as the other regions. Another application of this strategy is that part of the argument is to have recourse to the law or regulations, which is a standard argument. So, the president in his speeches mentions the united nations as an organization that legally investigates people who are oppressed and harmed in the terrorist attacks as he remarks:

"*The subcommittee estimates her plan would impose a lifetime cost of roughly $400 billion when you include the costs of healthcare, welfare, housing, schooling, and all other entitlement benefits that are excluded from the State Department's placement figures; each of them served their fellow citizens and all of them were part of our American family*".

As the eighth strategy, *lexicalization,* is also seen much prominently in the speech delivered by the president; henceforth, this strategy is defined by Van Dijk (1998) as meanings that might be stated in different words, based on the role, position, goals, point of view or opinion of the speaker. Nevertheless, using a critical way of speech regarding terrorist attacks using a variety of words and expressions, the presidents uses the verbs *execute*, *injure* and *shooting* to express his own remarks on the terrible deeds of presidents:

In June, 49 Americans were executed at the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, and another 53 were injured. It was the worst mass shooting in our history, and the worst attack on the LGTBQ community in our history.

The ninth strategy that requires attention here is the type of strategy of *reasonableness* that means a familiar move of argumentative strategies that not just reveal that the arguments are sound, but also that the speaker is 'sound', in the sense of rational or reasonable. So, here, the president provides some logics

and reasonable arguments regarding the USA actions against terrorism and counterterrorist actions. For instance, he reminds and points out to America the counterterrorist actions and says:

"First, our military will continue to hunt down terrorist plotters in any country where it is necessary. In Iraq and Syria, airstrikes are taking out ISIL leaders, heavy weapons, oil tankers, and infrastructure. And since the attacks in Paris, our closest allies—including France, Germany, and the United Kingdom—have ramped up their contributions to our military campaign, which will help us accelerate our effort to destroy ISIL".

In this statement, the speaker by revealing the sound arguments through the use of provocative words such as *confront*, *discredit* and *defeat* tries to provoke the addressee. The first sentence has the aim to attract the audience or addressee.

Through the first sentence, Trump also announced to the citizens of the United States to confront terrorism. In the next sentence, Trump stated, "*we will develop new ways to counter ... our nation or threaten our society"*. This sentence was intentionally placed as the last word because Trump wanted to enhance the strength of confrontation toward terrorism. The initial topic of the second sentence is about developing new ways to counter those who use new domains "*to attack our nation or threaten our society*". Here, Trump ignored the fact that the society also includes Muslims and Islam believers. There are improper nationalistic strategies enhanced by Donald Trump since the Muslim society that lived in the United States are to take the blame for the fault and the failure that they have never done. On the contrary, rather than solving the internal conflict between the Americans who put the blame on the Muslim community that has played no role in terrorism, Trump precisely tries to solve an external conflict that have not come yet.

The tenth strategy highlighted in the speeches of the president Trump was *repetition* which is defined by Van Dijk (2004) as the frequency of the positive remarks about our own and negative ones about the others. Thus, Donald Trump blamed the previous presidents of the United States and freed himself from the present conditions in Iraq. As he says:

"The failures in Iraq were compounded by Hillary Clinton's disaster in Libya. President Obama has since said he regards Libya as his worst mistake. According to then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, the invasion of Libya was nearly a split decision, but Hillary Clinton's forceful advocacy for the intervention was the deciding factor".

Therefore, based on the strategy of repetition, Donald Trump freed himself from the catastrophic situation in Iraq and blamed *Hillary Clinton* as the agent of the American involvement at Iraq war.

Here is another example for repetition in the following excerpt:

"Altogether, under the Clinton plan, you'd be admitting hundreds of thousands of refugees from the Middle East with no system to vet them, or to prevent the radicalization of their children. The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us why she believes immigration from these dangerous countries should be increased without any effective system to screen who we are bringing in".

Therefore, based on the context shown in the above-mentioned paragraph, the lexical choice "dangerous countries" refers to the Middle East countries. Trump selected the bad words to represent the negative self-perspective toward Middle Eastern countries. This is one of the explanations of his argument to prevent the United States from terrorism. Besides, the Middle East addresses the identity of many Muslims living in and migrating into the United States.   However, the term *dangerous* is used since the doer of bombing and terrorism is Muslim. Here, Trump tries to defend his argument for the National Security of United States. The administration needs to carefully choose the right judgment which limited the refugees from the Middle East.

As the *eleventh* strategy, Van Dijk et al.'s (1983) *vagueness* means a situation in which speakers/writers may make use of vague expressions like: few, a lot, very, thing, low, and high in order not to give precise information to the readers/listeners either as a positive self-presentation or a negative other-presentation. Therefore, discursively analyzing the president's remarks, it can be stated that this strategy is not far from expectation in his speeches, for instance, Trump proves this again and again. Here is an instance:

Hillary Clinton lacks[little) the judgement, the temperament and the moral character to lead this nation. Importantly, she also lacks the mental and physical stamina to take on ISIS, and all the many adversaries we face – not only in terrorism, but in trade and every other challenge we must confront to turn this country around.

Therefore, using the above expressions, based on Van Dijk's view, the president attacks his enemy and says that the weakness of *Clinton* brought about problems and the rise of the terrorism.

Finally, as the twelfth Van Dijkian strategies, the researcher discovered the strategy of the *victimization* in the speech of the Donald Trump. Indeed, the current strategy is defined by Van Dijk as the existence of binary *us-them* pair of in-groups and out-groups. This means that when the others tend to be represented in negative terms, and especially when they are associated with threats, then the in-group should be represented as a victim of such a threat. Nevertheless, the president Donald Trump mentions the victims in a sentence such as "*The Boston Marathon Bombing wounded and maimed 264 people, and ultimately left five dead – including 2 police officers".* Moreover, he adds that "*Last December, 14 innocent Americans were gunned down at an office party in San Bernardino, another 22 were injured".* Then, the president threatens them by these words "*we will defeat Radical Islamic Terrorism, just as we have defeated every threat we have faced in every age before. But we will not defeat it with closed eyes, or silenced voices*. Therefore, by uttering these words the president proves his claims and according to the rhetorical art used by Trump in his speech he tried to get his people to join forces to unite to make America a much better country. After all said so far, this is the final goal of the statement: bringing listeners to invite and accept it as well

4.2. Discursive Analysis of Al-Kazemi's Speeches on Terrorism based on Van Dijk's Framework

In September 2020, the prime minister of Iraq, Al-Kazemi provided a speech concerning the general challenges of the country and specially the issue of terrorism that in the recent years has paralyzed the nation of Iraq. However, investigating this issue analytically and discursively, the researcher aimed to discuss the prime minister's speeches from Van Dijkian viewpoint. Actually, such as any other politician figure, the prime minister, Al-Kazemi, utilizes the discourse strategies and ideologies pinpointed by Van Dijk (1983). The first strategy seen in the words of the prime minister is *actor description* strategy as defined by Van Dijk (1983) as all discourse on people and action involving various types of actor description. Thus, this strategy is defined and explained about the acting members of groups or as individuals, elaborated by first or family name, role or group name, function, as specific, unspecific, by their actions, or (alleged) attributes, by their position or relation to other people, and so on. Consequently, in the discursive description of the in-group, the prime minister, memorizes and names Iraqi people and mentions some institutions as he says:

"The members of this national service played an important role in destroying ISIS terrorist groups and are still attacking terrorist gangs based in remote areas. In recent months, during Operation Al-Sil al-Jarf, the armed forces led by ISIL's number two man in the anti-terrorism service, along with dozens, killed hundreds of members of the terrorist group.

Accordingly, at the beginning of his speech, the prime minister uses another strategy called *categorization* defined in Van Dijkian terms as tending to categorize people, particularly when others are involved. Once groups have been minimized and categorized (with lexically variable terms) they can be regarded both as negative or positive features. Thus, here, Al-Kazemi, the prime minister classifies the terrorist groups as a very occupying group with dark and non-human objectives which are the enemy of all people and in Iraq and also other categories in his speech described as positive characters and as friends when he says:

The Commander-in-Chief of the Iraqi Armed Forces stressed the need to pursue terrorist networks through international and regional cooperation to dry up the roots of this support and funding, and said that this was part of a broader diplomatic effort to establish networks related to national and economic interests are shared between the countries of the region.

The next strategy used by the prime minister of Iraq which is among the strategies proposed by Van Dijk, is *comparison* defined as those typically happening in talks about the others, namely when speakers compare in-groups and out-groups. Therefore, here, the political figure makes a comparison between the groups as brave, confident, and continues as below:

All Iraqi security forces, from the army to the police, al-Hashd al-Shabi, the Peshmerga, the National Security Service, the intelligence, etc., contributed to this success since they are brave and they have pre-defined objectives, but the counter-terrorism forces were different from other forces because their main and special responsibility was to fight. It is with terrorism".

The above-mentioned statement includes the art of rhetoric since the prime minister positions himself in a positive representation and invites its people to maintain the nation's sovereignty and to restore the nation of Iraq to a country not intervening in any terrorist hostility and by resorting to Van Dijkian strategy of *comparison* he describes Iraqi forces more courageous and thus he is trying to strengthen their sprit.

As the next strategy used, the *consensus* is described as a situation where a political strategy is utilized particularly when out-groups bully a county, so cross-party and international agreement is used. In fact, the Iraqi prime minister, AL-Kazemi, asks all Iraqi friends, allies, and fellow citizens to check this challenge that the nation of Iraq is facing at the moment. Accordingly, in his speeches, he says: "*The nation of Iraq should be vigilant enough regarding the harms done to Iraq and as he mentioned, 1.6 million of them were internally displaced and many of them were mortared"*.

Moreover, the next Van Dijkian strategy is *Hyperbole* which is the kind of expression about the fact that the Iraqi prime minister utilized in a few utterances presented below:

"Our forces Al-Taremieh, North of Baghdad, Iraq has stepped up thousands of operations against ISIS terrorists since the Baghdad bombings, and has killed many senior members of the Terrorist members, including the "ISIL governor in Iraq".

Therefore, in the above excerpt, the use of the words "thousands "and "many" is regarded as the use of hyperbole in language. The meaning of those words deals with the quantity of the many terrorist members in the past event based on the speaker's argument. This use of quantity is to symbolize the great amount 'that can be represented trough the word *thousands* and *millions*.

Also, in the provided speeches by Al-Kazemi, through the *Humanitarianism* strategy that is employed in favor of the in-group members such as the strategy of *empathy* all the politicians and nations are invited to focus on the violated rights of human in Iraq and Syria. In his speech, he points out some facts about this violated right when he says:

"Based on the statistics, in Iraq near to 1.6 million people were killed, displaced and many of them were martyred and he also sympathetically explains the conditions as mass area of the country were occupied by Terrorist groups; however, the mutual trust in the states and among the local security forces was dangerously low".

The next strategy, the strategy of the *illegality*, is much concentrated and focused in the speeches made by the Iraqi prime minister Al-Kazemi. The illegality means a device through which the members of the out-group are personified as criminal or law breaker. Here, the prime minister calls them criminals in a sentence:

"The terrorist group as the occupants in his homeland reminds their attack as a very non-human action and he mentions that "our concentration is to help educating and supporting that all the allied nations of Iraq are required to conduct negotiation and particularly diffuse the communal tensions in the aftermath of the terrorists' wars at Iraq so that displaced families can safely return to their homes, and to short-circuit the potential cycles of revenge violence among tribal leaders".

According to Van Dijk et al. (1983), vagueness means a situation in which speakers/writers may make use of vague expressions like: few, a lot, very, thing, low, and high in order not to give exact information to the readers/ listeners either as a positive self-presentation or a negative other-presentation. However, the prime minister uses this strategy and talks about its opponents and Iraq's democratic situation in an ambiguous way:

"The interim government of Al-Kazemi faces many challenges until the early elections of 2021 while the prime- minister opened his eyes wisely, including the economic crisis after the fall of oil prices, the new coronavirus pandemic, and the presence of terrorism that continues to threaten the security of the country.

Therefore, in the above excerpt, the prime minister has pictured himself throughout the statement of" o*pened his eyes wisely*" while simultaneously picturing the problems ahead of his nation and intends to make the people understand the problems, too.

Lastly, in the rhetoric art of speech, the prime minister states:

"Our nation has proved its determination against the Takfiri terrorism of ISIS. The desire for the life of our compatriots in the fight against the evil crime of Bab al-Sharqi was a unique message of pride and pride".

According to the rhetorical art used by the prime minister in his speech, he tried to get his people to join forces and unite to make Iraq a much better country. And we can say that this has been the final goal of the statement" to make listeners invite and accept well. Therefore, in the last speech, the sentence above is included in the art of rhetoric since the prime minster positions itself in a positive representation and invites its people to maintain Iraq soverneity by mentioning the glorious past of Iraq in fighting against the terrorism and restore the Iraqi state to a country free from their lives. The sentence used by the prime minster is very actual since it really helps him as a political figure to end his speech. That way, the people will accept all the statements that he conveyed.

5.   Discussions

The present research was a discourse analysis. It adopted Van Dijk's framework to analyze the political speeches of two politicians each representative of its own nation, one western and one eastern. There were twelve strategies for all of which some instances were found in both speeches and elaborated on in the previous chapter. Yet, some strategies prevailed more such as the repetition strategy. They

showed how the two leaders used as many strategies possible to influence their audience. Though most strategies were found to be used by both politicians, it seemed that the western party tried its best to portray a guilty role of the eastern peer in terroristic acts during the past years while the eastern counterpart attempted to exempt itself of the alleged convictions. Both were trying to highlight a positive face of themselves and highlight the negative, untruthful and interfering character of the other. These will be further discussed below.

The first research question asked: *How is terrorism manifested in Trump's discourse*? It can be said that in the first speech Trump frequently used repetition to glorify the Israel civilization in Jerusalem. Then in the second speech, the use of the pronoun 'us', 'we' and 'our' symbolized the unity which became the dominant result to indicate the topic. Then the last result found in the third speech was the use of lexical choice. It represented the unfavorable images of certain people or groups. Syntactically, each linguistic feature was used by Trump to manipulate his language to enhance his persuasive strategies and his political perspective. Besides, using the strategy of sympathy, Donald Trump attempted to picture the dark and non-human actions of terrorist groups.

As for the second question of the study, throughout picturing the self- or self-representation, Donald Trump used the strategy of repetition (positive remarks about our own and negative ones about the others) and tried to use this strategy to free himself from the catastrophic situation in Iraq and blamed *Hillary Clinton* as the agent of the American for involvement at Iraq war. Besides, Donald Trump tried to tell the audience that there are many enemies and they must be careful. In this speech scheme, Donald trump defined the enemy as a killer, radical Islam, and gunman. Trump also expressed Hillary Clinton's negative self-representation that wants America to maintain. To shed more light on this question, it can be stated that Van Dijkian strategies of *Empathy*, *Implication, Disclaimer*, and *Reasonableness* which represent a familiar move of argumentative strategies not only showed that the arguments are sound, but also that the speaker (Trump) used them to indicate a positive picture from the American and himself and yet the negative pictures of others.

The third question of the study explored how Trump represented the Iraqi government. Therefore, the main intention of Trump's political speeches can be pursued in the phrase "*The Middle East is a region rich with culture, spirit, and history. Its people are brilliant, proud and diverse. Vibrant and strong. But the incredible future awaiting this region is held at bay by bloodshed, ignorance and terror*". Here, the negative representation pointed at the Middle Eastern civilization. Trump recognized the future of the Middle East as bloodshed, ignorance and terror. Meanwhile, the researcher found the strategies of creating enemy images used by Trump to provoke American fellow to prevent the disastrous future that may happen to the United States. Then going to the next stages, Trump used the rhetoric art of speaking that emerges at the end of the speech. According to the context, the region is referred to the Middle East.

Trump used the phrase "rich with culture, spirit and history" to represent the greatness of the Middle East. On the contrary, Trump selected the words "bloodshed', "ignorance" and "terror" to represent the frightening possibilities of the future of the Middle East. Thus, the lexicon chosen by the speaker to deliver his speech has the aim of reminding the American fellow that the greatness of the country can be destroyed by terror. Here, Trump tried to show the aphorism to provocative American fellow to prevent the horrible future that may come to the United States. By using aphorism and the bad words such as "bloodshed", Trump aimed to build the nationalism toward American citizens to protect their own country from terror.

To answer the last question of the study which was related to the discursive speeches of the next political figure, Al-Kazemi, used many of the Van Dijkian strategies by concentrating on the issue of Terrorism. Particularly, the prime minister mentioned another strategy of the categorization defined in Van Dijkian terms as people tending to categorize people, particularly when others are involved. Thus, here, Al-Kazemi, the prime minister classified the terrorist groups as a very occupying group with dark

and non-human objectives which are the enemy of all people and in Iraq and also other categories in his speech described as positive and friends when he concentrates on them.

Besides, the supreme leader of Iraq used the Van Dijkian strategies mentioned in Table (4.1.), such as *dramatization, empathy, categorization, comparison, consensus, illegality, vagueness and hyperbole and* mingling it with power of language by using the rhetorical devices and aforementioned strategies to depict his own and his nation's hatred and enmity of the terrorism and ISIS which has committed unrests at Iraq nation.   For example, using the strategy of comparison included the art of rhetoric since the Prime Minister positions himself in a positive representation and invites its people to maintain the nation's sovereignty and restore the nation of Iraq to a country absent from any terrorist hostility and by using Van Dijkian strategy of *comparison* he describes the Iraqi forces more courageous and backs them up emotionally and morally.

6.   *Conclusions*

Political discourse can always be a potent source of analysis for researchers specially in the politicized world today. Thus, politics lend itself to critical discourse analysis. To do so, there is a need for a sound and reliable analytic framework. In the present research we used Van Dijk's framework to analyze the discourse presented by two political figures, one representing the west superpower and the other representing the east world. The topic was terrorism, which is still another heated discussion at a global scale. In the light of the present findings, we could conclude that the two political leaders used as many strategies as possible to exempt themselves of the responsibilities for terroristic acts and instead highlight the negative face of the opponent. The western party even attributed the terrorism partly to one of his political rivals too (in America). He did not want to take responsibility of any little part of the terrorism initiated in the U.S. and transported to the whole world. The eastern counterpart, similarly aimed to stand against this attributed terrorism and send it back to the western peer.

Overall, it seems that such analytic works of research can illuminate the nuances of the thoughts and intentions underlying the speech addressed to one or more whole nations. When the audience is as wide as a nation, for sure, the details of the speech are worthier of investigation. Such works of research can bring to light how the political representative describes the *self* and the *other* in his/her speech and how s/he attempts to influence people worldwide.

References

Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and politics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discours as social interaction: discourse as social interactions* (Vol. 2, pp. 206-230). (Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction). SAGE.

Jaworshki, A. & Coupland, N. (2002). *The Discourse Reader.* New York: Routledge.

Kress, G. (1989). History and Language: towards a social account of language change. Journal of Pragmatics 13 (445-466).

Locke, T. (2004). Critical discourse analysis. London and New York: Continuum.

McGregor, S. (2003). Critical science approach: A primer. *Kappa Omicron Nu Working Paper Series*. Retrieved from http://www.kon.org/cfp/critical_science_primer.pdf

Nordlund, M. (2003). *An essay of linguistic manipulation: An analysis of how attitudes are displayed in new reporting*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Lulea University of Technology, Sweden attitudes.

Schank, R. and Abelson, R. (1977). Scripts, Plans Goals and Understanding: A Inquiry Into Human Knowledge Structures. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Titscher, S., M. Meyer, R. Wodak,& E. Vetter. (2000). Methods of text and discourse analysis. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. New York: Academic Press.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1986). Discourse and Communication: New Approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media Discourse and Communication. Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as discourse*. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4, 249-283.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aim of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Japanese Discourse,* 1, 17-27.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Retrieved from http://www.discourses.org

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & society, 17*(3), 359-383.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*: Washington DC: Sage Publication Ltd.

Wodak (R.) & Meyer (M.) 2001. Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2001). *The semiotics of racism. Approaches in critical discourse   analysis*: Vienna: Passagen Verlag.

Wodak, R. (2007). Doing Europe: The Discursive Construction of European Identities. In M. Richard (Ed.), *discursive constructions of identity in European politics* (pp. 70-94). New York: Springer.

Copyrights