

Pragmatics: A Critical Instance Analysis of Discourse Background of Iraq War

Adib Darmawan^{1✉}

(1) English Department, Universitas PGRI Jombang

✉ Corresponding author

[adibdar@yahoo.com]

Abstrak

Selama dekade terakhir, terdapat banyak kontroversi seputar gagasan rumit tentang terorisme dan antiterorisme. Terorisme adalah topik yang sangat rumit dan mendominasi agenda nasional dan internasional. Bentuknya bisa bermacam-macam dan dikaitkan dengan berbagai kelompok dan alasan. Disajikan dalam berbagai cara sesuai dengan siapa yang berbicara. Dengan latar belakang tersebut, artikel ini bertujuan melakukan Analisis Wacana Kritis (CDA) terhadap pernyataan-pernyataan Bush mengenai terorisme. Ini menerapkan gagasan van Dijk tentang Analisis Wacana Kritis pada dua pidato Bush, dengan menggunakan teknik analisis isi kualitatif. Studi tersebut menemukan bahwa Bush memproyeksikan terorisme secara tidak baik, sementara memproyeksikan anti-terorisme secara positif dengan sengaja memilih terminologi dan ungkapan yang bermuatan emosi. Pernyataan Bush sering kali memuat referensi tentang kekuasaan sebagai kendali, kendali pikiran, dan kendali konteks. Penelitian ini mempunyai implikasi signifikan terhadap teori Analisis Wacana Kritis dan penelitian teroris.

Kata Kunci: Pidato, Bentuk Linguistic, Analisis Wacana Kritis

Abstract

Over the past decade, there has been much controversy surrounding the complicated idea of terrorism and antiterrorism. Terrorism is a highly complicated subject that dominates national and international agendas. It can take many different forms and is associated with a wide range of groups and reasons. It has been presented in various ways according on who is speaking. Against this backdrop, this article tries to do a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Bush's statements on terrorism. It applies van Dijk's notion of Critical Discourse Analysis to two Bush speeches, utilizing a qualitative content analytical technique. The study found that Bush projected terrorism unfavorably while projecting anti-terrorism positively by deliberately picking emotionally charged terminology and phrasing. Bush's remarks frequently included references to power as control, mind control, and context control. This study has significant implications for Critical Discourse Analysis theory and terrorist research.

Keyword: *Speech, Linguistic Forms, Critical Discourse Analysis*

INTRODUCTION

Norman Fairclough's *Language and Power* was one of the first seminal texts to focus on one of the most compelling issues in contemporary pragmatics today—that is, the exploration of the relationship between language, power and ideology. Fairclough's aim is the raising of critical consciousness concerning the ideological assumptions embedded in language use in contemporary society, largely through an explanation of existing social conventions which are seen as outcomes of struggles for power. This power can be used by politicians to make decision, to control resources, to control other people's behaviour and to control their values. As stated by A. van Dijk (2004:22) that power is not only a way to control the acts of other people, but also their minds, and such mind control, which is again at the basis of action control, is largely discursive. In other words, discourse plays a fundamental role in the cycle of the reproduction of social power. To achieve their aims, the

politicians will choose their words carefully since they believe in the power of language to influence the thought and they believe implicitly in linguistic relativity. In this case, Obama used their words to influence the muslims' impression and views. In his address, he touched on the four years he spent in the country as a child and emphasised the importance of Indonesia's example as a growing economy and a majority-Muslim nation that is largely tolerant of other religions.

According to Schriffrin (1994) there are two definitions of the term *discourse*. The first definition characterizes discourse as a unit of coherent language consisting of more than one sentence; while the functional one characterizes discourse as language in use. These definitions are argued by Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000:4) by saying that a piece of discourse is an instance of spoken and written language that has describable internal relationships of form and meaning (e.g. words, structures, cohesion) that relate coherently to an external communicative function or purpose and a given audience/interlocutor.

Dealing with the writer's purposes and readers' response, according to D'Angelo (1980) there are four categories of discourse forms. They are 1) informative discourse, in which the writer intends to inform or instruct, 2) literary discourse, where the writer's purpose is to entertain or please, 3) expressive discourse, where the writer intends to express strong feelings and emotion, and 4) persuasive discourse, in which the writer's intention is to convince or persuade. The analysis used to see the ideological assumption is known as Critical Discourse Analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis is a variety of approaches towards the social analysis of discourse which differs in theory, methodology, and the type of research issues to which they tend to give prominence (Fairclough, 2003:1). CDA works in how content in a discourse whether it is about politics, social, culture, military forces or gender, can be oriented and subjected to certain ideologies through the way it is presented.

In this study, the author will apply Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar, in terms of the three meta-functions: ideational function, interpersonal function and textual function, to find out the formal features of Bush's speech. Its aim is to explore the relationships among language ideology and power and to find out how to use the power of speeches to persuade the public to accept and support his policies. Based on the above explanation, the researcher conducted a research on Analysis of Discourse Background of Iraq War with 1. context of culture of Bush speech on October 7, 2002, context of situation of Bush speech on October 7, 2002, and ideological assumptions does Bush speech on October 7, 2002.

RESEARCH METHOD

This current research used Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) that look into the relationship between power and discourse, and specifically investigate the way in which authority, dominance and social inequality are constructed, sustained, reproduced and resisted in the discourse of written texts and spoken words. Various critical methods to discourse have been utilized to analyze a wide range of discourses, with special emphasis on their relevance to the study of politics. The establishment of political institutions, which require individuals to be convinced to work together for the benefit of everyone, appears to depend on the utilization of a symbolic communication system. It is quite likely that these two human characteristics have developed simultaneously.

The data were acquired from the internet, specifically from the website <http://www.google.com> (see to the References section for more particular information). The speeches delivered by President Bush in the last decade (2001-2011) were pre-written and rehearsed. To analyze the supplied data, we employed a qualitative content analysis methodology. This method involves subjectively interpreting the context of the text data by systematically classifying and finding themes and patterns through coding. It involves more than just tallying words or collecting factual information from texts. Instead, it delves into the analysis of meanings, themes, and patterns that may be evident or hidden within a certain text. The data were thoroughly examined to identify the different lexico-grammatical elements utilized by Bush. The researcher conducted a macro-level analysis utilizing critical discourse analysis to examine how power, ideology, context control, and mind control are manifested in the speeches. Attention was given to language and vocabulary during this process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

Context of culture

This speech was delivered on October 7, 2002, four days before Congress vote to decide Iraq war. This speech was scheduled so that Bush could explain his Iraqi policy directly to the American people. Although it seemed likely that the resolution Bush seeks will pass both houses of Congress by the end of that week, polls showed that public support is waning. Most Americans still supported war against Iraq but had questions about its timing and the lack of support from allies. This speech was delivered to show that confronting Iraq is crucial to winning the war against terror because the greatest threat to U.S. security was that Saddam Husein would turn his weapons of mass destruction over to terrorists who shared his hatred of the United States. This speech uses the American psychology that is haunted by the terror of September the 11th, 2001. The words choice reminds American people to the terror caused by terrorists which is outlined by Bush to get support from Saddam Hussein.

Context of situation

Field

A political speech addressing American people, asking for political support from American Congress to authorize the use of American's military and to enforce U.N. Security Council demands. These aims are achieved by trying to outline the threat of Iraq under Saddam Husein power.

Tenor

The speech is allegedly delivered by George W Bush, President of the United States, the most politically powerful men in the United States of America. This television speech is aimed to American people.

Mode

The speech is naturally in spoken form, and is organized seemingly to provide information for the listeners about the threat of Iraqi regime and to persuade the listeners to believe what Bush argues. The speech is a public spoken discourse act intended to be listened by all American people. It is a persuasive text that uses a number of 'facts' to reinforce and further its aims.

Post contextual analysis

The post contextual analysis is used to reveal the ideological assumption embedded in Bush speech. This analysis uses Fairclough's list of questions.

What *experiential* values do words have?

- *Are there words, which are ideologically contested?*

A word in the text that is immediately noticeable as being ideologically contested is *regime* and *terrorist*. These words are used by Bush to show that the reason of attacking Iraq is for the sake of winning the war to terrorism. The words have haunted all American people after September the 11th, 2001. The words have influenced psychological effects toward American people. The horror of September the 11th has been aroused by Bush through his speech.

- *What ideologically significant meaning relations are there between words*

Saddam Husein and George Bush have (obviously) ideologically different and therefore contested. The words *threat*, *weapon*, *regime*, *dictator*, *aggression*, *tyrant* are used many times by Bush to represent the negative side of Saddam Husein ideology. These words are confronted to Bush ideology's words such as *peace*, *disarm*, *winning the war*, *defend*, *protect*, *freedom*, *prevail*, *hope*. The words to express Bush ideology have positive effects while words addressed to Saddam have negative ones.

What *relational* values do words have?

The speech and its vocabulary are targeted towards the American people. The choice of words helps creating social relationships between participants. The words relating to the September 11 terrorist attack are used to arouse the same psychological perception among American people. The word *threat* in the speech title refers to be the American nightmare. It is

assumed that the life of American will be under the fear caused by terrorism. The following sentence contains the words creating social relationship between participants.

*"We also must never forget the most vivid events of recent history. On September the 11th, 2001, America felt its **vulnerability** -- even to threats that gather on the other side of the earth. We resolved then, and we are resolved today, to confront every threat, from any source, that could bring **sudden terror and suffering to America**. "*

*"We agree that the Iraqi dictator must not be permitted to threaten America and the world with **horrible poisons** and diseases and gases and atomic weapons. Since we all agree on this goal, the issues is : how can we best achieve it?"*

*These actions **killed or injured** at least 20,000 people, more than six times the number of people who died in the attacks of September the 11th*

The words *sudden terror, suffering to America, horrible poison, killed, injured* can emphasize the need for the nation to come together to combat terrorist.

What expressive values do words have?

Words with expressive values can be classified in two main ways, those that are positive and associated with the American ideology and those which are negative and used in conjunction with Terrorist represented by Saddam Husein.

Table 1. Expressive values of the speech

Positive Connotations	Negative Connotations
Peace	Threat
Security	Tyrant, dictator
Duty	Regime
Prevent	Aggression
Truth	Attack
Civilized world	Horrible poison
Human liberty	Violence
Strength	Mass destruction
Hope	Homicidal
Courage	Dangerous
Action	Terrorist
Secure	Arsenal terror
Lead the world	Murder
ruthless	sacrifice

What metaphors are used?

"Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator who is addicted to weapons of mass destruction."

The word *addicted* is usually used for a person who is unable to stop taking drugs or alcohol or a person who is extremely interested in something and spends a lot of time on it. The expression *addicted* is used to describe Saddam Husein as someone who is unable to stop spending his time on weapons of mass destruction and to show how dangerous Saddam Husein is. Saddam's addiction toward weapon of mass destruction is the same with someone who is addicted to drugs and he is difficult to stop.

What experiential values do grammatical features have?

The speech is opened by providing how agency can be hidden or distanced by the choice of grammatical structure used. The following sentence can explain it

"Tonight I want to take a few minutes to discuss a grave threat to peace, and America's determination to lead the world in confronting that threat."

The choice of nominalization '*America's determination*' in the opening emphasizes that all information delivered by Bush is for the sake of world peace led by America. This strong

commitment is used to invite American people's interest and strong support. There is a difference in choosing grammatical process and participant type. To show the negative side of Iraq and Saddam Hussein, Bush chooses to show the agency clearly while to show the important statement which is sensitive, Bush says the agency in the name of world or third party. It is aimed to avoid appearing arrogant or to slightly distance itself from the highly controversial subject.

"The Iraqi regime has violated all of those obligations. It possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons. It is seeking nuclear weapons. It has given shelter and support to terrorism, and practices terror against its own people". (The subject is Iraq regime)

"Iraq could decide on any given day to provide a biological or chemical weapon to a terrorist group or individual terrorists." (The subject is Iraq)

"Saddam Hussein has held numerous meetings with Iraqi nuclear scientists, a group he calls his "nuclear mujahideen" -- his nuclear holy warriors". (The subject is Saddam Hussein)

Compared to the following sentences:

"And surveillance photos reveal that the regime is rebuilding facilities that it had used to produce chemical and biological weapons.(The subject is surveillance photo)

The world has tried limited military strikes to destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities -- only to see them openly rebuilt, while the regime again denies they even exist." (The subject is the world)

"Many nations are joining us in insisting that Saddam Hussein's regime be held accountable." (The subject is many nations)

The declarative mode is used for all sentences delivered by Bush. George Bush presents almost all the information as unquestionable facts that appear to the listener to be true. To persuade the listeners, Bush uses grammatical questions that are answered by Bush himself. This question is to attract the listeners' attention for the next sentences.

"Since we all agree on this goal, the issues is: how can we best achieve it?"

If we know Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons today -- and we do -- does it make any sense for the world to wait to confront him as he grows even stronger and develops even more dangerous weapons?"

There are a lot of modal auxiliaries in the text that deals with the speaker authority, President Bush. There are two kinds of modality used by Bush; relational modality and expressive modality. Relational modality can be found in the following statements:

*"We also **must** never forget the most vivid events of recent history."*

*"We agree that the Iraqi dictator **must** not be permitted to threaten America and the world with horrible poisons and diseases and gases and atomic weapons."*

The modal auxiliary *must* is used to express the authority of Bush in relation to the audiences, American people and world people. It also signals the obligation obeyed by Saddam Hussein. By the use of *must* Bush shows that Saddam Hussein is under his power. Expressive modality can be found in the statement below. Expressive modality (*could* and *might*) are used to express Bush authority as the speaker with respect to the truth or probability of a representation of reality. The probability of the Bush speech refers to the prediction of the use of a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles.

*"We've also discovered through intelligence that Iraq has a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles that **could** be used to disperse chemical or biological weapons across broad areas."*

*"And, of course, sophisticated delivery systems aren't required for a chemical or biological attack; all that **might** be required are a small container and one terrorist or Iraqi intelligence operative to deliver it."*

Dealing with the use of pronoun Bush uses *I* for three times and *we* is used 50 times. The pronoun *we* is used to mean President Bush and all the listeners, the American people therefore there is an attempt to be inclusive. By using the pronoun *we*, Bush tries to persuade the listeners by involving them in outlining Iraqi threat. The title and the opening sentence of the speech '**President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat**' and '**The threat comes from Iraq**' show this point. The verbs (outlines and comes) are in the simple present tense forms which shows Bush's commitment to the truth of his statements.

DISCUSSION

The sentences in Bush speech are linked together which can be proven by the use of complex sentences characterized by coordination or subordination. The use of coordination or subordination can be found in the following sentences.

*"First, some ask why Iraq is different from other countries or regimes that also have terrible weapons. While there are many dangers in the world, the threat from Iraq stands alone -- **because it gathers the most serious dangers of our age in one place.** Iraq's weapons of mass destruction are controlled by a murderous tyrant who has already used chemical weapons to kill thousands of people. This same tyrant has tried to dominate the Middle East, has invaded and brutally occupied a small neighbor, has struck other nations without warning, and holds an unrelenting hostility toward the United States."*

The bold clause is the subordinate of the main clause *the threat from Iraq stands alone*. This main clause is indirectly to answer the question raised in the beginning sentence *First, some ask why Iraq is different from other countries or regimes that also have terrible weapons*. It also presupposes that Iraq is the most dangerous country compared to other countries or regimes in the world. This speech is a typical pattern of speech. It follows some typical conventions of formal speech. The speech is opened by greeting and followed by the aim of the speech. The next paragraph says the main idea of the speech, *the threat comes from Iraq*. The next paragraphs are the supporting paragraphs explaining more the Iraqi threat. In explaining it, Bush relates to the September 11th attack. The supporting paragraphs list evidences and facts of the threat and challenge all nations to take the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council seriously. The final section is simply asking for Member of Congress agreement to military action to Iraq and inviting American people support.

CONCLUSION

The study discovered that the language resources employed in addresses on terrorism by the two presidents included vocabulary items, phrases, clauses, and sentence structures, which were used to convey the ideas of terrorism and anti-terrorism. The vocabulary elements utilized to portray terrorism and anti-terrorism were primarily verbs and nouns. Verb phrases, noun phrases, adjectival phrases, adverbial phrases, and prepositional phrases and clauses were all used to project terrorism and anti-terrorism, as were simple, compound, and complex sentences. The two presidents legitimised antiterrorism and illegitimized terrorism by using these linguistic expressions.

REFERENCES

- Apple, M. W. (1996) *Cultural Politics in Education*. Teachers College Press: New York.
- Baker, C. D. & Freebody, P. (1989). *Children's First Schoolbooks*. Basil Blackwell: Oxford.
- Baker, C. D. Luke A (eds).(1991).*Towards a Critical Sociology of Reading Pedagogy*.John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Ball, S. (ed.).(1990). *Foucault and Education*. Routledge:New York.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity Press: Cambridge.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom Discours*. Heineman: Portsmouth, New Jersey.
- Corson, D. (ed.). (1995). *Discourse and Power in Educational Organizations*. Hampton Press: Creskill, New Jersey.
- Fairclough, N (ed.). (1992a). *Critical Language Awareness*.Longman: London.
- Fairclough, N. (1992b). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press:Cambridge.

- Foucault, M.(1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Harper and Row: New York.
- Foucault,M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Pantheon: New York.
- Gutierrez, C., Larson, J., & Kreuter, B. (1995). Cultural tensions in the scripted classroom: The value of the subjugated perspective. *Urb.Ed*: 29, 410-442.
- Hall, S. (1996). The meaning of New Times. In: Morley D, Chen K (eds) 1996 *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Routledge, London.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Edward Arnold, London.
- Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C., Walkerdine V 1984 *Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity*. Methuen: London.
- Kress, G. (1989). *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Lee, A. (1996). *Literacy, Gender and Curriculum*. Taylor and Francis: London.
- Luke, A. (1995). Text and discourse analysis in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. *Rev.Res.Ed*. 21:1-48.
- Luke, C., Gore J (eds).(1993). *Feminism and Critical Pedagogy*. Routledge:New York.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press:Minneapolis.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge: Mass.
- Muspratt, S., Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (eds). (1997). *Constructing Critical Literacies*. Hampton Press: Cresskill, NJ. New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Har.Ed.Rev*. 66:60-92.
- Williams, G. (1992). *Sociolinguistics: A Sociological Critique*. Routledge: London.