



***Adab Al-Rafidayn
Journal***

Refereed Scientific Journal

Issued by

The College of Arts

Issue No : seventieth

Year: Forty Four

Mosul

2014A.D. / 1435A.H.

Advisory Board

- **Prof. Dr. Hashim Y. AL-Mallaah**
University of Mosul (Islamic History)
- **Prof. Dr. Imad Al-Deen Kh.Omar**
University of Mosul (Islamic Literature)
- **Prof. Dr. Ibrahim Kh. Al-'Alaf**
University of Mosul (Modern History)
- **Prof. Dr. Muhyi Al-Deen T.Ibrahim**
University of Mosul (Arabic Language)
- **Prof. Dr. Saalih A. Al-Jumaili**
University of Mosul (Arabic Literature)
- **Prof. Dr. Bushra H. Al-Bustaani**
University of Mosul (Arabic Literature)
- **Prof. Dr. 'Abaas J.Raheem**
University of Mosul (English Language)
- **Prof. Dr. Hasan R. Al-Najaar**
Al-Mustansyriha University (Information & Library Science)
- **Prof. Dr. Natiq S. Matloob**
University of Mosul (Islamic History)
- **Asst. Prof. Muwafaq W. Mahmood**
University of Mosul (Sociology)

The opinions presented in this journal are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the editorial staff or the policy of the College of Arts

All correspondence to be addressed in the name of the
Editor-in-Chief

College of Arts – University of Mosul – Republic of Iraq

E-mail: adabarafidayn@yahoo.com

Adab Al-Rafidayn Journal



A refereed journal concerned with the publishing of
scientific researches in the field of arts and humanities
both in Arabic and English

Issue No. : seventieth

Year: Forty Four

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Dr. Basim I.Qasim

Secretary

Asst. Prof. Dr. Muhammad S. Hameed

Follow-up

Asst. Lect.. Shaibaan Adeeb Ramadaan Al-shaibani

Editorial Staff

-
- Prof. Dr. Muay'ad A. Abdul Hasan

 - Prof. Dr. Osmat B. Abdul Qahdir

 - Prof. Dr. Ali H. Khidhr

 - Asst. Prof. Dr. Muhammad A. Dawood

 - Asst. Prof.Dr. Ammar Abdulatif Zamabideen

Linguistic Revision and Follow-up

-
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| • Dr. Lect. Ali K. Bsheer | Arabic |
| • Lect. Osaama H. Ibrahim Al-'Ajeeli | English |
| • Co-translator.Iman.J.Ameen | Follow-up |
| • Co-translator.Najlaa.A..Hussein | Follow-up |
-

CONTENTS

Title	Page
Using Transitivity System in Analysing Arabic Literary Texts Asst. Prof. Dr. Hala Khalid Najim	1 - 24
The Translation of English Scientific Metaphorical Expressions into Arabic Asst. Prof. Dr. Luqman A. Nasser	25 - 42
Economy in Newspapers Headlines With Reference to Translation Lect. Zakariya Ismael Khaleel	43 - 60
The Translation of Paucity Plural in the Glorious Qurān into English Lect. Osama H. Ibrahim & Lect. May M. Abdul Aziz	61 - 86
Translating The Connotative Meaning of Lexemes Synonymous to "Wind" and "Winds" in Some Qur'ānic Ayas Into English Asst. Lect. Khawla Mohammed Jamil Al-Habbal	87 - 110
Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi	111 - 128
Author-Narrator in John Fowles' The French Lieutenant's Woman Asst. Prof. Ra'ad Ahmed Saleh	129 - 138
Contextual Analysis of some Semantically Linked Expressions in the Qur'anic Discourse Lect. Ameer Sulaiman Saleh	139 - 160
A Comparative Study of the Imperative Structures in French and English Asst. Prof. Dr. Tawfik Aziz Abdullah & Lect. Sanaa Sabeeh Othman	161 - 170
Le monologue entre silence et solitude dans Roberto Zucco de Bernard-Marie Koltès Lect. Ahmad Hassan Jarjisse	171 - 182

*Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in
the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal
Analysis*¹

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati * &
Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

تأريخ القبول: ٢٠١٣/١٢/٣

تأريخ التقديم: ٢٠١٣/١٠/٢٤

1. Introduction:

Politicians exploit language so as to persuade people for supporting their decisions. They construct their language for political purposes; they use language that can ensure the application of their ideologies, and hide their intended political meaning. Thus, politicians adopt different strategies in presenting their arguments in order to get the benefit they are looking for (Longobardi, 2010: 1-2).

Wareing (cited in Bayram, 2010: 29) argues that politicians choose their words skillfully because they know that certain words have strong influence on peoples' attitudes, affect peoples' perceptions, and direct and control peoples' thoughts and beliefs. For his part, Bayram (2010: 24) believes that politics is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice, to make a decision, to control other peoples' behaviours and usually to control their values.

2. The Problem:

In the political discourse of war, people are not able to recognize the persuasive discoursal strategies that politicians follow. They also have no ability to enlighten the hidden implications when they are exposed to such type of discourse.

¹ This is an abridged research of an M. A. thesis submitted to the council of the College of Arts/ University of Mosul/ Iraq, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in English Language and Linguistics.

* Dept. of English / College of Arts / University of Mosul .

Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

3. Aims of the Study:

The aims of the present study are devoted to:

1. Analyzing war discourse linguistically based on critical discourse, and examining the realization of power and ideology in this type of discourse.
2. Describing some persuasive strategies adopted by politicians to shape the publics' feelings and attitudes about political issues.
3. Showing the intended implications or ideologies behind using such persuasive strategies through which politicians strive to persuade people.

4. Hypotheses:

The present study hypothesizes that:

1. Political discourse of war involves the use of discoursal persuasive strategies with different implications for persuading people.
2. Political discourse of war is not made random but it is ideologically patterned. It is a reflection of politicians' ideological position.
3. Politicians focus on peoples' griefs in order to evoke their emotions and eventually change their attitude without any physical force.

5. Scope of the Study:

The present study is an investigation of some discoursal persuasive strategies and their implications in the political discourse of war. Thus, in the study no reference will be made to the grammatical and phonological features of the text.

It should be also noticed that no reference will be made to the non-verbal cues involved in the political discourse of war.

6. Data Collection:

The data to be analyzed in this work is a translated political speech which is texted from www.nytimes.com. This speech was delivered on 25 October 2005, and was devoted to university students.

7. Critical Discourse Analysis: Preliminary Remarks:

Rahimi and Sahragard (2008: 7-8) point out that critical discourse analysis has become a very influential academic research among other subjects in politics, social and linguistic sciences. Van Dijk (cited in Wodak and Meyer, 2001: 96) states that critical discourse analysis focuses on social problems and political issues, especially on how the production and reproduction of power relations are abused and presented

in a given discourse. Critical discourse analysis, he adds, means to do criticism from the discourse analyst's point of view. For his part, Muralikrishnan (2011: 20-21) believes that two senses of the term "discourse" are relevant in critical discourse analysis approach: the linguistic sense and the critical theorist's sense. The former includes the linguistic context and shared knowledge. The latter focuses on the way of understanding the social world from a critical point of view, and how a single reality in society is understood as structured and shaped by the various social forces which are frequently enacted in everyday discourse.

The central claim of critical discourse analysis, Muralikrishnan adds, is that any spoken or written form about certain realities of social world is not done randomly, but the choice the speakers or writers make in doing it is ideologically patterned. It tries to expose the underlying ideology and resist social inequality.. Thus, critical discourse analysis tries to show the connection between language, power and ideology.

Furthermore, Van Dijk (1993: 283-284) states that critical discourse analysis is a type of discourse analytical research that studies how social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted or produced and resisted by text and talk in social and political context. Dominance refers to the exercise of power by elites, institutions, or groups that results from social inequality as is the case in political, cultural, class, ethnic, racial and even gender inequality. So, critical discourse analysis tries to know what structure, strategies, verbal interactions or communicative events play the important role in these modes of reproduction.

8. Political Discourse of War:

Perini (2004: 57-60) regards the language of war as a type of political discourse which aims at exacting obedience since its vocabularies and expressions are intentionally constructed for political purposes and what politicians wish to express. The power of war language is not so intense but its effects are so strong that can achieve influence on peoples' attitudes. In fact, in war language, the speakers focus on peoples' grief and desire more than on their own to evoke their emotional response.

For his part, Ngoa (2011: 239-241) states that political discourse of war is constructed to either directly or indirectly influence peoples'

Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

opinion, emotion, attitude and behavior in order to accomplish the aims of politicians' objectives or organizations, and as a result encourages their actions to support a policy or a program. It is based on presenting a point of view in such a way that can make people see the world, or a particular issue, from a particular point of view, which is the speaker's view. As a result, political discourse of war attempts to evoke hatred against the enemy and preserve the friendship of allies.

9. What is Persuasion:

Politicians construct their languages in such a way that exploits peoples' emotions to make them accept their views and to act according to their will. Adopting different persuasive strategies, politicians strive to show themselves as experts who have knowledge in order to make people trust them and eventually persuade people to change their attitudes and beliefs. In doing so, they exercise their power and accomplish their ideologies without any physical force (Muralikrishnan, 2011 : 24).

Persuasion forms an important part in every day life (Ferrari, 2012: 2). Lakoff (cited in Pishghadam and Rasouli, 2011: 7) defines persuasion as the "attempt or intention of one party to change the behaviors, feelings, intentions, or view point of another". This implies that the speaker has a certain ideology and tries to convey this ideology to others in order to follow it . For Pishghadam and Rasouli (2011: 8), persuasion is a direct speech act in which the speaker's intention is to make the hearer commit him/herself to perform an action. Thus, the speaker aims at reshaping the hearer's attitude, feelings, and behaviours according to his/her ideology.

10. Principles of Persuasion:

To influence others and to build a successful message, there are six principles (www.1, 2006: 9) which Cialdini (2001: 11) regards as weapons because they have the ability to influence and persuade.

10.1 The Principle of Reciprocation:

This principle is based on the social norm "we should treat others the way they treat us", in the sense that people are usually obliged to return what they think it is debt, i.e. "if you give me a favor, you owe me a favor". People often say "yes" to those they owe. Thus, when they do

something for someone, they do not send it away, but what they do is a credit (www.1, 2006: 10).

10.2 The Principle of Scarcity:

Scarcity of goods is an important element for persuasion. People often want what they can not have. So, a person should associate the presentation of his/her thought with the benefit that people will get from him/her if they move with his/her direction, or with what he/she can offer them and they can not get it from anyone else (www.1, 2006: 10).

10.3 The Principle of Authority:

People are more likely to respond to a request that comes from someone who is a figure of authority. This principle derives from norms of our upbringing and education. Since childhood, we are taught to respect the authority of teachers and parents, and to agree with their demands and opinions (www.1, 2006: 10).

10.4 The Principle of Consistency:

This principle refers to people's desire to be perceived as consistent in their words and behaviours. Consistency means commitment, if the speaker convinces others to say "yes", then they should support him/her to the end in making future decisions (www.1, 2006: 10).

10.5 The Principle of Consensus:

This principle aims at convincing people to agree to a demand by explaining that many other persons have adopted the same behavior in the past. Thus, the best way to convince others that our ideas are the best is to get the agreement of all of them (www.1, 2006: 11).

Furthermore, Cialdini (2001: 103,119,140) points out that consensus is a principle of human behavior whereby people tend to determine what is correct and what is not, through examining the actions of others, i.e. they assume that an action or a way of thinking is correct, if other persons do or think of it, or even if they are told that many other persons are doing or think of it.

10.6 The Principle of Liking:

The liking principle is based on the notion that people are willing to accept proposals made by a person they respect. People often prefer to say "yes" when they feel that the person who sends the message is the

Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

person who likes them, and whom they like; so they would be happy to support that person (www.1, 2006: 11).

11. The Role of Persuasion in Political Discourse:

Kulo (2009 :1-3) argues that the successful persuader, especially in political contexts, needs to appeal to attitudes and emotions that are already within the listeners. When the listeners realize that their beliefs are understood and supported by the persuader, the persuader then creates a connection with the listeners. This connection is achieved through:

11.1 Existential Mode:

Within this mode, the arguments refer to daily problems and difficulties. The speaker describes one's existence, which is typical to peoples' psychological needs and tries to motivate people to think and analyze their own lives in order to show them the positive and negative sides of their lives. In doing so, politicians promise people that they have answers for all of their questions and the right solution for how to live in a happy and satisfactory way; they also claim that they provide support for all kinds of existential problems that people may face in their live (Krok, 2009: 54).

11.2 Cultural-Religious Mode:

This mode reflects universal questions about one's sense of the universe, the meaning of religious books and how they are interpreted and manipulated by the speaker in his argumentation. People, by nature, respect anyone who carries religious values because they think that he/she is moving with the direction of God's instruction. Politicians usually play on this sensitive issue and try to pretend that they are representing the side of goodness and their enemies represent the side of evil. Of course, people were in conflict with evil since the beginning of life, and would support anyone who would stand against the evil. In addition, every nation admires its culture, and the conflict between different cultures exists from the beginning of our life. So, politicians adopt this mode skillfully in order to persuade people (ibid: 54).

11.3 Protective Mode:

This mode consists of information that can protect people and bring peacefulness for them. Adopting this mode, politicians try to

persuade people that there are certain threats that might expose their lives to dangers; this, in turn, reflects a feeling of insecurity and anxiety among people. So, politicians assume that they will provide all the necessary means needed to defend individuals from the current dangers and they will secure a safe environment for their people (ibid: 54-55).

12. Credibility as a Persuasive Factor:

Mills (2000 : 13) believes that, for a speaker to be a great orator and persuader to attract people and get their attentions to his/her presentation, it is not enough to have a flexible mind and master all the technical devices of argumentation but he/she has to be believable, and to be credible. Kline (2008: 3-5) argues that a person has to build personal credibility through mentioning some of his qualities, his/her education, experience, and his occupation. People usually trust the expert person who shows some kind of responsibility that will ensure a secure future for them. People need to know everything about the person who will lead them. Therefore, the speaker has to state any information that will enhance his/her personal credibility. For example, his/her past deeds, future plans, personal qualities, and his/her interest about social values. In addition, the speaker has to tell stories that present him/her in a positive way, and talks about deeds that distinguish him/her from others. Furthermore, the speaker has to choose language that helps him/her to compare ideas that are familiar to his/her audience with the new ideas he/she wants to talk about.

For Mills (2000: 13) credibility is based on two pillars: trust and expertise.

12.1 The Pillar of Trust:

People, by nature, are suspicious; among their questions, they first ask, "can we trust this person?", "Do we believe him/her?", "Is he/she sincere?". People often respond to the persuasive message if they feel the speaker's integrity. Thus, the speaker has to be objective, and does his/her best to appear less bias and trustworthy in order to make people respond to his/her message. People must feel that the persuader will not gain any benefit for his/her own but he/she is looking after their benefits, and perhaps they want to feel that he/she will lose something in the subject of his/her argument. People, then, would believe that he/she is more credible (ibid: 13-15).

Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

12.2 The Pillar of Expertise:

Once the speaker ensures the trustworthy, it would be easy to establish the second pillar of credibility, viz. expertise. The language the speaker uses and his/her knowledge are the best means to establish his/her expertise. Thus, the speaker should master and cover all the matters that are related to his/her argument in order to give an impression about his/her expertise. People always trust the expert one and are willing to put their destiny in his/her hand. Therefore, the speaker should be armed with knowledge and appear to have some kind of wisdom and use language eloquently by which he/she can persuade people (ibid: 27-30).

Moreover, the speaker has to prove the validity of his/her ideas. He/she has to make decisions on the basis of reason rather than on emotion (ibid :34-35).

13. Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications within Political Discourse of War: Analysis and Discussion:

The study shows that in his political discourse of war, Mahmud, the Iranian president, adopts different types of persuasive strategies in his effort to convince or influence the audience of the validity of his ideas and ideologies. However, some of these strategies are more recurrent in his speech. In what follows, a detailed presentation of these strategies:

13.1 Association:

Lee (2012: 17-19) states that people by nature tend to be associated with other individuals of their groups. Hence, they associate themselves with others' ideas or events, whether this association is realized in the most minor issue or with issue that holds significant values or even with peoples' problems and events, for example, the words of president G. Bush in the first presidential debate on September 30, 2004 after the attack of "9/11" "We ought to take an action" (Uvehammer, 2005: 18). These words reflect an association with peoples' grief that he wants to revenge for them through war. Of course, this made the process more easy for him to convince people in supporting his future decision.

In order to reflect his ideas about what is going on nowadays in the world, Mahmud, as far as our study is concerned, thanks Allah, in one example, to have the opportunity to deliver his speech in the conference

and in a second example, he thanks the persons in charge who have chosen a valuable title for the conference:

- a. *I thank God that I have an opportunity to participate in the event today*
- b. *I need to thank you for choosing this valuable title for the conference*

Through the previous examples, then, Mahmoud tries to appear very grateful to Allah to share the event, and he evaluates the people who have chosen the title of the conference. In this sense, he wants to be more persuasive by pretending that the title of the conference corresponds to his own ideas. In fact, he tries to pretend that he will adopt the ideas and the recommendations of the conference, and that he represents the whole Muslim nation, not only his nation. This association accomplishes an effect on his listeners' emotions. This, in return, will ensure that he will be liked by his listeners. As a result, he has succeeded in achieving the principle of liking which is considered to be an important principle in persuasion. The play on this sensitive string will make his citizens support him in any future decision.

13.2 Rhetorical Questions:

These questions do not have a concrete or measurable answer, they are opinion-based where they are capable of inspiring thought and further debates (Petty et al, 1981: 435).

In our data, while speaking, Mahmud uses several rhetorical questions without the expectation of a reply but just to make a point. This can be shown in the following lines where he talks about the issue of Palestine:

Is it a fight between a group of Muslims and non-Jews? Is it a fight between Judaism and other religions? Is it the fight of one country with another country? Is it the fight of one country with the Arab world? Is it a fight over the lands of Palestine?

In fact, he employs these questions as a rhetorical device for the sake of encouraging his listeners to consider his message or his view point. In fact, Mahmud tries to appear as expert who possesses knowledge, and has the answers to all these questions. In doing so, he attempts to enhance his credibility by applying the pillar of expertise and eventually makes his listeners trust him. Moreover, appearing as the one

Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

who has answers for all kinds of questions means that within this strategy, he also adopts the existential mode where he appears as the one who will provide solutions for all kinds of existential problems that his listeners may face in their life. Thus, Mahmud has used these rhetorical questions to make a point, i.e. to direct his listeners' thought to the original problem, viz. the struggle between Zionism and the whole Muslim nation as clarified in some lines later within his speech:

*" the establishment of the occupier Zionist regime was
a move by the world oppressor against Islamic world "*

13.3 Repetition:

Lazarov and Zlateva (2012: 1, 10) states that repetition is a verbal behavior which is deliberately constructed through repeating words, phrases, sayings or text passages. Forraiova (2011: 7-9) believes that when repetition is used intentionally, it can have a rhetorical or an intensifying effect. The repetition of certain words or expressions makes the point known to the public and decodes it to their eyes. So, through, repeating certain words or expressions, politicians raise or emphasize their slogan or implied ideology in order to make an overall effect on peoples' emotion (Uvehhammer ,2005: 7).

Mahmud uses this strategy since it intensifies the core of the speech, viz. the struggle between the Islamic world and the world oppressor (The United States). Thus, throughout the whole of his speech, he repeats the word "struggle" eight times:

- a. *The situation has changed in this historical struggle.*
- b. *Therefore, the struggle in Palestine today is the major front of the struggle of the Islamic world with the world oppressor, and its fate will decide the destiny of the struggle of the past several hundred years.*
- c. *The Palestine nation adopted Islamic behavior in an Islamic environment in their struggle and so we have witnessed their progress and success.*
- d. *Many who are disappointed in the struggle between the Islamic world and the infidels have tried to spread the blame.*
- e. *Our Murshid targeted the heart of the world oppressor in his struggle.*
- f. *I hope the Palestinian will remain alert and aware in the same way that they have continued their struggle in the past ten years.*

In these examples, he wants to say that the Palestinian struggle is the struggle of the Islamic world and he will not leave the Palestinian nation alone. That is to say, the struggle between the Islamic world and the world oppressor (The United states) is ideologically based, i.e. since Zionism is the move of the world oppressor against the whole Muslim nation and since it is imposed upon the Islamic world to achieve the domination of the region , then the struggle will spread to the whole Muslim countries and Palestine is the frontline of the Islamic world's struggle with the United States. In fact, Mahmud tries to raise the feeling of insecurity and anxiety among his listeners that their lives also might expose to dangers since the struggle continues between the Islamic world and the world oppressor. In this sense, he applies the protective mode in order to persuade his listeners. At the same time, he sustains his effort by adopting the cultural- religious mode through which he tries to play on this sensitive issue in order to highlight the religious meaning and to shine his religious image in front of his listeners. This, of course, will present him as the one who carries religious value and who is moving with the direction of Allah's instruction.

13.4 Contrastive Pairs:

Kulo (2009: 8) states that the use of "contrastive pairs" is very common in political discourse of war. It consists of two parts that are in opposition. This strategy is used to point out a difference between two ideas or a difference in time, as in between "then, but" and "now" by stating, what something is, and then contrasting it with what it is not.

For his part, Uvehammer (2005: 19-20) points out that adopting this strategy by the speaker affect peoples' emotion and reflects the speakers' experience and gives the impression that he/she is an expert who has knowledge and this will enhance the speakers' credibility which is considered to be an important factor in persuading the listeners.

The use of this strategy can be shown in the following example where Mahmud compares two periods of time, namely, the period of "Shah regime" with the present days:

"All the Western and Eastern countries supported the regime even after the massacre of September 7 (1978) and said the removal of the regime was not possible. But our people resisted and its 27years now that we survived without a regime dependent on the United States"

Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis
Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

In the above-mentioned example, Mahmud contrasts their hostile regime (Shah regime), when this regime was supported by the United States and it was impossible for everyone to imagine that it would be removed, with the present days where his country is liberated from this regime and becomes stronger than before without the support of the United States. Resorting to existential mode, Mahmud wants to convince his listeners that they will be happy and safe without the world oppressor represented by the United states. This will motivate his listeners' psychological need and encourage them to think of their own lives. Moreover, Mahmud tries to give his audience the impression that he possesses knowledge and a kind of wisdom and this, of course, will make people trust and support him in any future decision. In fact, he tries to give evidences in order to enhance his credibility by showing that he is an expert which, in turn, builds the pillar of trust and finally persuades his audience.

13.5 Symbols:

Symbols are words or images or even persons that bring to peoples' mind larger concepts and usually have strong emotions. For example, a flag represents and stands for a country (www.2, 2012: 5). Thus, the use of symbols can inspire people to accept the argument without any doubt. As a result, it allows politicians to present their ideas in few words rather than long and boring explanations since the symbol would support his/her presentation and achieve an overall effect. Furthermore, in the political discourse of war, symbols that convey religious concepts are widely recognized. Thus, politicians resort to some religious characteristics in their effort to persuade people; they tend to exploit this point since peoples' life are often in contact with religious symbols (www.3, 2012: 8).

This strategy can be illustrated in the following example where Mahmud represents Al-Murshid and his statements as a symbol to reinforce his case:

"Our Murshid said that"

In fact, he attempts to persuade his audience that what he is talking about is the truth and it will happen. That is why, he resorts to one of Al-Murshid's foretells and how this foretell had achieved.

13.6 The Strategy of New:

People, by nature, tend to love new things and ideas. This is due to the fact that they need to change things and ideas that they are bored with and spend long time with since they believe that these new things are more useful for them.

Mahmud exploits this point in his speech and tries to offer a new idea. The use of this strategy can be shown in the following example:

"They say it is impossible to have a world without the United States and Zionism. But you know that this is a possible goal and slogan".

Through this example, he tries to get his audiences' attention with a new idea that the United States can be defeated. In fact, people love such new ideas because they used to hear that the United States is the strongest country and no one can challenge it. Therefore, Mahmud tries to encourage his listeners that this is a possible matter. The use of this strategy will ensure the support that he is looking for in any future decision. People place greater value on rare ideas because they are perceived as unique and exclusive. In doing so, he succeeds in achieving the principle of scarcity which is an important principle of persuasion.

13.7 Metaphor:

Muller (2005: 55) states that metaphor is a device of using something in order to understand something else, by resorting to one domain to clarify another. Metaphor is a word or a phrase used to make a comparison between one idea and another. In addition, metaphor, in political discourse, can be seen as an action of war where the politicians' aim is to persuade people (Kulo, 2009: 2-10).

Metaphor is used in Mahmud's speech since it makes the speech more alive and motivates people to accept the point he strives for. In the following example, Mahmud uses metaphor to refer to Israel without mentioning it by a declared name.

"Our ... targeted the heart of the world oppressor in his"

In the above-mentioned line, Mahmud refers to Israel as "the heart of the world oppressor". As mentioned earlier, the occupying regime (Israel) was a major move by the world oppressor. So, when he refers to "the heart of the world oppressor", actually he refers to Israel. Moreover, he tries to give an evidence that the struggle with the world

Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

oppressor should be directed to Israel. In fact, he wants to convince his audience that if we want to defeat the world oppressor, we have to direct our struggle to Israel. In doing so, Mahmud tries to present his idea in a logical way, i.e. by presenting information that makes sense to his listeners' perceptions in order to make them think in the way he wants. This, then, will ensure the influence on their personalities that he is seeking for.

Mahmud continues motivating and encouraging his audience with the use of further metaphorical image. This can be illustrated in the following extract which can be regarded as the most prominent within his speech since it is an explicit example of war language:

"The occupying regime must be wiped off the map"

In the previous extract, Mahmud threatens Israel with the implication of destroying it. This, as a result, can be understood as an outright declaration of war.

13.8 Scapegoating:

Adopting this strategy, the speaker does his/her best to put blames on a person, group, or race in order to convince people that he/she is the one who has a solution for a problem. For example, in the United States of America, some people claim that illegal immigrants are the main cause of unemployment, even though unemployment is a complex problem with many causes. The following example, in our study, illustrates the use of this strategy where Mahmud blames others:

"we can not comprise over the issue of Palestine"

In the previous line, Mahmud emphasizes the importance of the Palestine's problem by sending a message to those who negotiate the occupying regime. He blames them that such negotiations are considered a kind of giving a legitimacy to Israel. That is to say, these negotiations can be seen as a defeat not only for the Palestine's case, but for the whole Muslim nation.

Moreover, he tries to persuade his audience that he is the only one who cares about the Palestine issue. As a result, he will be the one who burdens himself with the whole Muslim problems, and this would make him a hero in his listeners' point of view. This, then, can lead to the liking effect and make his listeners be convinced and accept his decision.

14. Conclusions:

The study has come up with the following conclusions:

1. Political discourse of war needs a specific linguistic form in order to convey the politician's underlying ideologies by which he/she can change peoples' attitudes and beliefs to be in line with these ideologies.
2. Political discourse of war is intentionally constructed for political purposes. Thus, the choice of words and strategies are very important in war language so as to fulfill different implications and aims.
3. The ability of politicians to exploit language contribute in reinforcing the power of language since language is not powerful in its own, rather, its power depends on the skills of language users.
4. The emotional side plays an important role in conveying ideologies and in changing peoples' beliefs and attitudes.
5. Power is legitimized through the use of language, i.e. through the use of different discursal persuasive strategies.
6. The use of the existential and protective modes supports the politician's presentation with evidences which, in turn, helps in persuading the listeners that the politician has the answers and solutions for all existential problems that might face them.
7. The politician's credibility represented in expertise and trust is very important in enhancing the politician's effort to persuade his/her listeners.

15. Suggestions for Further Researches:

The study of persuasion as a discursal strategy in the field of critical discourse analysis involves further investigations. Thus, this work reaches to the following suggestions:

1. Persuasion may overlap with manipulation; manipulation could be a form of legitimating persuasion. Thus, this phenomenon requires a wide investigation, both in political discourse and in everyday interaction.
2. In critical discourse analysis, the description of a text whether in political discourse, the discourse of media or the discourse of advertising etc, is either done by describing the grammatical features or by describing the persuasive strategies of such a text. Thus, the grammatical features of a text in political discourse of war require a further investigation.

Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

Bibliography:

Bayram, F. (2010). "Ideology and Political Discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Erdogan's Political Speech", *Arecls*, Vol. 7, 23-40.

<www><http://www.google.com>

Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and Practice 4th ed.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ferrari, F. (2012). "Persuasion: Preliminary Insights and Persuasion in Political Discourse", 1-31.

<www><http://www.merriam-webster.com>

Forraiova, M. (2011). *The Use and Function of Repetition in Political Speeches*. M.A. Thesis. University of Pardubice: Faculty of Arts and

Philosophy.

Kline, S. L. (2008). "Strategy Options: Designing Persuasive and Informative Presentations for Public Policy Discourse", *Communication Policy Research: South Conference 5-7 December 2008, Beijing, China*, 1-43.

<www><http://www.cprsouth.org>

Krok, D. (2009). "The Influence of Persuasive Strategies Used by Cultic Groups in the Context of Forewarning", *Cultic Study Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 43-67.

<www><http://www.icsahome.com>

Kulo, L. (2009). "Linguistic Features in Political Speeches: How Language Can be Used to Impose Certain Moral or Ethical Values on People", Bachelor Thesis, Lulea University of Technology, 1-32.

Lazarov, I. and M. Zlateva (2012). "Nature and Meaning of Repetition in Political Discourse", 1-20.

<www><http://www.ejournal.vfu.bg>

Lee, M. (2012). "21 Powerful Ways to Persuade People to Do What You Want", 1-42.

<www><http://www.cisgrenada.com>

Longobardi, F. (2010). Linguistic Factors in Political Speech: How Persuasive Discourse Constitutes or Shakes Politics, *International Workshop: Political Speech*, November 10th, 1-22.

<www><http://www.dcs.gla>

- Mills, H. (2000). *Artful Persuasion: How to Command Attention, Change Minds, and Influence People*. New York: a Division of American Management Association.
- Muller, R. (2005). "Creative Metaphor in Political Discourse: Theoretical Consideration on the Basis of Swiss Speeches", 53-73.
<www><http://www.metaphorik.de>
- Muralikrishnan, T. (2011). "Critical Discourse Analysis: Political and Verbal Coding", 20-29.
<www><http://languageinindia.com>
- Ngoa, S. N. (2011). "A Review and Analytical Narrative of Propaganda Activities: A Nigerian Perspective". *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 1, No. 16, 237-248.
- Pretty, R. , T. John and H. Martin (1981). "Effects of Rhetorical Questions on Persuasion: A Cognitive Response Analysis". *Journal of Personality and Psychology*, Vol. 40, No. 3, 432-440.
- Perini, P. (2004). "Decoding the Language of War: The Art of Deceiving and Sidetracking". *Pace Diritti Umani*, N.3, 57-65.
- Pishghadam, R. and P. Rasouli (2011). "A Cross-Linguistic Study of Persuasive Strategies used in Persian and English Languages", *Research Journal of International Studies*, Issue 22, 7-17.
- Rahimi, A. and R. Sahragard (2008). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Tahrn: Zaitoon Chap Baharan Company.
- Uvehammer, M. (2005). "The Impact of Linguistic Strategies in Political Debate: A Linguistic Discourse Analysis of the First Bush and Kerry Presidential Debate, 2004", 1-39.
<www><http://hv.diva-portal.org>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse and Society*, Vol. 4, No.2, 249-283.
- Wodak, R. and M. Meyer (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publishing.
- WWW.1 (2006). "The Power of Personal Persuasion: Advancing the Academic Library Agenda from the Front Lines", *Association of College and Research Library: a Division of the American Library Assotiation*, 1-29.
<www><http://www.ala.org>
- WWW.2 (2012). "Language of Persuasion", 1-6.
<www><http://medialiteracyproject.org>

Some Persuasive Strategies and Their Implications in the Political Discourse of War: A Critical Discoursal Analysis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nashwan Mustafa Al-Sa'ati & Sa'ad Salih Hamad Al-Zubaidi

WWW.3 (2012). "Glassory of Rhetorical Terms: AP English Language and Composition", 1-9. <www><http://www.powayusd.com> .

من استراتيجيات الإقناع ودلالاتها المنضوية في الخطاب السياسي للحرب: تحليل خطابي نقدي

أ.م.د. نشوان مصطفى الساعاتي وسعد صالح حامد

المستخلص

تتضمن لغة الحرب مفردات أعدت مسبقاً للسياسية ولفرض الأيديولوجيات التي يتبناها السياسيون على الناس، وبحسب هذه الأيديولوجيات، يقوم السياسيون بإقناع الناس بجدوى أفكارهم، ومن ثم التمكن من تغيير وجهات نظر الناس بحسب رغباتهم. تهدف الدراسة إلى تحليل الخطاب السياسي للحرب لغويًا؛ ليكون تمييز سيطرة تلك الأيديولوجيات السياسية في مثل هذا النوع من الخطابات ممكنًا؛ لذلك تهدف الدراسة إلى وصف الدلالات المنضوية وراء توظيف بعض استراتيجيات الإقناع الخطابية التي يتبناها السياسيون لتغيير ميول الناس ومعتقداتهم.

وتفترض الدراسة أن الخطاب السياسي للحرب يحوي وسائل خطابية ذات دلالات مختلفة لإقناع الناس بوجهات نظر السياسيين، كما تفترض الدراسة أن هذا النوع من الخطابات هو انعكاس لمراكز السياسيين الرسمية وایدیولوجیاتهم، لهذا السبب يحاول السياسيون استغلال مشاعر الناس وإثارتها ليتمكنوا من تغيير قناعاتهم دون اللجوء إلى أساليب العنف.

وأهم النتائج التي توصلت إليها الدراسة أنّ الخطاب السياسي للحرب يحتاج إلى تركيب لغوي معين لإيصال أيديولوجيات السياسيين للناس فضلاً عن ذلك، فإنّ المشاعر تؤدي دوراً مهماً في عملية إيصال أيديولوجيات السياسيين للناس، وكذلك في عملية تغيير قناعات الناس ومعتقداتهم، وكما تبين أيضاً إنّ مصداقية السياسيين تعزز جهودهم في اقناع الناس .