

المصداقية والتضامنية في الخطابات السياسية الامريكية تحليل خطابي نقدي

م.حسين محمد عبدالحسين
كلية شط العرب الجامعة- قسم القانون

البريد الإلكتروني Email: aldarajeehussein@gmail.com

الكلمات المفتاحية: المصداقية، التضامنية، الخطاب، التوازي، التلاعب.

كيفية اقتباس البحث

عبدالحسين ، حسين محمد، المصداقية والتضامنية في الخطابات السياسية الامريكية تحليل
خطابي نقدي، مجلة مركز بابل للدراسات الانسانية، 2021، المجلد: 11، العدد: 2 .

هذا البحث من نوع الوصول المفتوح مرخص بموجب رخصة المشاع الإبداعي لحقوق التأليف
والنشر (Creative Commons Attribution) تتيح فقط للآخرين تحميل البحث
ومشاركته مع الآخرين بشرط نسب العمل الأصلي للمؤلف، ودون القيام بأي تعديل أو
استخدامه لأغراض تجارية.

Registered مسجلة في

ROAD

Indexed مفهسة في

IASJ



Believability and Solidarity in American Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis

By: Instructor :Hussein Mohammad Abdulhussein
Shatt al Arab university College-Department of Law

Keywords: credibility, solidarity, discourse, parallelism, manipulation.

How To Cite This Article

Abdulhussein , Hussein Mohammad, Believability and Solidarity in American Political Speeches:A Critical Discourse Analysis, Journal Of Babylon Center For Humanities Studies, Year:2021,Volume:11, Issue: 2.



[This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

المخلص

يهدف هذا البحث الى دراسة اللغة كوسيلة اقناع من قبل السياسيين الامريكان في خطاباتهم.الاختيارات اللغوية من قبل مختلف السياسيين خلقت تاثيرات كبيرة على عقول الشعوب. يكشف هذا البحث استخدامات مختلف اجزاء الكلام، اشكال الكلام والتي عند اسخدامها بلباقة من قبل المسؤولين يكون لها تاثيرا كبيرا على الجماهير.تسعى هذه الدراسة الى استخدام تركيب الكلمات التي يستخدمها رؤوساء العالم للبلدان التي تتحدث الانكليزية لغرض التأثير على الجماهير وجعلهم مرتبطين ومصدقين بكلماتهم.

وعليه فان هذا البحث يعنى ببحث اللغة في مجال القضايا الادارية عن طريق اختبار ادوات المعنى التي يستخدمها المسؤولين السياسيين في خطاباتهم من اجل نمو وزرع المصدقية والتضامنية مع المجاميع اي ا شبه باقناعهم في الوقت الذي تكون فيه الحاجة الى كشف الوسائل السياسية للمنطق كما يبدو خلال الاستراتيجيات الغير هادفه. الاستراتيجيات المستخدمة من قبل السياسيين لتحفيز المواطنين عن طريق انتقاء المفردات عادة لها تاثير كبير على عقول الناس. على وجه الخصوص،الحكام الامريكان يستخدمون بشكل مطلق مفردات خاصة لتحريك اهتمامات الناس وتحفيزهم على الانتباه والاصغاء تماما.



يستغل هذا البحث مصادر اساسية من الويب او شبكة الانترنت عن طريق الحصول على اتجاهات مدونة للولايات المتحدة والتي تحتوي على نسخة من المواقع السياسية. بالاضافة الى هذا يمضي البحث في تحليل استخدام شكل الكلام من قبل حكام البلد عند الاستشهاد بالتوضيحات من نصوص مختلفة. يهدف البحث الى رسم تحليل مقارن في الطريقة التي يلعب فيها المعنى دورا في خطابات السياسيين. الفلسفة من استخدام بعض التراكيب المعرفة توضح عن طريق الاختبار التقدي للخطابات من الامة.

Abstract

This paper aims to study language as a means of persuasion adopted by the American politicians in their speeches. The linguistic choices made by the different politicians have created huge impacts in the minds of the people. The paper explores the uses of various parts of speech, figures of speech which when used tactfully by the leaders had different impacts on the masses. It investigates the use of combination of words used by world leaders of both the English speaking countries in order to influence and keep the audience hooked onto their speeches.

This paper will thusly mean to research language in the space of administrative issues by examining the sorts of semantic instruments that government officials use in their addresses in order to develop credibility and solidarity with the group similarly as persuade them while also needing to uncover the political methods of reasoning kept up by them as appeared through their aimless strategies. The strategies used by politicians to motivate citizens by selective use of words always have a deep impact on the human minds. Particularly, the American leaders, in their speeches have articulated words perfectly to stir human interest and intrigue them to listen to them intently.

This paper will utilize basic sources amassed from the web by getting to chronicled destinations for the United States , which contains transcripts of political locations. Further, it proceeds to analyses the use of the figures of speech used by the leaders of the country while citing explanations from various texts. The paper aims to draw a comparative analysis on the way semantic plays a role in the speeches of the politicians. The philosophy of using some defined structure are thereby presented by critically examining the speeches from the nation .

1.Introduction

Language is a centre segment of our lives, influencing us on each level both exclusively and all things considered. Any place an individual goes, they do not just utilize language as a method for correspondence yet additionally use it as a sort of cash or funding to arrange the conditions



around them. This is on the grounds that language has a broad impact over its beneficiaries and furthermore holds the possibility to enable its clients. Legislative issues is likewise another component that is available in regular daily existence, from the suppositions we hold to the decisions we make. Legislators regularly exploit language imaginatively so as to influence their crowds' feelings and loyalties, just as uncover their ideological perspectives.

This exploration paper will along these lines intend to investigate language in the domain of governmental issues by inspecting the kinds of semantic instruments that lawmakers use in their addresses so as to build up believability and solidarity with the crowd just as convince them while additionally wanting to reveal the political philosophies maintained by them as showed through their desultory techniques.

2. Critical Discourse Analysis.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) began developing as an examination field in late twentieth century. Unique models by Fairclough, Van Dijk, Reisigl, and Wodak have contributed a great deal to this field. Fairclough (2001) first made a differentiation between discourse and text. He asserts that text is a structure of item, while discourse is the bigger social connection procedure and text is a piece of it. He built up a structure comprising of three measurements of discourse ideas, giving a three-dimensional strategy for discourse examination.

Van Dijk (2001) tried to set up a connection between discourse and political belief systems in the wording of the structures of political talk. For example, he watched the utilization of one-sided lexical things, syntactic structures, for example, actives and passives, pronouns such as 'us and 'them', similitudes or topoi, contentions, suggestions, and numerous different properties of discourse. Van Dijk (2006b) took a gander at discourse as a medium through which political belief systems are gained, communicated and engendered.

The research paper is based on the speeches presented by the political leaders of America. The kind of words and figures of speech utilized by the politicians like the American Clinton and Bush are systematically studied and presented categorically. The use of alliterations, pronouns, in their speeches follow a definite pattern in respect to the country they belong to. Some parts of their addresses are gathered from the web and analyzed to study the mechanism behind the word combinations. It is generally the socio-cultural background and linguistic base which plays an important role in the articulation of the content presented by them.

The grammar features, use of rhetoric as put forward in the paper makes it comprehensive in approach. The use feature of contrast is used more by

the American political leaders . Works of Fahenstock, Sornig has been cited to elaborate on the linguistic usage of the Presidents in their speeches. The entire discourse focusses to bring out a comparative analysis on the nature of words used by the world leaders. This clearly gives us an idea how the difference in vocabulary and articulation plays a major role in influencing people of the speaking countries.

3. Political Discourse

Political discourse is conceivably the most far-reaching social space point that Critical Discourse Analysis professionals have persistently taken a shot at, endeavouring to and approaches to raise individuals' attention to control, misuse, power misuse, political belief system, and social inequalities (Chilton, 2004; Wodak, 2009; Fairclough and Mauranen, 1997; van Dijk, 2007; Fairclough, 1992). This investigation embraced Fairclough (2010, 2003's) three-dimensional structure for detailing and breaking down a talk by at first investigating semantic highlights and association of cases of talk. Plainly, language and legislative issues are entwined in the manner that wording and stating are identified with political ideas and qualities. Chilton (2004) accentuates that “political activity does not exist without the use of language.” (6)

It is additionally noticed that both the semantic and syntactic parts of language assume jobs in moulding various conceptualizations of political belief system. For example, when the specialist is darkened and passive verb word structures are utilized by political leaders, this syntactic option can create various impressions from when a functioning action word structure is picked (Machin & Mayr, 2012). Bloommaert and Bulcaen (2000) order the phonetic highlights and association of cases of discourse as “choices and patterns in vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and text structure” (448).

Every one of these highlights of language should be methodically dissected so as to reveal insight into the connection between phonetic investigation and the social practices broke down (Wodak, 2009). When a discourse-as-text measurement is cultivated, CDA experts endeavour to connect those etymological highlights with the setting by exploring how specific writings are created, imitated, dispersed and devoured just as fusing large-scale conditions. The last CDA measurement proposed by Fairclough is discourse as-social practice, which expects to draw on the ideological impacts and authoritative forms in which a specific discourse is comprised, and, if conceivable, raise social mindfulness and oppose hegemony as “choices and patterns in vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and text structure” (Fairclough and Mauranen, 1997).

4. Analysis and Discussion



In this part, four political speeches by two American leaders are analysed. They are Clinton (1993 and 1997), Bush (2001, 2005). The information will be broken down utilizing subjective methods. Every discourse will be painstakingly gathered for explicit semantic highlights which point to the utilization of powerful methodologies and to proof of ideological positions then the discoveries will be abridged, contrasted and examined with general highlights along with American style of rhetoric. As Sornig calls attention to "rhetoric and persuasion is all about" the way that "stylistic resources and devices" are utilized by a speaker "to bring a certain perspective to the fore" (95). Hence as the examination pushes ahead, some of these devices will be recognized and talked about as far as their capacity inside the more noteworthy extent of the discourses and their motivation. Because of the length imperatives of this research, the conversation of every device and models gave will essentially be somewhat restricted, anyway, care will be taken to speak to the most notable highlights of every discourse. The outcomes and conversation will be introduced all the while and sorted out as per the kind of linguistic apparatus in isolated segments. All addresses are made accessible in full in the connected index, nonetheless, applicable passages will be given inside this segment to the simplicity of reference.

Parallelism in Speeches

There are a couple of various kinds of parallelism present in the discourses. This component is available in the American with respect to the extensiveness and frequency. Below are few instances of parallelism in the speeches of the politicians in discussion which will help to enlighten the topic.

1993, Clinton: But **when most people** are working harder for less; **when others** cannot work at all; when the cost of health care devastates families and threatens to bankrupt our enterprises, great and small; **when the fear** of crime robs law-abiding citizens of their freedom; and **when millions of poor children** cannot even imagine the lives we are calling them to lead **We must** be bold. **We must** do what no generation has had to do before. **We must** invest more in our own people, in their jobs, and in their future, and at the same time cut our massive debt. And **we must** do so in a world in which we must compete for every opportunity.

We rededicate ourselves to the very idea of America, **an idea** born in revolution and renewed through two centuries of challenge; **an idea** tempered by the knowledge that, but for fate, we, the fortunate, and the unfortunate might have been each other; **an idea** ennobled by the faith that our Nation can summon from its myriad diversity the deepest

measure of unity; **an idea** infused with the conviction that America's long, heroic journey must go forever upward.

2001, Bush: **We will** defend our allies and our interests. **We will** show purpose without arrogance. **We will** meet aggression and bad faith with resolve and strength. And to all nations, we will speak for the values that gave our Nation birth.

We are bound by ideals that **move us beyond** our backgrounds, **lift us above** our interests, and **teach us what** it means to be citizens.

If our country does not lead the cause of freedom, it will not be led. **If we do not turn** the hearts of children toward knowledge and character, **we will lose** their gifts and undermine their idealism. **If we permit** our economy to drift and decline, the vulnerable will suffer most.

2005, Bush: The rulers of outlaw regimes **can know** ... The leaders of governments with long habits of control **need to know** ... And all the allies of the United States **can know** ...

We have seen our vulnerability, and **we have seen** its deepest source. **there is no justice without** freedom and **there can be no** human rights **without** human liberty.

As Fahnestock clarifies, parallelism depends on some type of "resemblance in the language" which can happen at numerous levels whether it is between "phrases, clauses, or even larger units of discourse" (224). As the above models show most of the political talks display parallelism as far as linguistic structure as there is a specific syntactic equation that is duplicated by the speakers. In the Clinton 1993 portions for instance, sequential expressions start with the deontic modular must or the refutation no. As per Fahnestock, this sort of parallelism is alluded to as "parison" (225). Notwithstanding showing parison, these expressions additionally thusly exhibit the parallelism structure of reiteration. A significant number of the above models follow a similar linguistic structure as well as do so utilizing exactly the same words actually, in this manner rehashing them, for example, Bush's 2005 selection We have seen our powerlessness, and we have seen its most profound source which reuses the underlying action word state in each sentence. Fahnestock takes note of that "repeating opening or concluding phrases in this way was a much-noticed source of emphasis in the rhetorical tradition" (226). Henceforth, when government officials use this type of parallelism it helps them in giving more prominent accentuation to their contentions and thusly it influences the crowd also by causing them to notice these contentions with more effect.

A.Feature of Contrast



The phonetic element of contrast is another structure wherein contentions might be introduced to a group of people. The American politicians utilize this element

Speech

Number of words

Clinton 1993

1,598

Clinton 1997

2,155

Bush 2001

1,592

Bush 2005

2,071

1997, Clinton: The challenge of our **past** remains the challenge of our **future**:

nothing **big** ever came from being **small**

2001, Bush: the story of a power that went into the world **to protect but not possess, to defend but not to conquer**

the story of **a slaveholding society** that became a **servant of freedom**,

2005, Bush: the moral choice between **oppression, which is always wrong, and freedom, which is eternally right**.

Across the generations, we have proclaimed the imperative of self-government, because **no one is fit to be a master and no one deserves to be a slave**.

From the perspective of a single day, including this day of dedication, the issues and questions before our country are many. **From the viewpoint of centuries**, the questions that come to us are narrowed and few:

As Fahnestock clarifies, contrast is basically the utilization of alternate extremes in contention, it might likewise be alluded to as "antithesis" for the situation "when two parallel phrases or clauses feature words that an audience would recognize as opposites" (231-232). The impact of utilizing such structures is generally the "reinforcement and support" of the thoughts being introduced (Fahnestock, 232). This semantic device may likewise fill the need of "drawing stark contrasts" by the speaker (Fahnestock, 233). As the above models illustrate, sometimes the contrasts use words which are immediate antonyms, for example, past/future, huge/little, in/out, up/down, or wrong/right. Such combines assist with showing an unmistakable resistance between thoughts all together that the crowd may get a handle on the message better. There is some different and more subtle complexity combined, for example, diplomacy/force, single-day/centuries, and protect/possess which don't

really utilize antonyms yet work inside a general thought of the distinction between two ideas. This sort of complexity keeps on creating a similar impact on the crowd by fortifying the message being sent by the speaker through its matching with a contradicting one. The utilization of this etymological gadget is by all accounts significantly more unmistakable in the American speech.

B. Pronoun manipulation in speeches

It is noticeable that there is stark distinction in the pronoun combination in the American political speeches. This is discussed further with the assistance of the examples presented below.

American Politician-

1993, Clinton: today **we** celebrate

by the words **we** speak

Though **we** marched

I salute my predecessor

I thank the millions

Let **us** embrace it

1997, Clinton: It is **our** great good fortune

When last **we** gathered

I pledge all my strength

2001, Bush: **I** am honored and humbled

this is in **our** reach

ideals that move **us** beyond

2005, Bush: **We** are led, by events

survival of liberty in **our** land

the questions that come to **us**

oath that **I** have sworn

From an assessment of the models outlined above apparently, the American discourses of both Bush and Clinton utilize some first-person pronouns, be that as it may, they are very restricted in number when contrasted with the more comprehensive second person usage and accusative and possessive pronouns. This second person gathering of pronouns is utilized with high recurrence all through their discourses. By and large, there is a regular use of the first person in quite a while of the discourses.

As Fahnstock notes "using [pronouns] to draw attention to the speaker or addressee is a choice the rhetor makes, a choice with consequences" (279). In this way, the way wherein a crowd of people is tended to surely influences the kind of relationship that is set up towards them by the government official. One of the advantages of utilizing I is that it can





reflect "personal testimony" also [may] be used to foreground claims made from a position of authority" (Fahnestock, 2011, p. 280). In this manner, such a strategy assists with keeping up the force distinction between the speaker and crowd, nonetheless, it may likewise permit the crowd to consider them to be as progressively receptive because of the impression that they are describing their own point of view to them. Consequently, utilizing this technique makes a more prominent feeling of the network between the politician and their crowd which joins them together in a solitary reason as happens in the American speech. As a nation worked by the people for the people, it is maybe increasingly important that the American leaders utilize this technique.

C. Use of Alliteration

This component strikingly enough is by all accounts just present in the American addresses. It in this manner demonstrates that its development may have been made more towards a logical impact instead of a basic open speech.

American Politicians-

1993, Clinton: strong steps

deadlock and drift

profound and powerful

powerful people

1997, Clinton: can claim care

flame of freedom

turmoil and triumph

demands and deserves

2001, Bush: community over chaos

Power to prevent

reduce taxes to recover

by blood or birth

flawed and fallible

courage, compassion and character

2005, Bush: minds of men

fire of freedom

will walk

women welcome

granted in good measure

preparing our people

As Fahnestock clarifies, "assonance and consonance are frequently cited in studies of poetry, often as part of the aesthetic dimensions of a text" with consonance alluding to the redundancy "of consonant sounds

within and among words" (136). This implies the use of such linguistic devices in political discourse would artistically affect the message being passed on. Similar sounding word usage explicitly "refers to repetitions in the initial sounds of words that can produce echoes of phonetic similarity throughout a text" and utilizing this method "produce[s] the effect of a coherent set" (Fahnestock, 136-137). In this way, alliteration being a tasteful device it likewise gives the specific components to the speech which conveys a feeling of solidarity as has been exhibited in the above models. The American speeches along these lines, in showing this component appears to be progressively examined and equipped towards artistic execution.

D. Inclusion of Metaphors

There are many intriguing kinds of metaphors utilized all through the discourses inspected, be that as it may, once more they are significantly richer in the American dialogue.

American Politicians-

1993, Clinton: Though we **marched to the music of our time**, our mission is timeless

Yes, you, my fellow Americans, have **forced the spring**. Now we **must do the work the season demands**.

Today, a generation raised in **the shadows of the cold war** assumes new responsibilities a world **warmed by the sunshine of freedom** **a spring reborn** in the world's oldest democracy

1997, Clinton: with America's bright **flame of freedom** spreading throughout all the world.

Our schools will have the highest standards in the world, **igniting the spark of possibility in the eyes** of every girl and every boy.

Yes, **let us build our bridge**, a bridge wide enough and strong enough for every American to **cross over to a blessed land of new promise**.

2001, Bush: Now it is **a seed upon the wind, taking root in many nations**.

America's faith in freedom and democracy was **a rock in a raging sea**.

2005, Bush: After the **shipwreck of communism** came years of relative quiet.

E. Ideologies conveyed through linguistic use

Upon an assessment of the substance of the American speeches, it becomes exposed that the American addresses contain a lot progressively etymological systems and deliver the discourses significantly more detailed. Their preeminent point in this way has all the earmarks of being the influence of the crowd. This proof harmonizes with Gruber's recently referenced perception in regards to the capacity of American debut





discourses being established more in influence than data (2013, p. 41). As Finlayson and Martin call attention to, "a political speech can reveal the fact that an ideology is not only its propositional content but also how it thinks propositions can and should be forwarded. In this respect, one of the things an ideology is, is a style of argumentation" (2008, p. 451). The American leaders demonstrate some control because of the utilization of such a large number of phonetic systems alongside a belief system of predominance and high contribution in universal issues as dependent on the substance.

5. Conclusion

In end, it might be noticed that the American political leaders utilize some semantic procedures in their discourses. They do as such for various reasons, for example, explanation, accentuation, influence, and building trust. The Americans, be that as it may, contain a bigger amount of these procedures by and large incompletely in light of the fact that some of them are viewed as a political custom.

The linguistic choices made by the different politicians have created huge impacts in the minds of the people. The paper explores the uses of various parts of speech, figures of speech which when used tactfully by the leaders had different impacts on the masses. It investigates the use of combination of words used by world leaders of both the English speaking countries in order to influence and keep the audience hooked onto their speeches. The American leaders demonstrate some control because of the utilization of such a large number of phonetic systems alongside a belief system of predominance and high contribution in universal issues as dependent on the substance .

References

- Austermühl, F. The great American scaffold: Intertextuality and identity in American Presidential Discourse, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2014
<https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.aus.edu>
- Beard, H. The Language of Politics, Routledge, 2000
- Fahnestock, J. Rhetorical Style: The use of language in Persuasion, Oxford University Press, 2011
- Gruber, H. Genres in political discourse: The case of the 'inaugural speech' of Austrian chancellors, P. Cap & U. Okulska (Eds.), John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2013, pp. 29-72
- Hart, R. P., Jarvis, S. E., Jennings W. P., & Smith-Howell, D. Political keywords: Using language that uses us, Oxford University Press, 2005
- Sornig, K. Some remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion, R. Wodak (Ed.), Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1989, pp. 95-114
- Gruber, H. (2013). Genres in political discourse: The case of the 'inaugural speech' of Austrian.