A Critical Discourse Analysis of Two Iraqi Politicians' Speeches in Terms of Van Dijk's Socio- Cognitive Model

Researcher :Rawaa Kudhir Nasih
Asst. Prof. Dr. Zaidoon Abdulrazaq Abboud
Dept. of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Basrah

Abstract:

This paper discusses Critical Discourse Analysis and Political Discourse with special reference to two Iraqi political speeches (the Prime Minister Ayad Allawi and the Presiden Barham Salih). The study focuses on exploring different ideologies, perspectives and attitudes through the use of Teun Van Dijk' Socio-Cognitive Model (2005). It aims to examine Iraqi politicians' speeches in order to find out how the politicians try to justify their ideas and convince their audience. The paper hypothesizes that there is an essential consideration of political discourse in reflecting and manipulating the community. Analyzing the speeches linguistically shows how Iraqi politicians differ in conveying or expressing their ideologies. The study approves its exposure of attitudes and ideologies through examining the applicability of Van Dijk's model to Iraqi politicians. The outcome of the analysis demonstrates that Allawi makes use of a larger number of discursive devices while Salih's usage is less frequent. Hence, the study approves its hypotheses and objectives.

Key words: **Critical Discourse Analysis, Political Discourse, Ideology, Power.**

<div dir="rtl">

تحليلُ الخطابُ النقديِ لِخطبٍ سياسيينٍ عراقيينٍ مِنْ حيّث إنّموذج الأجِتماعيِّ المعرفيِّ لِفان دايك

الباحثة: رواء خضر ناصح
أ.م. د. زيدون عبد الرزاق عبود
قسم اللغة الانكليزية/كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية/جامعة البصرة

الملخص:

تناقش هذه الدراسة تحليل الخطاب النقدي والسياسي مع إشارة خاصة إلى خطابات اثنين من السياسيين العراقيين (اياد علاوي و برهم صالح). تركز الدراسة على استكشاف مختلف الأيديولوجيات ووجهات النظر والمواقف من خلال استخدام النموذج الاجتماعي المعرفي للعالم فان دايك (٢٠٠٥) تهدف الدراسة الى فحص اثنان من خطاباتهم من اجل معرفة كيف يحاول السياسيون تبرير أفكارهم وإقناع جمهورهم ، وتفترض الدراسة أن هناك اعتبارًا أساسيًا للخطاب السياسي في انعكاس المجتمع والتلاعب به و كيف يختلف السياسيون العراقيون لغويا في نقل أو التعبير عن إيديولوجياتهم، وتوافق الدراسة على عرضها للمواقف والأيديولوجيات من خلال فحص مدى انطباق نموذج فان دايك على خطب السياسيين العراقيين. توضح نتائج التحليل أن علاوي يستخدم عدد أكبر من العناصر الاستطرادية بينما صالح استخدم القليل منها.اثبتت الدراسة عرضها للمواقف والايديولوجيات التي تفحص مدى انطباق انموذج فان دايك على خطب السياسيين العراقيين .

الكلمات المفتاحية: تحليل الخطاب النقدي ، الخطاب السياسي ، الأيديولوجي، القوه.

</div>

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Two Iraqi Politicians' Speeches in Terms of Van Dijk's Socio- Cognitive Model

1-Introduction

Analyzing political speeches as a guide for understanding actions and ideas is to understand the relations between the linguistic features of the discourse and its function. Politicians use language to expose their feelings, judgments, and viewpoints about other people, situations and things. Hunston and Thompson (1999:2) declare that the speaker's or writer's belief or opinion is an important characteristic of a language that demands to be explained in a full description of the meanings of texts, and this is not always conveyed directly. Language is used to possess the management of those with whom there is a struggle of concern; a process referred to as "language manipulation" (Rudyk, 2007: 28). It is outlined as "a communicative and interactional practice, within which a manipulator exercises management over others, sometimes against their will or against their best interests" (Van Dijk, 2006:360-361).

Most of politicians use an extensive variety of linguistic devices to attain their political goals and interests such as determining and persuading the community's thoughts, criticizing rival politicians, pretending or trying to act out the feelings of people to make them believe in politicians. Hence, we should have an awareness of the discursive devices and its performance in every phrase used. Therefore, by reading more than one of a politician's speech, we could get more insight into how the politicians use language manipulatively to validate their ideologies and values for the positive results.

2- Discourse and Discourse Analysis

'Discourse' has become one of the common words in a range of disciplines such as philosophy, sociology, politics, linguistics, and various other fields. Tracing back the meaning of discourse comes to be difficult to be approached since every field has its particular interpretation towards the term which can vary depending on the context of that discourse. However, this does not imply that there is no approximate understanding of the intentional term. Leech (1983: 84) indicates that discourse is a linguistic communication that may be perceived as a switch between a speaker and a listener. It is a relational activity whose form is set by its social purpose. Discourse analysis is a wide field that is associated with the use of language in context. Tistcher (2000:42) states that "discourse is a broad term with different definitions, which integrates a whole palette of meanings". Discourse analysis takes consideration of different methodological and theoretical methods such as anthropology, linguistic, psychology and sociology. The demands that we create on it and the functions it has to work or serve are nearly linked to language's nature. These functions are particular to a culture. "The particular form has been taken by the grammatical system of language is closely related to the social and personal need that language is required to serve" (Halliday, 1978:142).

The early discourse analysis has been involved within the inner construction of text. Halliday's systematic functional linguistics is considered as a new evolution against the internal structure of the texts. In accordance with Halliday (1978), texts ought to encode both social and personal processes; texts ought to be generated, realized and placed into a social context. Discourse analysis relies on micro and macro levels. Hence, all social and linguistic analyses are significant. Discourse can be interpreted as communicative events for the reason that discourses among people express messages beyond what is assumed and said in a direct way and what is essential and necessary in such discourse in indirect way.

3-Critical Discourse Analysis

The noticeable features of a text have been identified in CDA to decode and make sense of the ideologies conveyed in the grammatical forms and representations of the discourse. It is a "multidisciplinary approach to language that struggles to focus on the nature of social dominance and power by demonstrating the involved relationships between text, social cognition, talk, society, power and culture" (Van Dijk, 1995: 253). In Applied Linguistics, it is a cross-discipline method which is a relatively branch of discourse analysis. CDA is rather concerned with concerns of language, ideology and power within the discourse of texts, since discourse analysis concerns itself with studying the relationships between the contexts and language in which language is used(Coffin, 2001: 99; McCarthy, 2006: 5).

At the end of the 1970s, in discourse studies, CDA has been recognized and considered as one of the most crucial area of research. It is identified as an approach that has relied on the social theory and the union of language studies (Fairclough, 1992:76). Besides, CDA examines how social power is abused, the way text and talk procreate, represent and struggle dominance within the social and political context. The foremost distinguished figures in this domain are Norman Fairclough and Van Dijk. The former has established a three dimensional structure for studying discourse processes of text production, distribution and consumption, whereas the latter introduces the socio-cognitive approach (1988).

4-Political Discourse Analysis

Political discourse is essentially a field of discourse analysis which mainly focuses on the discourse practices formed in particular political environments or political domains such as legislative processes, parliamentary debates, hearings etc.(Johnson & Johnson, 2000 :291). As a result, it can be explained as a field of discourse analysis that ensures the political discursive actions for revealing the concealed ideologies and substantial agendas of political performers. For Van Dijk (1993, 1995, 1998c & 2006) political discourse does not denote only to the politicians' discourse who achieve certain political actions, but also for all of those stakeholders who directly or indirectly achieve their starring role in discursive political actions. Additionally, political discourse reveals political activities of electors, media and political parties, power groups, political workers, etc. (Van Dijk,

1998c:11). A very common and important category of political discourse comprises certain speeches in the media sources and that they are delivered by political leaders (Van Dijk, 1998c:18). Other alternative forms or practices might comprise several formal things such as political operations, discussions, parliamentary processes, interviews and public conferences. Some political leaders and pressure sets show their notions through magazines, newspapers, news , etc.

Van Dijk (1998c:48) states that PDA deals with the relations of power. It focuses upon how   political   power is expanded and retained. According   to Van Dijk's (1998c: 52) perspective, PDA is concerned with the study of ideology (re) construction,   identity   (re)presentation and demonstration, power manipulation, power exercise, power dominance, power manipulation, etc.

4.1.Power

According to Foucault(1998 :93), power is a complicated strategic state of affairs in a particular society or social situation. It is the measurement of an entity's capacity to manage its environment, containing the behavior or manners of other entities. The exponential idea is that power can be worked out by anybody, anywhere and can be in debt with its origins from anywhere. Foucault (1998:95) disproves the traditional present concept in which it is worked out by some groups periodically and with dominion as mere acts of authority.

A critical concept for CDA and PDA is power because one of the central explanations for CDA is that it is an approach which is involved in   analyzing the language that has associations underling it such as dominance, power, discrimination and control (Wodak, 2001a: 2). Basically, CDA deals with the study of the discursive devices of power abuse and misuse with forms of social inequality and domination (Van Dijk, 2005:87). With respect to CDA, power is a systemic, distinctive, non-static and transformative feature of interaction which is both legitimized and involved in every interaction (Weiss & Wodak, 2003:13).

Van Dijk (1996: 84) argues that power is described as relations among institutions, social groups and establishments. He draws attention to social power because of its solid effects on the actions and awareness of controlled groups. Power here, either by persuading or forcing them, means the domination of the controlled groups over the social members. Nearly, individuals in power have special privilege like prime ministers, presidents, doctors, journalists, etc. Thus, they can contact the public minds or awareness and expose their power with properties of dealings among different social groups (1996: 85).

Following Foucault, Fairclough brings some defined facet about power. He defines it as not merely an unbalanced authority which occurs among individuals who use relations of power in the same discursive occasion, but also by means of how particular people have different abilities to contact and dominate and how discourses are created, distributed and enthused (1995a:1). He believes that power relations work progressively more at an implied level through language. Therefore, dominant groups will be conscious of using discourse in a lined way to coach their ideologies through it (1992:12).

4.2.Ideology

Entirety, everything that we write or utter has an ideological conception : "language is not a clear window, but a refracting, structuring medium". Ideology is "a systematic body of ideas, organized from a particular point of view". (Hodge and Kress,1993 :6). Ideology is the significant systems and sets of beliefs that are common and shared by social groups , it can be exposed through specific linguistic choices in texts. Language mirrors and builds ideology (Simpson,1995:5-6). Ideologies are defined as "particular ways of representing and constructing society which reproduce unequal relations of power, relations of domination and exploitation" (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997:275). One of the unique aims of CDA is to expose hidden ideologies as established and recognized in the language used and then the ideas conveyed to the listener or the reader. Ideology is interconnected with the relations of control and power in society. Fairclough (2004:14) states:

> I understand ideology as" meaning in the service of power. (Thomspon,1984,1990)–Ideologies are propositions that generally figure as implicit assumptions in texts, which contribute to producing or reproducing unequal relations of power, relations of domination. They may be implicit, for instance in the presuppositions(taken – for –granted assumptions) of texts.

5 – Model of the Study and Analysis

5.1. Teun A.Van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Model, the CDA Approach

Van Dijk's framework began to form in the 1980s when he showed "a critical analysis of media text with a specific emphasis on portrayal of minorities". The typical characteristic of Van Dijk's framework for media discourse (1988) (news, press, and political text and talk) is essential in applying the analytical framework to go beyond the textual and structural analysis and to test the discourse at production, comprehension or reception levels (Sajjad, 2015:43). It comprises analysis of "higher level properties such as coherence, overall themes and topics of news stories and the whole schematic forms and rhetorical dimensions of texts". This holistic analytical view explains discourse as "a complex communicative event that also embodies a social context featuring participants (and their properties) as well as production and reception processes". (Van Dijk, 1988 :2) Van Dijk proposes a socio-cognitive model of CDA. This model combines "discourse, social and cognitive analyses". It is based on the assumptions that cognition intercedes between "society" and "discourse" and that discourse analysis is directed on different talk and text structures (Van Dijk, 1995:21).

The micro-level analysis includes lexicon, syntax, topics, local semantics, and schematic structures. Thus, the social analysis involves "overall societal structures, e.g. parliamentary democracy and capitalism; institutional/ organizational structures, e.g. racist political parties; group relations, e.g. discrimination, racism;

group structures, e.g. identity, tasks, goals, norms, position and resources" (Van Dijk, 1995:20). The macro-level analysis, on the other hand, conveys power, dominance, and inequality among social groups.

To differentiate the ideological opposition in political discourse, Van Dijk's political discourse analysis model (2005) appears to be a complete analytical tool (Van Dijk, 2005; Bello, 2013; Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). Van Dijk introduces the general strategies of the "Ideological square" (2005) to examine an ideological discourse based on four principles: Self and Others Representation. Van Dijk (2005:734) summarizes them as follows:

- **Emphasize "Our" good things.**(Exaggerate in self's positive features/actions)
- **Emphasize "Their" bad things.**(Exaggerate in other's negative features/actions)
- **De-emphasize "Our" bad things**.(Extenuate self's bad features/actions)
- **De-emphasize "Their" good things.**(Extenuate other's positive features/actions) (2005 :734).

These four principles play a significant role in a larger contextual approach of "positive self –presentation and negative other-presentation". Self-presentation debates the individual's action as a member of a group while confidently conveying many ideological ideas, and that of positive self-representation emphasizes individuals' positive behavior as in saying positive things about "Us" and saying negative things about "Them". This positive stance is an abstract representative of group conflicts and as the interface pattern competes against the other groups (Van Dijk, 2000,2004).

With an emphasis on "positive self-representation and negative other-representation", this ideological square can be précised into a "fundamental dichotomy" (Rashidi & Souzandehfar, 2010: 69). The dichotomy polarizes "actors into in and out groups and how the former project their positive side but downplay their negative side; while they project the negative side of the latter and downplay their positive side" (Bello, 2013:86). Propaganda, programs, speeches, debates and interviews in the political domain typically highlight "the preferred topics of 'our' group or party, on what we have done well, and associate political opponents with negative topics such as war, violence, drugs, lack of freedom, and so on" (Van Dijk, 2005:734).

The self-positive representation or in-group preference and the negative other-representation are both semantic macro-strategies. The dichotomy is, instead, engaged with the purpose of "face-keeping or impression management" and elimination of the oppositions from the in-group, in that way assigning them in the out-group**.** The overall target of these classifications is to portray oneself as the so-called "good, superior and us" and the other as "bad, inferior and them" (Van Dijk, 2005:739).

In addition to this macro-semantic ideological square, other properties such as syntax, lexical items and discursive devices at the micro- structure level can be used to inculcate the positive ideology in the mind of the public (Van Dijk, 2002, 2005). With this sense, Van Dijk states certain cases of ideology in discourse by indicating different levels of analysis (syntax, semantics, lexicon, context, etc.). Also, he mentions discourse strategies, Van Dijk (2005:735) applied 25 discursive devices which, in Dijk's words, are "general strategies of ideological discourse production and also a handy discovery or recognition procedure for ideological analysis of political discourse" (p.735).

According to Van Dijk (2005:735-736), these 25 discursive devices with their discourse analysis sphere are:

Actor description (meaning), **authority** (argumentation), **burden** (topos), **categorization** (meaning), **comparison** (meaning, argumentation), **consensus** (political strategy), **counterfactuals** (meaning, argumentation), **disclaimers** (meaning), **euphemism** (rhetoric, meaning),**evidentiality** (meaning, argumentation), **example/illustration** (argumentation), **generalization** (meaning, argumentation), **hyperbole** (rhetoric), **implication** (meaning)**, irony** (meaning), **lexicalization** (style), **metaphor** (meaning, rhetoric), **national self-glorification** (meaning)**, norm expression** (normalization), **number game** (rhetoric, argumentation), **polarization: US-Them categorization** (meaning), **populism** (political strategy), **presupposition** (meaning), **vagueness** (meaning), **and victimization** (meaning) (p.735-736).

5.2. The Micro- level Analysis

The micro level analysis presents the frequencies, percentage and the analysis of the discursive devices for both of Allawi and Salih:

Table (1). Frequency and Percentage of the total of each Discursive   device (the Micro-level) for the two politicians' four speeches

The politician	Allawi		Salih	
Discursive devises	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Actor description	*34*	*6.25%*	*39*	*9.219%*
Authority	*11*	*2.022%*	*7*	*1.654%*

7

Category				
Burden	17	3.125%	11	2.600%
Categorization	16	2.941%	12	2.836%
Comparison	3	0.551%	4	0.945%
Consensus	24	4.411%	21	4.964%
Counterfactuals	14	2.573%	7	1.654%
Disclaimers	31	5.698%	23	5.437%
Euphemism	7	1.286%	5	1.182%
Evidentiality	32	5.882%	24	5.673%
Illustration	21	3.860%	13	3.073%
Generalization	47	8.639%	26	6.146%
Hyperbole	24	4.411%	30	7.092%
Implication	21	3.860%	18	4.255%
Irony	1	0.183%	-	0
Lexicalization	81	14.889%	52	12.293%
Metaphor	1	0.183%	-	0
National self-glorification	17	3.125%	11	2.600%
Norm expression	23	4.227%	43	10.165%
Number game	31	5.698%	10	2.364%
Polarization	26	4.779%	13	3.073%
Populism	16	2.941%	14	3.309%
Presupposition	10	1.838%	11	2.600%
Vagueness	19	3.492%	17	4.018%
Victimization	17	3.125%	12	2.836%
Total No.	544		423	

Table (1) shows that Allawi makes use of the discursive devices 544 times out of which *Lexicalization* occurred 81 times **(14,889%)** followed by *Generalization* 47 times **(8.639%)**, *Actor description* 34 times **(6.25%)**, *Evidentiality* 32 times **(5.882%)**, *Disclaimers* 31 times **(5.677%)**, *Number game* 31 times **(5.698%)**, *Polarization* 26 times **(4.779%)**, *Hyperbole* 24 times **(4.411%)**, *Consensus* 24 times **(4.411%)**, *Norm expression* 23 times **(4.227%)**, *Illustration* 21 times **(3.860%)**, *Implication* 21 times **(3.860%)**, *Vagueness* 19 times **(3.492%)**, *Burden* 17 times **(3.125%)**, *Victimization* 17 times **(3.125%)**, *National self-glorification* 17 times **(3.125%)**, *Populism* 16 times **(2.941%)**, *Categorization* 16 times **(2.941%)**, *Counterfactuals* 14 times **(2.573%)**, *Authority* 11 times **(2.022%)**, *Presupposition* 10 times **(1.838%)**, *Euphemism* 7 times **(1.286%)**, *Comparison* 3 times **(0.551%)**, *Metaphor* once **(0.183 %)** and *Irony* once **(0.183 %)** respectively.

Besides, Table (1) shows that Salih employs the discursive devises 423 times out of which *Lexicalization* occurred 52 times **(12.293%)**, *Norm expression* 43 times **(10.165%)**, *Actor description* 39 times **(9.219%)**, *Hyperbole* 30 times **(7.092%)**, *Generalization* 26 times **(6.146%)**, *Evidentiality* 24 times **(5.673%)**, *Disclaimers* 23 times **(5.698%)**, *Consensus* 21 times **(4.964%)**, *Implication* 18 times**(4.255%)**, *Vagueness* 17 times **(4.018%)**, *Populism* 14 times **(3.309%)**, *Polarization* 13 times **(3.073%)**, *Illustration* 13 times **(3.073%)**, *Categorization* 12 times **(2.836%)**, *Victimization* 12 times **(2.836%)**, *National self -glorification* 11 times **(2.600%)**, *Presupposition* 11 times **(2.600%)**,*Burden* 11 times **(2.600%)**, *Number game* 10**(2.364%)**, *Counterfactuals* 7 times **(1.654%)**, *Authority* 7 times **(1.654%)**, *Euphemism* 5 times **(1.182%)**, *Comparison* 4 times **(0.945%)**, *Metaphor* **(0)** and *Irony* **(0)** respectively.

5.2.1.Actor Description

Actor description "introduces detailed and complete information of an entity such as place, person, thing and the manner this entity plays its role in a social or political context, etc., either positively or negatively" (Van Dijk, 2005 :736). Ideologies enact the way individuals are illustrated in discourse. Ingroup members aim to be defined in a positive or neutral way, whereas outgroup members aim to be described in a negative way. The politician Barham Salih utilizes the category *Actor description* slightly more than Allawi and. Salih employs *Actor description* 39 times with a percentage of (9.219%) in his two speeches (2006- 2019) and Allawi employs it 34 times with a percentage of (6.25%) in his two speeches (2004 -2008). This shows how the politicians use *Actor description* to introduce and describe information of an entity/ thing , place or people to reveal the meaning behind their information and description like **"…this stability is an important accomplishment that must be preserved and must not be forfeited…"** (Salih 2019), in this utterance Salih declares how the stability is significant issue that must be well- maintained. Similarly, Allawi introduces a description about the reconciliation and the importance of its purpose as in: **"it shows the commitment towards Iraq, towards civility in the region, which is a very important region"** (Allawi, 2008).

5.2.2. Authority

It is the category that refers to discourse makers' expertise in a subject or topic by resorting to information or evidence provided by authorities to make a copy up the discourse producers' beliefs, opinions, or claims to trace the feelings of the audience; the authority refers to the discourse producers' employment of deductive or cognitive reasoning (logic) to persuade the listeners as well (Van Dijk, 2005; Rashidi & Souzandehfar, 2010). In addition, the discourse producers' employment of deductive or cognitive reasoning can be shown in their speech by utilizing the category, the politicians utilize this category for the same purposes : firstly, to persuade the listeners e.g.: **"we were successful. The shrine was preserved. Order was restored. And Najaf and Kufa were returned to their citizens"** (Allawi,2004). Secondly, to refer to their expertise in a subject **e.g.: "the Iraqi people have the strength and the stamina to continue fighting for freedom, not only for Iraq but also Iraq is a key country in the region and the greater Middle East"** (Allawiو 2008). Thirdly, to make a clear idea about the discourse producers' beliefs, claims, or the historical achievements of their country to trace the feelings of the audience and to remind them of the authority and glorification of his country   as in the utterance **:We have many geopolitical and economic and cultural and religious considerations in this field Iraq is the cradle of our Prophet Abraham Iraq has Muslim neighbors and an Arab depth it is a meeting point of great nations in the region (Salih, 2019).**

5.2.3.Burden (topos)

Burden (topos) is the category that indicates human loss of a group or the financial, whether a small group or big one like a nation, to victimize or abuse the group or touch the feelings of the audience (Van Dijk, 2005:736). Also, to gain the attention of the audience and sympathy for politicians. This is shown through making use of the discursive device *Burden* :17 times with a percentage of (3.125%) is utilized by Allawi, 11 times with a percentage of (2.600%) is utilized by Salih : "**We have been losing people killed, the settlers have been killed, the families had been killed, but we didn't go back to the government. We are still in the political process" (Allawi 2008)**. In this utterance, Allawi uses *Burden* category to indicate human loss of a group to victimize the group. In Salih's utterance,he mentions the burden that their people endure, such as paying debts as a result of mistakes of Western and Middle Eastern strategy, is to touch the feelings of audience: **We are paying off an accumulated debt from the mistakes of Western and Middle Eastern policy in the pre-9/11 era—the folly of engaging the region through its dictatorial superstructure, the contempt of the governing elites and ruling castes for their subjects (Salih 2006).**

5.2.4. Lexicalization

Lexicalization indicates using semantic features of words to depict or describe something or someone positively or negatively (Rashidi & Souzandehfar, 2010; Van Dijk, 2005: 738). Allawi makes use of *Lexicalization* much more than Salih . *Lexicalization* occurs   81 times with a percentage of (14.889%) in Allawi's speech (2004-2008) and 52 times with a percentage of (12.293%) in Salih's speech (2006-2019). Employing more usage of *Lexicalization* in the politician's speech is a reference for usage of different style of lexical choices, the political speakers frequently use *Lexicalization* to depict their particular beliefs into the mind of the audiences. Thus, democracy is viewed in their media discourse when   the politicians   aim   to represent themselves positively and to present others negatively through *Lexicalization*. Allawi and Salih employ different intensive use of negative lexicalizations such as **"hesitation", "threats", "reluctant", "sectarianism","terrorism","tyranny","terrorists"…**etc(Allawi,2008),**"thebrutal ","barbaric""murder","hostages","mourn"**,...etc.(Allawi,2004),**"decades", "the criticisms" , "The turmoil", "racist tyranny"**(Salih 2006).

5.2.5. Vagueness

Generally, vagueness is used to save face; "virtually in all contexts speakers may use vague expressions, that is, expressions that do not have well-defined referents, or which refer to fuzzy sets" (Van Dijk, 2005:739). The   data analysis of the discursive devices also display that there is a significant difference   in the three politicians' employment of the discursive device *Vagueness*. Salih's   usage of *Vagueness* is approximately close to Allawi's usage of the *Vagueness* device: 17 times with a percentage of (4.018%) and 19 times with a percentage of (3.492%) respectively. The following   utterances are exemplars of utilizing the discursive device *Vagueness* in the speeches of politicians: **"<u>some of the countries, I think three, agreed and the rest are still reluctant</u>"**(Allawi, 2008), **"<u>In those cities</u> a firebrand cleric had taken over Shia Islam's holiest sites in defiance of the government and the local population"** (Allawi, 2004). Also, Salih does not give a clear number of days when the government embraced a draft law as in   **"the Iraqi government <u>a few days</u> ago adopted a draft law"** (Salih, 2019).

5.2.6.Number Game

The application of statistics or numbers by a discourse maker in argument to increase the sincerity and authority of their beliefs/opinions or ideas is called "number game". Much argument is adapted to enhancing credibility by moves that emphasize objectivity. They symbolize the "facts" against mere opinion and impression (Van Dijk,2004:79). The frequency of the discursive device *Number game* is higher in   Allawi's speeches (2004-2008) than that of Salih's speeches. Allawi employs it 31 times with a percentage of (5.698%) and Salih employs it 10 times with a percentage of (2.364%) . Both of the discourse makers rhetorically employ or mention   statistics or numbers in their speeches for purposes : to

increase the authority of their beliefs as in Allawi's speech (2004) in the following utterance: **"Thousands of my Kurdish brothers and sisters were gassed to death by Saddam's chemical weapons" (2004)** and Salih's speech in **"We estimate at least 300,000 in mass graves, which stands as monuments to the inhumanity of Saddam's regime" (2006).**

5.2.7. Victimization

Allawi and Salih 's utilization of *Victimization* category :17 times with a percentage of (3.125%) and12 times with a percentage of (2.836%) respectively. It is organized by demonstrating out-group members negatively and representing in-group members as the victims to unfair/ bad treatment. Clearly, Salih introduces Iraqi people as a victim to bad results of corruption and terrorism of the Ba'ath regime as in the utterance: **"the Iraqi people's suffering over 40 years because of oppression because of campaigns of genocide such as the Anfal genocide mass graves the use of chemical weapons and Halabja the drying of the marshes and the destruction of the environment the war is the siege the ravages of terrorism, the destruction of infrastructure and corruption" (2019).** Thus, both of the politicians utilize the category of Victimization to attract the feelings of the audience and reduce others hard attitudes towards them. Hence, with discourse the topics of terrorism and victims are appeared in such category, this help the audience easily to know what is exactly meant by aggression, terrorism and their bad results, and that is often the first source/ tool of information for the audience.

5.3. The Macro- level Analysis

At the macro-level, the comparison of the employment of the ideological "the positive self-representation" and "negative other-representation" dichotomy shows that there is a considerable dissimilarity between the employment of positive self-representation and negative other-representation:

5.3.1. Positive Self-Representation in the Speeches

Through reading Ayad Allawi's speeches (2004-2008) and Barham Salih (2006-2019), it is noted that they utilize the positive self- representation strategy a lot in their speeches. Allawi and Salih strongly stress the good things and features of the country of Iraq and its peoples, as well as focusing on the bad things and treatment of others like the terrorists, Takfiris, Saddamists , the jihadist base...etc.

Having read the speeches, it is noted that the politicians positively use this strategy in most of the discursive devices that are found in their speeches; for instance, in the *national self – glorification* discursive device, *authority* discursive device, *consensus* strategy…etc. However, the politicians, all along with their speeches, have deeply emphasized the real issues of Iraqi forces and highlighted the courage of its people and the Iraqi forces. They show successfully and positively their positive representation and describe their standing and reaction towards Iraqi

forces by demonstrating that they are aiming to promote the power as in utterance: **"These new Iraqi forces are rising to the challenge. They are fighting on behalf of sovereign Iraqi government, and therefore their performance is improving every day. Working closely with the coalition allies, they are striking their enemies wherever they hide, disrupting operations, destroying safe houses and removing terrorist leaders**." (Allawi 2004). **"We   hope to activate with the assistance of our brothers and friends"**(Salih 2019), here, Salih's utterance is full of positive feelings; especially when he uses the words 'hope', 'activate' and 'our'. He positively introduces his ideas and strategy for assisting the people of his country.

5.3.2. Negative Other-Representation in the Speeches

  Mainly, the negative other –representation strategy according to Van Dijk's ideological square is presented through the others' negatives. It is basically employed to emphasize the bad/negative actions and de- emphasize their good actions, it can be seen that this strategy is used in most of the sentences of Allawi and Salih's speeches through employing discursive strategies that carry the negative presentation most of the time such as using 'lexicalization','burden', 'victimization' ...etc. Here, **"America's engagement with Iraq did not begin in 2003. It started many decades earlier and it was sometimes a sorry and bleak story"**(Salih, 2006) in this sentence Salih wants to emphasize the painful result of America's entry into Iraq, its engagement and its domination of status in Iraq. **"Well over a million Iraqis were murdered or are missing. We estimate at least 300,000 in mass graves, which stands as monuments to the inhumanity of Saddam's regime"** (Allawi, 2004).This clear image about the bad action and brutality of Saddam's regime illustrated in Allawi's utterance by mentioning the result of the bad regime murdering Iraq people. The result show that others management have a negative ideology as Sadam who was signed as an enemy that is recognized as negative ideology and that the image of those negative representations displays various variations of ideologies.Thus , utilizing such negative presentation sentences and words in the speeches by the politicians is to attract the audiences and readers' attention.

6. Conclusion

        The study displays that the overall use of these political ideologies appears to be within Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model (2005). The contextual and linguistic characteristics of the speech are set purposely to serve ideologically "positive self-representation and negative other-representation". Its core purpose is to highlight the opposition and variation between "positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation" as a means of governing the audiences' minds and maintaining the misapplication of manipulation, power and inequality.

This study concludes that the politician Allawi's use of discursive devices (544 times) occurs more than that of the politician Barham Salih's use. However, the outcome of an analysis of devices demonstrates that Allawi makes use of a larger number of discursive devices; this might be clarified that Allawi's speeches seem to be more formal, as they embrace more complex discursive strategies and structures. The more utilization of these discursive devices, the more their speech is formal and has more ideological stances/attitudes. So, they adopt more complex discursive strategies, structures and a rhetoric devices differently. The study approves the applicability of Van Dijk's model (2005) to Iraqi politicians' speeches. It also depicts how the underlying ideologies of each political speech with respect to the democratic issue and media in Iraq are revealed since media mostly achieves it by utilizing socio-political and ideological beliefs in implied utilization of linguistic strategies.

References

Abdulkareem, Mustafa A.(2017). *The Representation of ISIS in the American Newspapers in terms of Van Leeuwen's Social Actor Approach: A Critical Discourse Analysis.* Unpublished MAThesis. University of Basra, College of Arts.

Adday, R. (2017). *Rhetoric of Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Tony Blair's Speeches of Iraq War 2003.* Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Basra , College of Arts.

Bello, U. (2013). "If I could make it, you too can make it! Personal pronouns in political discourse: a CDA of president Jonathan's presidential declaration speech". *International Journal of English Linguistics, 3* (6), Pp.84-96.

Burns, A. (2001). Analysing Spoken Discourse: Implications for TESOL. Burns, A. and Coffin, C. (Eds.), *Analysing English in a Global Context: A Reader.* Oxon: Routledge,Pp. 123-148.

Coffin, C. (2001). Theoretical Approaches to Written Language—A TESOL Perspective. Burns, A. and Coffin, C. (Eds.), *Analyzing English in a Global Context: A Reader.* Oxon: Routledge, Pp.93-122.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak. R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: A Multidisciplinary Introduction.* London: Sage Publications Ltd,Pp. 258-284.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge, UK:Policy Press.

------------------ (1995). "Media Discourse. Great Britain: Edward Arnold". Retrieved from http://www.citeulike.org/group/236/article/202562

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as a Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning.* University Park Press.

Hodge, R., V. & Kress, G. R.(1993). *Language As Ideology.* London: Routledge.

Hunston, s. & Thompson,G. (1999). *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2000). "Civil Political Discourse in a Democracy: The Contribution of Psychology". *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 6*(4), Pp. 291-317. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327949PAC0604_01

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics.* London: Longman.

McCarthy, M. (2006). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rashidi, N., & Souzandehfar, M. (2010). "A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Debates between Republicans and Democrats over the Contribution of War in Iraq". *JOLIE, 3*(67), Pp. 42-82.

Rudyk, I. (2007). "Power Relations in President Bush's State of the Union Speech". *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture, 23*, Pp.68-76.

Sajjad, Farhat. (2015). "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Hussein Obama's Political Speeches on the Middle East and the Muslim World". *International Journal of Linguistics, 7*(1), Pp1-41.

Shousha, A., Ibrahim.(2010). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Image of Arabs in theAmerican Press.* Unpublished MA Thesis. Alexandria University, Faculty of Arts.

Simpson, Paul. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.

Titscher, S.; Meyer, M.; Wodak, R.; & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. (1998c). What is Political Discourse Analysis? In J. Blommaert & C. Bbulcae (Eds.), *Discourse and society. Pp.11-52*

--------------- (1993). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse & Society*, 4(2). Pp. 249-283.

--------------- (1995). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In Christiina Schaffner and Anita L. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and Peace*. Dartmouth: Aldershot, Pp.17-33.

--------------- (1988). *News Analysis: Case Studies of International and National News in the Press.* Hillsdale : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

--------------- (2000). "Critical Discourse Analysis". Retrieved from http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html.

----------------- (2002). Ideology: Political Discourse and Cognition. In P. Chilton, & Ch.Schaffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

----------------- (2004). "Politics, Ideology and Discourse". Retrieved from http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html.

---------------- (2005). Contextual Knowledge Management in Discourse Production: A CDA Perspective. In R. Wodak, and P. Chilton. (Eds), *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinary*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, Pp.87-739.

----------------- (2006). "Discourse and Manipulation". Journal of *Discourse & Society,* 17 (3), Pp.360-361.

Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.) *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, Pp.352-371.

Additional References:

Ayad Allawi, (September 23 /2004 ; July 25 in (2008). "U.S regarding Iraq's interim government", "Iraq future". Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2004/09/23/international/middleeast/iraqi-prime-ministers-speech-to-us-congress.html , https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tV_ud7T2PIo&t=3110s and https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RMLuyw6U77M

Barham Salih, (September 13 /2006 ; September 30/2019). "Iraq's National and International Compacts" , "the general debate of the General Assembly of the UN" Retrieved from :

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RJqxR2cWVjI&t=236s

https://gadebate.un.org/generaldebate74/en/