

University Mohamed Kheider of Biskra
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English Studies and Literature
Contributor: Dr TURQUI Barkat

Political Discourse

1. Introduction

The study of political discourse, like that of other areas of discourse analysis, covers a broad range of subject matter, and draws on a wide field of analytic methods. Perhaps more than with other areas of discourse, however, one needs at the outset to consider the reflexive and potentially ambiguous nature of the term political discourse. The term is suggestive of at least two possibilities: first, a discourse which is itself political; and second, an analysis of political discourse as simply an example of discourse type, without explicit reference to political content or political context. But things may be even more confusing. Given that on some definitions almost all discourse may be considered political, then all analyses of discourse are potentially political and, therefore, on one level, all discourse analysis is political discourse.

The analysis of political discourse has been around for as long as politics itself. The emphasis the Greeks placed on rhetoric is a case in point, because one of the core goals of political discourse analysis was to seek out the ways in which language choice is elaborated for specific political effect. In more modern times, it was perhaps Orwell who first drew out attention to the political potential of language. He considers the way in which language may be used to manipulate thoughts and suggests, for example, that “political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible.” Orwell was concerned with a general decline in the use of English and politicians had a central responsibility for this decline. Indeed, politicians in this sense are the group of people who are being paid for their (political) activities, and who are being elected or appointed. However, politicians are not the only participants in the domain of politics, in fact, it includes also the public, the citizens and many other social or professional categories.

Additionally, much work on political discourse was traditionally being done under the label of ‘Rhetoric’ which was developed as an art to persuade people in political assembly. Thus, special arguments, special form and style when there is an association with political text and talk, the politician must be highly skilled to convince people of what he is saying. On the whole, analysis of political discourse has an interdisciplinary character: it reflects the relation between language and power in the linguistic, sociological, interpersonal, cultural and cognitive aspects.

2. Definitions of Political Discourse

The main core of studies of political discourse is about the text and talk of professional politicians or political institutions, such as presidents and prime ministers and other members of government, parliament or political parties, both at the local, national and international levels. However, even politicians are not always involved in political discourse, and the same is obviously true for most other participants, like the public or citizens in general, or even members of social movements or action groups. Since people and their practices may be categorized in many ways, most groups and their members will occasionally 'act politically', and we may propose that 'acting politically', and hence political discourse, are essentially defined contextually; in terms of special events or practices of which the aims, goals or functions are not exclusively but at least primarily political.

Furthermore, van Dijk (1997) suggests that linking the views of critical discourse analysis practitioners and how they see the study of political discourse as an essential critical enterprise. Political discourse analysis is consequently understood as an analysis within a critical perspective, this latter should focus on the reproduction and contestation of political power through political discourse. On the other hand, the second standpoint emphasizes the linguistic features which characterize political discourse. In the case of political debates for example, all levels of linguistic components are involved, in fact, most samples of political discourse may be mapped onto the various levels of linguistics from lexis to pragmatics. At the level of lexical choice there are studies of such manifestations as loaded words and technical words. In grammar there are analyses of selected functional systems and their organization within different ideological frames, moreover, there are investigations concerned with pronouns and their distribution in political speech. Lastly, there are studies of more pragmatically oriented objects such as implicature, metaphors and speech acts.

Finally, political discourse- in simple terms- refers to a certain type of both written and spoken language used by different players in any kind of political process. The function of this sort of discourse can be displayed in terms of some principal objectives: to influence or persuade a specific audience or the general public; to express a resistance or opposition or even a complete rejection by protest; to alter society's perception about a particular topic or debunk the truth about a certain competitor for the sake of personal interest. It is also worth mentioning that political discourse is not exclusive only to governmental bodies, on the contrary, this type of language can be used by non-governmental organizations, economic institutions, corporations, lobbies, and even the average citizens. In sum, the main and ultimate role of political discourse is the stimulation of the addressing group with ideas presented in an objective way by using various arguments and proofs.

3. The Structure of Political Discourse

Politics actors do know the role of language in politics because of its impact on the different audiences and the significance of speech in terms of political adherence and conviction. In fact, languages are implicated in politics but this does not mean that every use of language is political. Only through language commands, threats, offers, questions or promises can be set, and only by the use of language a war can be declared, sentences can be made in courts. Speech acts have been treated by 'ordinary language' philosophers and some pragmatists within linguistics as a largely technical problem. It is clear, however, that the non-logical parts of meaning-making cannot be easily separated from social and political interaction, its conventions and institutions.

As a matter of fact, Mey (2001: 115-16) asserts that- within this context- language always reflects the conditions of the community at large:

Among these conditions are institutions that society, that is, the social humans, have created for themselves: the legislative, the executive, the judiciary, and other organs of the state; the various religious bodies such as faiths and churches; human social institutions such as marriage, the family, the market and so on. In all such institutions and bodies, certain human agreements and customs have become legalized, and this legalization has found its symbolic representation in language.

The author points at democratic institutions in which there exists a separation of powers, but of course the same point can be made for other forms of governance. It might appear on closer inspection that the argument is viciously circular, for it can be said that it is precisely the use of language that creates institutions. Therefore, language use and politics are both cooperative and uncooperative.

Moreover, one might argue that the structure of human linguistic communication is related to precisely these functions: it makes what we recognize as 'political' interactions possible. One should in this sort of perspective expect some of the structural components of language to have a functional role. It should be possible to see a connection between what we can interpret as political discourse and the use of particular features of language.

On the other hand, van Dijk (1997) states that political discourse analysis in many respects will be like any other kind of discourse study. The specifics of political discourse analysis therefore, should be searched for in the relations between discourse structures. Thus, whereas metaphors in classroom discourse may have an educational function, metaphors in politics will function in a political context for legitimation of political power, in the attack on political opponents or the presentation of policies. An account of the structures and strategies of phonology, graphics, syntax, meaning, speech acts, style or rhetoric, conversational interactions, among other properties of text and talk is consequently necessarily part of political discourse analysis only if such features can be politically contextualized.

However, we may ask ourselves whether specific discourse structures are more or less typical or effective for the political functions they may have, or even, more precisely in the specific political contexts in which they might be used. Thus, we know that the 'official

language' of government decisions, or the legal jargon of bills, laws and regulations, in both discursively, politically and legally mandatory. Similarly, parliamentary debates are expected to be held in relatively formal style of address and dialogue. That is, at least for the official, public forms of political text and talk, we seem to have a number of stylistic constraints, which may not be exclusive, but which political discourse shares with other forms of official and public talk and text.

Some of the more formulaic expressions, forms of address and textual and dialogical conventions are even specific for bills, laws, regulations, parliamentary debate, or political speeches. Hence, the main structures of political discourse embrace: topic, rhetoric, syntax, lexicon; local semantics, super structures or 'schemata', expression structures, speech acts and interaction.

4. Characteristics of Political Discourse

4.1 Agonistic Ability or Competiveness

The basis of political discourse is made by continuous dialogue between the party in power and opposition in which opponents attack each other from time to time, hold the fort, reflect blows, and take the offensive. Competiveness through political debates between politicians and parties aims at indicating who is the 'best' or 'great' in the leadership. Example: "If fate had put Gore and Bush in the other's place on election night, the drama of the next five weeks would have had everybody playing the opposite role." (This election is not an award for past performance, Congressional Digest, October 2000.)

4.2 Aggressiveness

One of the most important components of political speech is aggression, in English explanatory dictionaries the word aggression is defined as violent behaviour or attitude. Aggression in political discourse is connected with hierarchy and domination which serve as indicators of ranking in human relations. In fact, aggressiveness or aggression is used by some presidents or leaders to express their opinions against 'enemies' or opposition in a 'war situation'.

4.3 Ideological Character

The system of social representation, group knowledge, beliefs and opinions are based on group values, norms and interests. This feature brings the political discourse with the military issues, as it is generally indicated, war is a continuation of policy by other means. The scope of this interaction is military doctrine, political agreement or peace negotiations. Ideological character implies the fact that every political discourse is based on ideas and beliefs and, this can form the background of the speaker to show the audience how is s/he thinking.

4.4 Theatricality

The category of theatrical pulls together political discourse, it is connected with advertising and scenic discourse. One of the parties of communication (election campaign, television political debate, etc.) carries out the addresser or observer in a process of perception of the current or future political events. Theatricality signifies the role of art 'actor' is clear more than other roles by using plays to express the living situation in the easiest way in order to be understood by simple audience.

4.5 Truth and Lie

Politicians' text and talk is not true sometimes; and that happens for the safety of the country mostly but that may make people think they are being deceived. Chilton. P. (2004: 23) states that:

I cannot arrive at the conclusion that you are deceiving me unless I want and expect that you will be telling the truth. At least most of the time, for if I believe you are always deceiving me the concept of 'deception' makes no sense, since there can be no expectation of truth-telling to contrast it with. Such a fundamental expectation of truth is consistent with the way perception works. The world that one perceives (and constructively conceives) is taken to be prima facie accurate. Sure, appearances can be deceptive, but we have to meta-represent that assertion and code it as a monitory dictum in social intercourse.

In sum, politicians have to assure or provide guarantees for the truth they have spoken.

4.6 Metaphorical Reasoning

In political discourse, metaphors are not just for decoration, but they represent a manner of reasoning. Metaphors are used to try to make an account or a description more vivid and interesting. They bring into the political speech words which create a mental picture and thus enable the addressee to visualize the scene (sense) more effectively. A metaphor takes the comparison to a very far stage by saying that a person is something which he is not or that he is doing something which, in fact, he is not doing.

Examples: Their party had a landslide victory during the election.

It was a big decision to make. The President stood silently for a moment, like a man on the edge of a precipice.

He is apt to ride roughshod over everyone's feelings.

It is easy to be swept along by the current of popular opinion.

Metaphors may be used humorously in order to criticize or denigrate opponents or parties of opposition such as:

Politics is like football- it doesn't matter whether you win 3-1 or 1-0, you still get 3 points.

A politician is an arse upon which everyone has sat except a man.

4.7 Index Political Discourse

One's choice of language, or features of speech, can implicitly signal political distinctions. For instance, choosing to speak one language rather another, selecting a regional accent, or accent associated with a social class, opting for words related to particular ideologies, adopting forms of address (and in some languages pronouns) that express distance or solidarity.

4.8 Characteristics of Political Discourse by Teun A. van Dijk

The procedure consists of selecting some relevant categories for the categorization of political text and talk:

4.8.1 Societal Domain or Field

The domain plays an important role in the common sense definition of political actions and discourse. It is assumed that social actors generally; know in which 'field' they are currently acting. Such categorization may even be more general, viz., those of the Private vs. the Public Sphere, or Business vs. Pleasure, or Personal vs. the Social.

4.8.2 Political Systems

These systems are among the most obvious common sense categories of the domain of politics: communism, dictatorship, democracy, fascism, or the social democracy, among others, are generally seen as typically 'political'. These systems are usually understood as referring to the organization and distribution of power and the principles of decision making.

4.8.3 Political Values

At the most general and abstract level, shared cultural values may be declared typical for political systems. Thus, political values organize more specific political ideologies and attitudes such as: Freedom, Solidarity, Equality and Tolerance. Ideological groups and categories will especially also define themselves (and their goals) in term of their most cherished (preferential) values.

4.8.4 Political Ideologies

They are the basic belief systems that underlie and organize the shared social representations of groups and their members. In that respect, communism or democracy may be seen both as a system and a complex set of basic representations, involving relevant values.

4.8.5 Political Institutions

They organize the political field, actors and actions, such as the State, Governments, Parliament or Congress, City Councils, State Agencies, and so on.

4.8.6 Political Organizations

Less official are the large number of political organizations that structure political action, such as political parties, political clubs, NGOs, etc.

4.8.7 Political Groups

Political actors may form more or less formal, cohesive or permanent groups, such as opponents, dissidents, demonstrators, coalitions, crowds, and in general socio-political movements.

4.8.8 Political Actors

They can be defined by all those who are elected and paid representatives and those 'engaged in politics', by accomplishing political action, including demonstrators, lobbyists and strikers.

4.8.9 Political Relations

They indicate how the State relates to its citizens, or how certain political groups are positioned relative to others, these relations can take many forms, such as: power, power abuse, hegemony, oppression, tolerance, equality and inequality, among many others.

4.8.10 Political Process

The political process is the overall term that categorizes complex, long-term, sequences of political actions. For instance, governing, legislation, opposition, solidarity, agenda-setting, and policies are among the prototypical aspects of such political processes. The political processes can imply subordinate features like estimation, modality, intertextuality, emotiveness and expressivity.

In summary, discourse analysis would be a very useful approach to analyse some important issues in political discourse, such as immigration, multiculturalism and racism that are of political and public relevance and the different discursive forms and implications.

5. Objectives of Political Discourse

5.1 Persuading the General Public

Political discourse can be used to convince people of certain ideas or actions which they would not accept in different circumstances. A significant case in point would be the global war on terror policy and the invasion of Iraq by the Bush Administration. Prior to the 9/11/2001 events, there were many insinuations that the American government was determined on overthrowing Saddam Housain's regime, nevertheless, the political speech that was used did not achieve its goals because the public refused the idea of war. Indeed, there were many opposite views and voices from in and outside the government, however, many specialists argue that all what the American government lacked and really needed

was a ‘nudge’ what they called a “second Pearl Harbour” to convince the American people and that came with the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Centre that decisively shaped the public opinion in favour of the war. Besides, many politicians believe that the 9/11 attacks were nothing but an internal job orchestrated as what can only be described as a ‘subconscious political discourse’ aimed to persuade the American people to support the war.

5.2 Criticism

Certain forms of political discourse, especially debates and speeches, can be used for criticizing, slandering or discrediting an opponent, governmental institution or political officials. An interesting example would be the American elections in which Republican candidate Donald Trump employed the leaked emails of his opponent and Democratic candidate Hilary Clinton against her. The latter was accused of informing the Russians of classified issues which ultimately discredited her and destroyed any chances she would have in winning the elections.

5.3 Altering Public Opinion

When it is combined with mass media, political discourse can be used in certain manner to change society’s most strong and old beliefs and values either in terms of religion, norms or traditions. This was the case in America and the Western culture as a whole when seventy years ago homosexuality was regarded as abnormality by psychologists and as a crime by the law. However, in the recent years, political discourse pushed the homosexuality issue through mass media down the throat of Western society till came the moment where the American Supreme court legalized it and many other Western countries soon followed!

5.4 Effects

In its essence, political discourse is a directed and subjective type of language aimed not only at brainwashing the public but at shaping their opinions and thoughts as well. Eventually, this might lead the public into endorsing policies that are not in their best interest but in favour of an oligarchy.

In summary, it is obvious that for the citizens and societies in general, political discourse remains a key factor in shaping our individual views and the way we see the world. Indeed, the choice of our future depends to a great extent on choosing the best or worst leaders for our country, in fact, it is a slippery slope where the fate of a nation can simply be determined by the proper selection of words.

6. Approaches to Discourse Studies

6.1 Speech Act Theory: Austin 1955, Searle 1969

It is a logical-philosophic perspective on conversational organization focusing on Interpretation rather than the Production of utterances in discourse. It grows from the basic belief that language is used to perform actions. Founded on this theory, every utterance can be analysed as the realization of the speaker's intent- illocutionary force- to achieve a particular purpose. The focus of the analysis is Speech Act (SA) or illocutionary force (IF). The principal problem faced by the linguist is the lack of a one-to-one matchup between discourse function (IF) and the grammatical form. This theory provides the insight that the basic unit of conversational analysis must be functionally motivated rather than formally defined one.

6.2 Interactional Sociolinguistics: Goffman 1981, Gumperz, 1982

This theory grows out of the work of anthropologists. It is centrally concerned with the importance of context in the production and interpretation of discourse. It emphasizes the analysis of grammatical and prosodic features in interactions. Gumperz demonstrated that interactants from different socio-cultural backgrounds may 'hear' and understand discourse differently according to their interpretation of contextualizations cues in discourse, for instance intonation contours, 'speaking for another', alignment or gender. Schiffrin (1987) focused on quantitative interactive sociolinguistic analysis, especially discourse markers. Her basic concern is the accomplishment of conversational coherence. She argues for the importance of both qualitative and quantitative analysis in order to determine the function of the different discourse markers in conversation.

6.3 Ethnography of Communication: Hymes 1972-1974

This theory is concerned with understanding the social context of linguistic interactions: 'who says what to whom, when, where, why and how. The prime unit of analysis is Speech Event. Speech event refers to "activities that are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech." (Hymes, 1972:56) Speech event comprises components called Hymes' Speaking Grid, namely: Setting, Participants, Purpose, Key and Message Content (Topic). Analysis of these components of a speech event is central to what became known as Ethnography of Communication or ethnography of speaking, with the ethnographer's aim being to discover rules of appropriateness in speech events. The ethnographic framework has led to broader notions of Communicative Competence. Nevertheless, the problem which is posed is the lack of explicitness in Hymes' account on the relationship between genre and other components of the speaking grid and their expression in language and recognition of the close connection between speech events and their sociocultural contexts.

6.4 Pragmatics: Grice 1975, Leech 1983, Levinson 1983

This theory formulates conversational behaviour in terms of general 'principles' rather than rules. At the base of pragmatic approach to conversation analysis is Gricean's Co-operative Principle (CP). This principle seeks to account for not only how participants decide what

to DO next in conversation, but also how interlocutors go about interpreting what the previous speaker has just done. This principle is broken down into specific maxims: Quantity (say only as much as necessary), Quality (try to make your contribution one that is true), Relation (be relevant), and Manner (be brief and avoid ambiguity). It provides useful means of characterizing different varieties of conversation, for example in interactions one can deliberately try to be provocative or consensual. Its significant drawback is it implies that conversations occur co-operatively, between equals where power is equally distributed. However, in reality, conversations involve levels of disagreement and resistance, and power is constantly under contestation.

6.5 Conversation Analysis: Harold Garfinkel 1960's- 1970's

Garfinkel's concern as a sociologist is to understand how social members make sense of everyday life. Schegloff and Jefferson (1973) tried to analyse how conversation takes place, likewise CA is considered to be a branch of ethnomethodology. There are two grossly apparent facts: the first is that only one person speaks at a time, and the second speakers change recurs. Thus, conversation is a 'turn-taking' activity. Speakers recognize points of potential speaker change- Turn Constructional Unit (TCU). CA identifies TCU as the critical units of conversation. It has not specified exactly how a TCU boundary can be recognized in any situation. Models conversation are infinitely generative turn-taking machine, where interactants try to avoid lapse: the possibility that no one is speaking. The theory's major problems that we can put forward are:

- The lack of systematization, thus quantitative analysis is impossible.
- Its limited ability to deal comprehensively with complete, sustained interactions.
- Despite the fact that it offers a powerful interpretation of conversation as dynamic interactive achievement, it is unable to demonstrate what kind of achievement it is.

6.6 Variation Analysis: Waletzky 1967, Labov 1972

Labov and Waletzky argue the fundamental narrative structures are evident in spoken narratives of personal experience. The overall structure of the latter involves six stages: Abstract, Orientation, Complication, Evaluation, Resolution and Coda. Despite its clarity and applicability, the problem is that data was obtained from interviews. In fact, variationists' approach to discourse stems from quantitative linguistic change and variation. Although typically focused on social and linguistic constraints on semantically equivalent variants, the approach has also been extended to texts.

7. Critical Discourse Analysis

Approaches to social research are not isolated in space. In sampled terms they can be understood as a certain set of explicitly or implicitly defined theoretical assumptions which are specifically linked with empirical data. They allow specific ways of interpretation and, thus reconnect the empirical with the theoretical field. Approaches normally obtain and

maintain their identities by distinguishing themselves from other approaches. It is generally agreed that Critical Discourse Analysis must not be understood as a single method but rather as an approach, which constitutes itself at different levels, and at each level a number of selections have to be made.

Firstly, at a programmatic level, a selection is made of (a) the phenomena under observation, (b) some explanation of the theoretical assumptions, and (c) the methods used to link theory and observation. Within this triangle, the methodical aspect often becomes the distinguishing feature, because research is regularly legitimized as scientific by means of intelligible methods. The term method usually denotes research pathways: from the researcher's own standpoint or from point A (theoretical assumptions) another point B (observation) is reached by chosen pathway that permits observations and facilitates the collection of experiences. If one proceeds systematically, wrong turnings are avoidable. "Methodical procedure can, like Ariane's Thread, guarantee the researcher a safe route back." (Titscher et al., 2000: 5). It can also help both the addressees of research findings to reconstruct the researcher's argumentation and other researchers to see the starting point differently, and even to decide not to go back, but to find other more interesting starting points. Methodical procedure will make it easier to record findings and to compile reports of experience. Secondly, at a social level, a specific peer group is formed as a distinctive part of a scientific community, and thirdly, at a historical level, each approach to social research is subject to fashions and expiry dates.

The differences between CDA and other sociolinguistic approaches may be most clearly established with regard to the general principles of the procedure. First, the nature of the problems with which CDA is concerned is different from all those methods which do not determine their interest in advance. CDA scholars play an advocatory role for groups who suffer from social discrimination. If we look at the approach contributions collected in this reader it becomes evident that the line drawn between social scientific research, which ought to be intelligible, and political argumentation is sometimes crossed. Whatever the case, in respect of the object of investigation, it is a fact that CDA follows a different and critical approach to problems, since it endeavours to make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden, and thereby to derive results which are of practical relevance.

One important characteristic arises from the assumption of CDA that all discourses are historical and can therefore only be understood with reference to their context. Accordingly, CDA refers to such extra linguistic factors as culture, society, and ideology. In any case, the notion of context is crucial for CDA, since this explicitly includes social, psychological, political and ideological components and, thereby postulates an interdisciplinary procedure. Beyond this, CDA, using the concepts of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, analyses relationships with other texts, and this is not pursued in other methods. From this basic understanding of the notion of discourse it may be concluded that CDA is open to the broadest range of factors that exert an influence on texts.

In connection with the notion of context, a further difference emerges concerning the assumption about the relationship between language and society. CDA does not take this

relationship to be simply deterministic but invokes an idea of mediation. Norman Fairclough (1996) defines the relationship in accordance with Halliday's multifunctional linguistic theory and the concept of orders of discourse according to Foucault, while Ruth Wodak, like Teun. A. van Dijk, introduces a socio-cognitive level. Furthermore, another significant distinguishing feature of CDA is the specific incorporation of linguistic categories into analyses. CDA in no way includes a very broad range of linguistic categories: one might therefore get the impression that only a small group of linguistic devices are central for CDA studies, particularly pronouns, attributes and the verbal mode, time and tense.

As for the methods and procedures used for the analysis of discourses, CDA generally regards its procedure as a hermeneutic process, although this characteristic is not completely evident in the position taken by the various authors. Compared to the (casual) explanations of the natural sciences, hermeneutics can be understood as the method of grasping and producing meaning relations. The hermeneutic circle implies that the meaning of one part can only be understood in the context of the whole, but this in turn is only accessible from its component parts. In reality, the specifics of the hermeneutic interpretation process are not made completely transparent by many CDA oriented studies. If a crude distinction has to be made between 'text-tending' and 'text-reducing' methods of analysis, then CDA, on account of its concentration on very clear formal properties and the associated compression of texts during analysis, may be characterized as 'text-reducing'.

A further feature of CDA is its interdisciplinary claim and its description of the object of investigation from widely differing perspectives, as well as its continuous feedback between analysis and data collection. In comparison with other linguistic methods of text analysis, CDA seems to be closest to sociological and socio-psychological perspectives, although these interfaces are not well defined everywhere. For instance, the issues of power, domination and the like should at least be compatible with what is demonstrably relevant for the behaviour of participants in an interaction. Only when such categories as the gender of interlocutors are obviously considered to be significant by an explicit reference that CDA will 'bind' to the data and avoids the risk of ending up merely ideological.

Alongside this general debate about the whole enterprise of CDA, a more specific discussion has developed between N. Fairclough and H.G. Widdowson. The latter criticizes the fact that the term discourse is as vague as it is fashionable: "discourse is something everybody is talking about but without knowing with any certainty just what it is: in vogue and vague." (Widdowson, 1995: 158). In fact, Widdowson believes that CDA is, in a dual sense, a biased interpretation: in the first place it is prejudiced on the basis of some ideological commitment, and then it selects for analysis such texts as will support the preferred interpretation. (Widdowson, 1995: 169). Analysis ought to mean the examination of several interpretations, and in the case of CDA this is not possible because of prior judgements.

Fairclough (1996) in reply to this criticism, draws attention to the open-endedness of results required in the principles of CDA. He also points out that CDA, unlike most other approaches, is always explicit about its own position and commitment. Actually, these controversies concretize two irreconcilable positions within the methodological debate in social research: is it possible to perform any research free of a priori value judgement and is it possible to gain insight from purely empirical data without using any pre-framed categories of experience?

8. Functions and Analyses of Political Discourse

Case Study: Comparison of M.L. King and B. Obama Speeches.

8.1 Speech Functions

Some elements are primordial in the analysis of political discourse, namely:

- (a) **Ideational Function:** Halliday states that it is through this function that the speaker embodies in language his experience, reaction, cognitive perception and also his linguistic acts of speaking and understanding. The ideational function mainly consists of ‘transitivity’ and ‘voice’. Hu Zhuanglin (1988: 312) points out “This function not only specifies the available options in meaning but also determines the nature of their structural realizations.” From the student’s perspective, our main concern evolves around The Transitivity System because it represents the ideational function that can be realized through grammar. It is through the grammatical system that the speaker or the writer conveys what is occurring, and what is his position such as authority. We can notice that in the case of Barak Obama, the use of personal pronouns is very adequate, guiding the audience and used in particular situations, such as gratitude, plans and promises.
- (b) **Interpersonal Function:** The speaker uses language in his own way if intrusion into speech event describes his acts along with the kind of relationship that exists between him and the listener. If we take the speech of Martin Luther King we can observe that he affirms his status. Thus, he used the personal pronoun ‘I’ as a way to demonstrate his position as a leader of the coloured people’s actions and desires “I have a dream”, in addition, he uses the plural when he is addressing actions or threats “will have a rude awakening”. On the other hand, Barak Obama did not need to indicate his status due to the fact that he mainly aimed at creating a link between him and the audience under the umbrella of the American Dream. In order to achieve this, he associated the Action Verbs with elements of inclusions, such as ‘we’ or ‘our’. Furthermore, he uses ‘I’ only with cases like persuasion, salutation or admiration, because his audiences are only required to follow his ideas and plans compared whereas M.L. King opted for the radical changes that he believes in as a leader of solely one category that is a part of the nation. Thus, he could not make a familiarity only in the case of the future tense which implies the eventual hope of joining black and white men together facing the same fate.

- (c) **Textual Function:** The textual function indicates the links that exist between the language itself and the situation. We can realize that in the case of M.L. King, he was in a context in which the audiences are heterogeneous, moreover, we should take into consideration that he was a leader of the oppressed coloured people and he was in a position that even allowed him to state threats either implicitly or explicitly “will not pass”. Henceforth, he employed direct yet somehow a sophisticated language to represent the American Dream as an instrument to unite the audiences through the paraphrasing from the Bible and Shakespeare which are familiar and common for most of the audiences. It is equally noticeable that the orator uses a great deal of Alliteration, Anaphora and Allusion.

8.2 Speech Analyses

- (a) **Transitivity Analysis:** The ideational function is represented in text by transitivity. It is a basic semantic system which construes the world of experience into a manageable set of process types. Halliday divides these processes into six types: Material Process, Mental Process, Relational Process, Behavioural Process, Verbal Process and Existential Process.

Process Types	Core Meaning	Participants
Material	Doing, Happening	Actor, Goal
Mental	Sensing	Sensor, Phenomenon
Relational	Being	
Verbal	Saying	Sayer, Receiver, Verbiage
Behavioural	Behaving	Behaver
Existential	Existing	Existent

Overview of Process Types by Peng. Pingping, 2007

Material Process: It consists of ‘doing’. The process is usually indicated by a verb expressing an action, either concrete or abstract. There are generally two participants in the process: Actor and Goal. Actor is comparable to the Subject and Goal is comparable to the Object and both of them are realized by noun phrases. When the participants both exist, the clause can be either in active voice or passive voice.

Example of Obama’s Speech:

Actor	Process	Goal
I	Receive, congratulate, make, need, thank.	Call, partner, help.
We, Americans, each of us, our.	Achieve, start, face, seek, share, refuse, reject, volunteer, carry	Money, challenges, values, trust, hope, journey, bitter swill.

Example of King’s Speech:

Actor	Process	Goal
I	Remind	Emergency
We, a great American	Come, signed;	Crash a cheek, emancipation

We can observe that Obama’s use of action verbs is mainly accompanied with the use of conclusive pronouns such as ‘we, all, Americans, actors’. Thus, he intends to create familiarity among his audience and to structure a unification in order to form a conduct between him and the audiences to work by the goals of the speech. On the other hand, King uses material process to state historical facts to make links and frame civil rights within the American mythology, and amplify warnings “will not pass.”

Relational Process: It is a process of ‘being’. It can be divided into two modes: Attributive Relation and Identifying Relation. The first indicated what properties an object possesses or what category it can be put into. The latter shows that an entity is uniform, it is used widely to describe people and objects.

Example of Obama’s Speech:

Attributive	Identifiant
The dream of our founders is alive.	America is a friend of each nation. A friend of each nation is America.
Our challenges may be new.	America is a place where all things are possible. A place where all things are possible is America.

Example of King’s Speech:

Attributive	Identifiant
Greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.	The Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land.

As far as the relational process is concerned, we can see from a novice point of view that Obama consolidates and establishes an image of America and its people. Therefore, he demonstrates the state of being of both the nation as an entity and its population, and links it to the future “our challenges may be new.” This implies a sense of achievement and belonging to the audience through familiarity. Whereas King uses the relational element not to give an image, but to remind people with the state of being that contradicts the American mythology. To realize this, he used the relational function as argumentation and a demonstration that the Nation did not fulfil its mythology as it was promised “But one hundred years later, the Negro still is not free.”

Mental Process: It is a process of ‘feeling’, ‘thinking’ and ‘seeing’. Actor is not the real subject of doing, but the feeling. It represents inner experience, such as ‘perception’, ‘reaction’ and ‘cognition’. The two participants are called *Senser* and *Phenomenon*.

Example of Obama’s Speech:

“In reaffirming the greatness of our nation, we (*senser*) understand (*mental process*) that greatness is never a Given.”

Example of King’s Speech:

“As we (*senser*) consider (*mental process*) the road that unfolds before us, we (*senser*) remember (*mental process*) with humble gratitude those brave Americans who, at this very hour, patrol far-off deserts and distant mountains.”

“And we (*senser*) know (*mental process*) the government cannot solve every problem.”

One can remark in the above quotation that Obama used the *mental process* in order to share inner feelings with the audience, which makes his speech special, because in general speakers employ this sort of process for specific occasions, such as the Independence Day. In this particular situation the President expressed his sentiment of gratitude towards workers which denotes a sense of creativity that impacted the audience. In comparison, King uses the *mental process* in a lesser rate due to the fact that he is mainly stating historical facts, actions and possible reactions.

- (b) **Modality Analysis:** Modality refers to a speaker’s attitudes towards an action or opinion about the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence. It also extends to one’s position with regard to an issue or event if it is only described by a sentence.
- **Modal Verbs:** According to the statistics, it is obvious that modal verbs are used to convey the addresser’s attitudes and judgements with an average of 0.8 per cent in the whole speeches. The high percentage of the use of modal verbs is appropriate to the speaking record the addresses are delivered in spoken form. Compared with other verbs, modal verbs are easily identified and understood and, consequently, accepted because at the time of listening to speeches, there is no opportunity for the audience to reflect properly. For example, Obama states “because they believed that this time must be different, that their voices could be that difference. The road ahead will be long. Our climb will be steep. We may not get there in one year or even in one term. But, America, I have never been more hopeful than I am tonight that we will get there.” In addition, King asserts “We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until ‘justice rolls down like waters, and righteousness like a mighty stream’.”
 - **Tenses:** Tense is the time of a clause. Halliday (1994) points out that primary tense means past, present or future at the moment of speaking; it is the time relative to ‘now’. On the basis of the general statistics of tenses, we can remark that the tense of simple present is most frequently used in the speeches, the average percentage being 64.45 per cent. The simple past ranks second with an average percentage of

- 14.9 per cent and is followed by the simple future with an average percentage of 10.8 per cent. The use of the present perfect is slightly less frequent than the simple future and ranks the fourth. It is natural that the simple present tense ranks with top priority since the addresses are intended to present the domestic and worldwide situations ranging from political, economic and cultural fields at present. The use of the tense facilitates the creation of a close relationship between the politician and his audience and the easy identification and acceptance of the validity of the assertions embedded in the speech. In comparison, we believe that King uses the past in a higher rate than Obama due to the fact that he took the past promises and agreements as an argumentation. Indeed, he associated the latter with the use of the present tense to demonstrate the failure of fulfilling those promises “one hundred years later negroes live alone in an island of poverty.”
- **Personal Pronouns:** In general, it is the first person which is mostly used. For instance, the employment of the first person pronoun ‘we’ is to shorten the distance between the speaker and the audience, regardless of their disparity in age, social status and professions. The purpose is to include both the speaker and listener within the same arena and, thus, make the audience feel close to the speaker’s views. On the other hand, we notice that King uses the first person’s pronoun in a higher amount compared to Obama. This is probably due to the fact that he addresses the audience as a leader of the coloured people’s voice, and he used ‘we’ to present threats and to show the strength and unification of the Afro-American people behind him “we will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual.”
- (c) **Textual Analysis:** The textual function refers to the fact that language has mechanisms to make any stretch of spoken or written discourse into a coherent and unified text; and to make a living passage different from a random list of sentences. For example, Obama’s inaugural address is the first time for him to give a formal speech as a president and also an optimal time to show himself a qualified president. As a result, to fulfil the aim of convincing the American people and the whole world that he and his team are capable of leadership, with vigour and with vision, he must illustrate the planned policies, both domestic and foreign, in a formal, convincing and forceful way. The process often includes the following information according to Cheng Yumin (2007):
- **Salutation.**
 - **The expression of gratitude and honour.**
 - **A review of the American history and achievement in the past.**
 - **An analysis of the contemporary situation, at home and in the world.**
 - **A displaying and explanation of domestic policies and/or foreign policies of the new government.**
 - **Hopes for the beautiful and prosperous future of the country.**
 - **Resort to God for help and blessing.**

All the previously mentioned elements were also associated in Martin Luther King's speech. Moreover, he introduced many other techniques, such as: alliterations "Trials and attributions", "Dignity and discipline"; anaphora which consists of repeating a word or phrase at the beginning of the clauses or sentences in political speech. It is considered to be an emphasizing or organizing tool, such as the famous expression "I have a dream", "We can never be satisfied" and "Let freedom ring". The speeches of King are also characterized by many other strategies like Rhetoric "But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation." Lastly, Paraphrasing is often introduced in his speeches sometimes with certain modifications that culturally and sociologically accommodate the audiences, such as to shift seasons which convey a positive connotation like to replace 'summer' by 'autumn' in: "The sweltering summer of the negroes' legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigoration autumn of freedom and equality."

General Conclusion

The impact and success of political speech depends to a great extent on the effectiveness of its aftereffects. This process is mostly significant because the speaker needs to form a conduct between him and the hearer. Despite the fact that the hearer's role is passive, the speaker is required to constitute that implicit conduct because any political actions that would be eventually taken are conditioned by that important link that binds the speaker and the hearer. Moreover, the existence of this conduct can be achieved if the speaker manages to use all of the speech related elements, namely: the knowledge of the audiences, grammar, structure, rhetoric and the choice of the suitable language and its techniques.

Additionally, there are other essential elements that play an important role in the determination of the success or failure of political speech. First, awareness and knowledge of the self as a speaker and the relationship with the audience. In other words, determining the speaker's position enables him to choose the convenient language (authoritarian, conclusive, exclusive, etc.). Furthermore, the proper use of grammatical components, such as tenses (the past as a reminder or as an argument, and the future as an amplification for the long term plans).

Second, the grammatical accuracy of political speech is equally a necessary prerequisite for the obtaining of numerous very positive credits. One can observe that, whether consciously or unconsciously, the speaker is affected by grammar because it regulates language and conveys meanings that result with a particular form in each use. Third, the structuring of political speech should be skilfully elaborated. As a matter of fact, building one's speech is a vital element in the specification of the goals that are assigned to the political speech in question. In

fact, the speech should be very well organized and as much direct and clear as possible.

Fourth, political speech needs to be rhetorically coherent. In reality, rhetoric elements are crucial because once the speaker has come to master them- taking into account the relevance to the topic and the audience- he can guide the hearer's thinking. Lastly, it becomes evident that the success and influence of any type of political speech, depends to a large extent on the combination of the majority, if not all, of the necessary elements that have been under scrutiny in the present work.

References

- Cheng, Y. (2007). An Analysis of Style Features of Inaugural Speeches Given by American Presidents Based on the Functional Theory of Halliday. MA Thesis. Tai Yuan Science University.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.
- Etherton, A.R.B. (1972). *Mastering Modern English*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1996). A Reply to Henry Widdowson's 'Discourse Analysis: A Critical Review'. Sage Publications Ltd.
- _____ (2000). *Language and Power* (2nd Ed). New York: Longman.
- _____ (2001). 'Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research.' In Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 121-128). London: Sage Publications.
- Junling, Wang. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Barak Obama Speeches*. Retrieved from: <http://www.academypublication.com>
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd Ed). Oxford, Blackwell.
- Robertson, Connie. (Ed) (1993). *Book of Humorous Quotations*. Wordsworth Reference.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1998). 'Reflections on Studying Prosody in talk-in-interaction'. *Language and Speech*, Vol 41, no. 3-4, pp. 235-263. Bibtex edit pdf dor.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1985). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Academic Press, London.
- _____ (1997). *What is Political Discourse?* Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Widdowson, H. A. (1995). *Discourse Analysis: A Critical Review*. Sage Publications Ltd.

Zhuanglin, H. (1998). *Linguistic Analysis of Social Relation in a Political and Religious Discourse*. Peking: Peking University Press.

Workshop Sessions

Task 1. Make a textual and contextual analysis of the following statement with a special emphasis on the arguments developed in the text.

Statement by President Trump on Jerusalem. Foreign Policy. Issued on December 6, 2017.

The President: Thank you. When I came into office, I promised to look at the world's challenges with open eyes and very fresh thinking. We cannot solve our problems by making the same failed assumptions and repeating the same failed strategies of the past. Old challenges demand new approaches.

My announcement today marks the beginning of a new approach to conflict between Israel and the Palestinians.

In 1995, Congress adopted the Jerusalem Embassy Act, urging the federal government to relocate the American embassy to Jerusalem and to recognize that city- and so importantly- is Israel's capital. This act passed Congress by an overwhelming bipartisan majority and was reaffirmed by a unanimous vote of the Senate only six months ago.

Yet, for over twenty years, every previous American president has exercised the law's waiver, refusing to move the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem or to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital city.

Presidents issued these waivers under the belief that delaying the recognition of Jerusalem would advance the cause of peace. Some say they lacked courage, but they made their best judgements based on facts as they understood them at the time. Nevertheless, the record is in. After more than two decades of waivers, we are no closer to a lasting peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians. It would be folly to assume that repeating the exact same formula would now produce a different or better result.

Therefore, I have determined that it is time to officially recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

While previous presidents have made this a major campaign promise, they failed to deliver. Today, I am delivering.

I've judged this course of action to be in the best interests of the United States of America and the pursuit of peace between Israel and the Palestinians. This is a long-overdue step to advance the peace process and to work towards a lasting agreement. Israel is a sovereign nation with the right like every other sovereign nation to determine its own capital. Acknowledging this as a fact is a necessary condition for achieving peace.

It was seventy years ago that the United States, under President Truman, recognized the State of Israel. Ever since then, Israel has made its capital in the city of Jerusalem- the capital of Jewish people established in ancient times. Today, Jerusalem is the seat of the

modern Israeli government. It is the home of the Israeli parliament, the Knesset, as well as the Israeli Supreme Court. It is the location of the official residence of the Prime Minister and the President. It is the headquarters of many government ministries.

For decades, visiting American presidents, secretaries of state, and military leaders have met their Israeli counterparts in Jerusalem, as I did on my trip to Israel earlier this year.

Jerusalem is not just the heart of three great religions, but it is now the heart of one of the most successful democracies in the world. Over the past seven decades, the Israeli people have built a country where Jews, Muslims, and Christians, and people of all faiths are free to live and worship according to their conscience and according to their beliefs.

Jerusalem is today, and must remain, a place where Jews pray at the Western Wall, where Christians walk the Stations of the Cross, and where Muslims worship at Al-Aqsa Mosque.

However, through all these years, presidents representing the United States have declined to officially recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital. In fact, we have declined to acknowledge any Israeli capital at all.

But today, we finally acknowledge the obvious: that Jerusalem is Israel's capital. This is nothing more, or less, than recognition of reality. It is also the right thing to do. It's something that has to be done.

That is why, consistent with the Jerusalem Embassy Act, I am also directing the State Department to begin preparation to move the American embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This will immediately begin the process of hiring architects, engineers, and planners, so that a new embassy, when completed, will be a magnificent tribute to peace.

In making these announcements, I also want to make one point very clear: this decision is not intended in any way, to reflect a departure from our strong commitment to facilitate a lasting peace agreement. We want an agreement that is a great deal for the Israelis and a great deal for the Palestinians. We are not taking a position of any final status issues, including the specific boundaries of the Israeli sovereignty in Jerusalem, or the resolution of contested borders. Those questions are up to the parties involved.

The United States remains deeply committed to helping facilitate a peace agreement that is acceptable to both sides. I intend to do everything in my power to help forge such an agreement. Without question, Jerusalem is one of the most sensitive issues in those talks. The United States would support a two-state solution if agreed to by both sides.

In the meantime, I call on all parties to maintain the status quo at Jerusalem's holy sites, including the Temple Mount, also known as Haram al-Sharif.

Above all, our greatest hope is for peace, the universal yearning in every human soul. With today's action, I reaffirm my administration's longstanding commitment to a future of peace and security for the region.

There will, of course, be disagreement and dissent regarding this announcement. But we are confident that ultimately, as we work through these disagreements, we will arrive at a peace and a place far greater in understanding and cooperation.

This sacred city should call forth the best in humanity, lifting our sights to what is possible; not pulling us back and down to the old fights that have become so totally predictable. Peace is never beyond the grasp of those willing to reach.

So today, we call for calm, for moderation, and for the voices of tolerance to prevail over the purveyors of hate. Our children should inherit our love, not our conflicts.

I repeat the message I delivered at the historic and extraordinary summit in Saudi Arabia earlier this year: The Middle East is a region rich with culture, spirit, and history. Its people are brilliant, proud, and diverse, vibrant and strong. But the incredible future awaiting this region is held at a bay by bloodshed, ignorance, and terror.

Vice President Pence will travel to the region in the coming days to reaffirm our commitment to work with partners throughout the Middle East to defeat radicalism that threatens the hopes and dreams of future generations.

It is time for the many who desire peace to expel the extremists from their midst. It is time for all civilized nations, and people, to respond to disagreement with reasoned debate- not violence.

And it is time for young and moderate voices all across the Middle East to claim for themselves a bright and beautiful future.

So today, let us rededicate ourselves to a path of mutual understanding and respect. Let us rethink old assumptions and open our hearts and minds to possible and possibilities. And finally, I ask the leaders of the region; Israeli and Palestinian; Jewish and Christian and Muslim- to join us in the noble quest for lasting peace.

Thank you. God bless you. God bless Israel. God bless the Palestinians. And God bless the United States. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Task 2. Provide your personal explanations and comments on the following symbols, words and expressions that are used in political discourse for propaganda techniques and tools.

Bandwagon. Plain Folks. Glittering Generality. Testimonial. Name Calling.

Demonization. Patriotic Appeals. Evocative Visual Symbols.

Task 3. Analyse carefully the following humorous political quotations and indicate the embedded irony in each of them. Historical and socio-cultural knowledge of the context would help in the right interpretation of the different sayings and assertions:

1. Northanger Abbey: “From politics, it was an easy step to silence.”
2. Bailey John: “Politics is not a good location or a vocation for anyone lazy, thin-skinned or lacking a sense of humour.”
3. Blum Norbert: “Politics is like football- it doesn’t matter whether you win 3-1 or 1-0, you still get 3points.”
4. Clement Attlee (replied to): “Politics are too serious a matter to be left to the politicians.”
5. Three laws of Politics: (a) Get elected. (b) Get re-elected. (c) Don’t get mad, get even.
6. Himmel Sam: “A dictatorship is a country where they have taken the politics out of politics.”
7. *Parkinson’s Law*: Men enter local politics solely as a result of being unhappily married.
8. Politics is supposed to be the second oldest profession. I have come to realize that it bears a very close resemblance to the first.
9. *The Illiterate Digest*: The more you read and observe about this Politics thing. You got to admit that each party is worse than the other.
10. If you ever injected truth into politics you would have no politics.
11. *The Duenna*: Conscience has no more to do with gallantry than it has with politics.
12. *Tel Quel 2 ‘Rhumbs’*: Politics is the art of preventing people from taking part in affairs which properly concern them.
13. *Observations, Anecdotes and Characters*: The greatest art of a politician is to render vice serviceable to the cause of virtue.
14. Cameron Simon: “An honest politician is one who when he is bought will stay bought.”
15. The most successful politician is he who says what everybody is thinking most often and in the loudest voice.

Task 4. Make a contextual and textual analysis of the following extracts **John Kennedy’s Moon Speech**.

“We meet at a college noted for knowledge, in a city noted for progress, in a State noted for strength, and we stand in need of all three, for we meet in an hour of change and challenge, in a decade of hope and fear, in an age of both knowledge and ignorance. The greater our knowledge increases, the greater our ignorance unfolds.”

“So it is not surprising that some would have us stay where we are a little longer to rest, to wait. But the city of Houston, this State of Texas, this country of the United States was not

built by those who waited and rested and wished to look behind them. This country was conquered by those who moved forward- and so will space.”

“We set sail on this new sea because there is new knowledge to be gained, and new rights to be won, and they must be won and used for the progress of all people. For space science, like nuclear science and all technology, has no science of its own. Whether it will become a force for good or ill depends on man, and only if the United States occupies a position of pre-eminence can we help decide whether this new ocean will be a sea of peace or a new terrifying theatre of war.”

“We choose to go to the moon. We choose to go to the moon in this decade and do the other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win, and the others, too.”

“The growth of our science and education will be enriched by new knowledge of our universe and environment, by new techniques of learning and mapping and observation, by new tools and computers for industry, medicine, the home as well as the school.”

“Many years ago the great British explorer George Mallory, who was to die on Mount Everest, was asked why did he want to climb it. He said, “Because it is there.” Well space is there, and we’re going to climb it, and the moon and the planets are there, and new hopes for knowledge and peace are there. And, therefore, as we set sail we ask God’s blessing on the most hazardous and dangerous and greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked. Thank You.”

Task 5. Indicate the most important characteristics in the following quotes of **Martin Luther King’s Speech “I Have a Dream.”**

“Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation.”

“But one hundred years later, the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land. And so we’ve come here today to dramatize a shameful condition.”

“But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. And so, we’ve come to cash this check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.”

“We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of Now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to loft our nation from the quick-sands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God’s children.”

“There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights, ‘When will you be satisfied?’ We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality. We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities. We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro’s basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one. We can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their self-hood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating: ‘For Whites Only’. We cannot be satisfied as long as a Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and a Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote. No, no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until ‘justice rolls down like waters, and righteousness like a mighty stream.’”

“I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.’”

“I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.”

“I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.”

“I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the colour of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream today!”

“I have a dream that one day, down in Alabama, with its vicious racists, with its governor having his lips dripping with the words of ‘interposition’ and ‘nullification’ - one day right there in Alabama little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers. I have a dream today!”

“I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, and every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight; ‘and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together.’”

“Let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire.”

“Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York.”

“Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania.”

“Let freedom ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado.”

“Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California.”

“But not only that:

Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia.

Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.

Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi.

From every mountainside, let freedom ring.”

“And when this happens, and when we allow freedom ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God’s children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: Free at last! Free at last!”

“Thank God Almighty, we are free at last!”

Task 6. A member of the House of Commons (British Parliament) answered a question by the following:

“Well Minister, if you asked me a straight answer, the I shall say that, as far as we can see, looking at it by and large, and taking one time with another, in terms of the averages of departments, then, in the final analysis, it is probably true to say that, at the end of the day, in general terms, you would probably find that, not to put too fine a point on it, there probably wasn’t very much in it one way or the other, as far as one can see, at this stage.”

- (a) Please introduce the necessary cohesive devices in order to improve on the text.
- (b) Can you indicate the MP’s objectives that are embedded in his answer?

Task 7. Analyse the speech functions of Attack/Defence (argument and counterargument) in political discourse illustrated in the following exchange:

Michael Latham (Conservative MP, Great Britain): “Israel’s security will be permanently endangered by an independent PLO-dominated West Bank State.”

D. J. McCarthy (Labour MP, Great Britain): “It is high time someone exposed the absurdity of this. What threat is an impoverished Arab territory smaller than Yorkshire going to be when it would not only be surrounded by Arab neighbours who were party to the peace settlement, but also at the daily mercy of Israel’s military power?!”

Task 8. Explain the contextual parameters that contribute in the interpretation of the following sequences:

- (a) Despite the employment of modern weapons and the admitted use of torture to extract information from suspects, 800,000. French troops were unable to curb the rebellion.
- (b) “The borders of Israel are where the Jews live, not where is a line on a map.”
- (c) “You must attack the leader and Arab nationality at its roots; the power of Abderkader must be destroyed or you will never get anywhere in Africa.”
- (d) In this country, September constitutes a traumatic event and has left an indelible mark on the popular imagination; and in the other country Black September did the same.
- (e) The farce began in 1827 when Hussein, the Turkish Dey was provoked into losing his temper and slapped the consul across the face with his fly whisk.
- (f) In July 1962, the President Ben Khedda, dismissed him from command of the army; he reacted by marching on Algiers one month later.
- (g) The lower house is elected by the people and has more power, the upper house is made up of a number of peers most of these are appointed by the Queen.

Task 9. Analyse President Recep Tayib Erdogan’s speech (The Humanitarian Ships Incident) in terms of the Accusation speech act and the arguments developed to support it.

“Today I do not only want to speak to my dear people but to all of humanity. I want to call to the conscience and hearts and minds of the whole of humanity, I would like to share courageously my feelings.

Yesterday, in the darkest moment of the night two bloody attacks occurred. The first of them was the terrorist attack against our military troops at the Iskenderun Naval Base. In this malicious, vicious attack, six of our soldiers died, and they have become martyrs. Seven of our soldiers have been injured. The second, at dawn in the waters of the Mediterranean Sea, the heart of humanity has taken one of her heaviest wounds in history. The aid ships, from the humanitarian heart, these flowing aid ships have been hindered with guns, by violence, despotism.

They, who with mercy, compassion and humaneness, loaded these ships, they could not reach their place of destination, they were wrecked in carnage.

Yesterday, beginning in the morning hours, armed elements of the Israeli Army stopped humanitarian aid being brought to the Gazan people, from more than 32 countries, with 600 people inside carried by the Free Gaza Flotilla, in international waters, in an absolutely illegal way did they attack, spilling the blood of innocent humans.

At this violent attack, resulting in casualties and persons being wounded, the humanitarian aid ships were seized and sequestered. This inhuman attack against those women, young

people, religious functionaries that the ship was carrying, I do one more time strongly, severely condemn.

The bloody massacre of Israel brought against the ships bringing humanitarian aid to Gaza is a massacre deserving of any kind of curse and condemnation. This is openly an attack against the international law, against the heart of humanity, against world peace, I say against the heart of humanity, for, on those ships were people from all nations, all religions. People alone and they only were bringing humanitarian aid to those under blockade, embargo, to the people in Gaza. The ships, before they left openly declared to the entire world their cargo, their intention, their mission. As witness to this openly humanitarian aid from the world and our country 60 journalists have entered the ships as well. In international waters, in open sea, this armed attack against 600 people and 6 ships which were carrying aid to oppressed people, poor people, to starved people, to people whose homes were destroyed- this was openly an attack against the basic philosophy of the United Nations.”

(From Palestine Think Tank. Translated and transcribed from Turkish by Guzin Bilgi for www.palestinethinktank.com and Gulagnik Translators www.gulaknick.wordpress.com English editing by Mary Rizzo.)

Task 10. Analyse President Obama’s speech with a special focus on the different references to the US history.

Democratic National Convention Keynote Address 2004.

“Tonight, we gather to affirm the greatness of our Nation- not because of the height of our skyscrapers, or the power of our military, or the size of our economy. Our pride is based on a very simple premise, summed up I, a declaration made over two hundred years ago:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal,
that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights,
that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

That is the true genius of America, a faith- a faith in simple dreams, an insistence on small miracles; that we can tuck in our children at night and know that they are fed and clothed and safe from harm; that we can say what we think, without hearing a sudden knock on the door; that we can have an idea and start our own business without paying a bribe; that we can participate in the political process without fear of retribution, and that our votes will be counted- at least most of the time.

People don’t expect- people don’t expect government to solve all their problems. But they sense, deep in their bones, that with just a slight change in priorities, we can make sure that every child in America has a decent shot at life, and that the doors of opportunity remain

open to all. They know we can do better. And they want that choice. In this election, we offer that choice.”

Task 11. Indicate the different linguistic and contextual markers that the following poem reflects some political thoughts and stands. The circumstance is the erection of a marble monument of an unknown citizen by the state.

The Unknown Citizen by W.H. Auden

He was found by the Bureau of Statistics to be
One against whom there was no official complaint
And all the reports in his conduct agree
That, in the modern sense of an old-fashioned word, he was a saint,
For in everything he did he served the Greater Community.
Except for the War till the day he retired
He worked in a factory and never got fired,
But satisfied his employers, Fudge Motors Inc.
Yet he wasn't a scab or odd in his views;
For his Union reports that he paid his dues,
(Our report on his Union shows it was sound)
The Press are convinced that he bought a paper every day
And that his reactions to advertisements were normal in every way.
Policies taken out in his name prove that he was fully insured,
And his Health-card shows he was once in hospital but left it cured.
Both Producers Research and High-Grade Living declare
He was fully sensible to the advantages of the Instalment Plan
And had everything necessary to the Modern Man,
A phonograph, a radio, a car and a Frigidaire.
Our researchers into Public Opinion are content
That he held the proper opinions for the time of year;
When there was peace, he was for peace: when there was war, he went.

He was married and added five children to the population,
Which our Eugenist says was the right number for a parent of his generation.
And our teachers report that he never interfered with their education.
Was he free? Was he happy? The question is absurd:
Had anything been wrong, we should certainly have heard.

Task 12. Analyse in terms of ‘Real Politic’ and ‘Economic Interests’ President Trump’s political statement.

Statement from President Donald J. Trump on Standing with Saudi Arabia.

Foreign Policy Statement and Releases Issued on November 20,2018.

America First!

“The world is a very dangerous place!

The country of Iran, as an example, is responsible for a bloody proxy war against Saudi Arabia in Yemen, trying to destabilize Iraq’s fragile attempt at democracy, supporting the terror group Hezboallah in Lebanon, propping up dictator Bashar Assad in Syria –who has killed millions of his own citizens- and much more.

Likewise, the Iranians have killed many Americans and other innocent people throughout the Middle East. Iran states openly, and with great force, ‘Death to America! Death to Israel!’ Iran is considered ‘the world’s leading sponsor of terror;’

On the other hand, Saudi Arabia would gladly withdraw from Yemen if the Iranian would agree to leave. They would immediately provide desperately needed humanitarian assistance. Additionally, Saudi Arabia has agreed to spend billions of dollars in leading the fight against Radical Islamic Terrorism.

After my heavily negotiated trip to Saudi Arabia last year, the Kingdom agreed to spend an invest 450 billion dollars in the United States. This is a record amount of money. It will create hundreds of thousands of jobs, tremendous economic development, and much additional wealth for the United States. Of the 450 billion, 110 billion dollars will be spent on the purchase of military equipment from Boeing, Lockheed Martin, Raytheon and many other great U.S. defence contractors. If we foolishly cancel these contracts, Russia and China would be the enormous beneficiaries- and very happy to acquire all this newfound business. It would be a wonderful gift to them directly from the United States!

The crime against Jamal Khashoggi was a terrible one, and one that our country does not condone. Indeed, we have taken strong action against those already known to have participated in the murder. After great independent research, we know now many details

of this horrible crime. We have already sanctioned 17 Saudis known to have been involved in the murder of Mr. Khashoggi, and the disposal of his body.

Representatives of Saudi Arabia say that Jamal Khashoggi was an ‘enemy of the state’ and a member of the Muslim Brotherhood, but my decision is in no way based on that- this is an unacceptable and horrible crime. King Salman and Crown Prince Mohammad bin Salman vigorously deny any knowledge of the planning or execution of the murder of Mr. Khashoggi. Our intelligence agencies continue to assess all information, but it could very well be that the Crown Prince had knowledge of this tragic event- maybe he did maybe he didn’t!

That being said, we may never know all of the facts surrounding the murder of Mr. Jamal Khashoggi. In any case, our relationship is with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. They have been a great ally in our very important fight against Iran. The United States intends to remain a steadfast partner of Saudi Arabia to ensure the interests of our country, Israel and all other partners in the region. It is our paramount goal to fully eliminate the threat of terrorism throughout the world!

I understand there are members of Congress who, for political or other reasons, would like to go in a different direction- and they are free to do so. I will consider whatever ideas are presented to me, but only if they are consistent with the absolute security and safety of America. After the United States, Saudi Arabia is the largest oil producing nation in the world. They have worked closely with us and have been very responsive to my requests to keeping oil prices at reasonable levels- so important for the world. As President of the United States I intend to ensure that, in a very dangerous world, America is pursuing its national interests and vigorously contesting countries that wish to do us harm. Very simply it is called America First!”

Task 13. Pick up the most important political speech acts that characterize the present speech of Nelson Mandela.

Trial Speech “I am Prepared to Die” by Nelson Mandela.

“Our fight is against real and not imaginary hardships. My Lord, we fight against two features which are the hallmarks of African life in South Arica which are entrenched by legislation which we seek to have repealed. These features are poverty and lack of human dignity. The whites enjoy what may well be the highest standard of living in the world, whilst Africans live in poverty and misery.

Poverty goes hand in hand with malnutrition and disease. The incidence of malnutrition and deficiency diseases is very high amongst Africans. Tuberculosis, pellagra, kwashiorkor, gastro-enteritis, and scurvy bring death and destruction of health. The incidence of infant mortality is one of the highest in the world.

The complaint of Africans, however, is not only that they are poor and whites are rich, but that the laws which are made by the whites are designed to preserve this situation. There are two ways to break out of poverty. The first is by formal education, and the second is by the worker acquiring a greater skill at his work and thus higher wages. As far as Africans are concerned, both these avenues of advancement are deliberately curtailed by legislation.

Moreover, Africans in the unskilled and semi-skilled occupations which are open to them are not allowed to form trade unions which have recognition under the Industrial Conciliation Act.

Our complaint is not that we are poor by comparison with people in other countries, but that we are poor by comparison with white people in our own country, and that we are prevented by legislation from altering this imbalance. The lack of human dignity experienced by Africans is the direct result of the policy of white supremacy. White supremacy implies black inferiority. Legislation designed to preserve white supremacy entrenches this notion. Menial tasks in South Africa are invariably performed by Africans. When anything has to be carried or cleaned the Whiteman will look around for an African to do it for him; whether the African is employed by him or not. Because this sort of attitude, whites tend to regard Africans as a separate breed.

Pass laws, which to the Africans are among the most hated bits of legislation in South Africa, render any African liable to police surveillance at any time. Hundreds and thousands of Africans are thrown into jail each year under pass laws.

This leads to a breakdown in moral standards, to an alarming rise in illegitimacy, and to growing violence which erupts not only politically, but everywhere. Death sentences cannot cure the festering sore. The only cure is to alter the conditions under which Africans are forced to live and to meet their legitimate grievances.

We want to be allowed to live where we obtain work, and not be endorsed out of an area because we were not born there. We want to be part of the general population, and not confined to living in our ghettos. We want to be allowed out after eleven o'clock at night and not to be confined to our rooms like little children. We want to be allowed to travel in our country and to seek work where we want to, where we want to and not where the Labour Bureau tells us to. We want a just share in the whole of South Africa; we want security and a stake in society. Above all, My Lord, we want equal political rights, because without them our disabilities will be permanent.

I know this sounds revolutionary to the whites in this country, because the majority of voters will be Africans. This makes the white man fear democracy. But this fear cannot be allowed to stand in the way of the only solution which will guarantee racial harmony and freedom for all. It is not true that the enfranchisement of all will result in racial domination.

Political division, based on colour, is entirely artificial and, when it appears, so will the domination of one colour group by another. The ANC has spent half a century fighting against racialism. When it triumphs as it certainly must, it will not change that policy.

It is a struggle of the African people, inspired by our own suffering and our own experience. It is a struggle for the right to live. During my lifetime I have dedicated my life to this struggle of the African people. I have fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons will live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal for which I hope to live for and to see realized. But, My Lord, if it needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die!”