Thi Qar Arts Journal
VOL5 NO 46 JUNE. 2024

Examining the Language of Politics and the Politics of Language via Political Discourse Analysis

Dorgham Ahmed Nafea

dhurgham.ahmed@utq.edu.iq

https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5189-071X

Aboothar Ali Taher

abother@utq.edu.iq

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6484-3686

College of Arts, University of Thi Qar

https://doi.org/10.32792/tqartj.v5i46.632

Received 21/2/2024, Accepted 28/3/2024 , Published 30/6/2024

Abstract

An overview of political discourse analysis (PDA) research is provided in this essay. We start by placing this work in the context of the linguistic and political shifts that occurred in the last half of the twentieth century in the social and human sciences. We next go over many opinions about what constitutes the political and relevant subjects of study for PDA. We examine the connection between PDA and critical discourse analysis (CDA), adopting an inclusive understanding of politics and discourse. We conclude by reviewing political discourse studies in terms of the theoretical and analytical frameworks they use, as well as the sociopolitical topics they tackle.

Keywords: Language of Politics, Politics of Language, Political Discourse Analysis

Introduction

"Necessary, inseparable, essential, inextricable," etc. When asked, "What is the relationship between language and politics?" discourse analysts and political scientists alike always bring up one or more of these words. For example, Chilton and Schaffner (1997) maintain that "it is probably the case that the use of language in the constitution of social groups leads to what we call 'politics' in a broad sense" and that "it is surely the case that politics cannot be conducted without language." (206). Pelinka (2007) argues

that "language must be seen (and analyzed) as a political phenomenon" and that "politics must be conceived and studied as a discursive phenomenon," noting that the study of language transcends the fields of literature and linguistics (129). The ancient Greek and Roman treatises on rhetoric are where the basic connection between language and politics was first recognized. Due to the crucial role Aristotle believed that the art of rhetoric was essential to citizenship throughout the emergence of city-states in ancient Greece, and that political oratory played a significant role in state affairs (Aristotle 1954).

Cicero shared this understanding, viewing rhetoric as a potent tool for influencing political opinion and behavior. In fact, people's ability to live and participate in civilized communal life was made possible by the art of rhetoric (Bizzell and Herzberg 1990). Within rhetorical and communication studies, political communication research reflects the legacy of the classical rhetorical tradition.

This study is undoubtedly significant and educational, but the review that follows concentrates on what is known as "political discourse analysis." PDA is a collection of cross- and multidisciplinary studies that emphasize the political nature of discursive practice as well as the linguistic and discursive aspects of political text and discourse. This study is multidisciplinary because it acknowledges that, in order to fully understand its subject of study, discourse analysis cannot function only within linguistic and discursive frameworks; rather, it must also make use of the frameworks, methods, and materials of other disciplines. It is multidisciplinary in that it examines socio-political phenomena and issues relevant to different fields of study by bringing together experts from different disciplines.

The PDA lineage and the theoretical and practical conception of the enterprise are the main topics of this review. After that, I give an overview of political discourse studies, including their theoretical and analytical underpinnings and the sociopolitical concerns they tackle.

Taking Turns: The Politics of Language and the Language of Politics

The term "political discourse analysis" highlights the dual nature of the nominal and its endeavor, akin to a janus face. PDA can refer to a political, or critical, approach to discourse analysis or to the study of political discourse, which is defined as the words and conversations of politicians within obviously political circumstances, as van Dijk (1997) explains. Therefore, PDA focuses on comprehending the nature and purpose of political discourse as well as analyzing the part discourse plays in establishing, preserving, misusing, and opposing power in modern society. According to van Dijk (1997), such work "should be able to deal with issues that are discussed in political science and answer genuine and relevant political questions.". Chilton (2004) bases his methodology on the following central question: "What does language use in what we consider to be 'political' contexts tell us about humans generally?" . This question presupposes a relationship

between language, politics, culture, and cognition. It also proposes a linguistic framework that is "socially concerned" for analyzing the complexities of political conduct and thought. Understanding the linguistic practices that political speakers use to "imbue their utterances with evidence, authority, and truth" and, consequently, gain legitimacy in certain political contexts, is the focus of this type of work. According to Chilton, the development of this linguistic method coincided with a group of linguists switching from Chomsky's generative framework to Halliday's (1978, 1994) systemic-linguistic and social semiotic framework. The phrase "analysis of political discourse" (APD), which Okulska and Cap (2010) use,refers to socially-oriented studies of "polity and" or politics that are situated at the junction of political social institutions and political public discourse. The field of "political linguistics," which is commonly understood to be the study of language and language practices "primarily (but not exclusively) within political contexts," provides the foundation for their mission. This field is "heterogeneous and fragmented" (3). Initially focused on the "interplay between language and politics," PL was contextualized within a "renewed critical awareness" of the reciprocal, constitutive, and dynamic relations between language and politics that "had penetrated various domains of language study," as explained by Blommaert (1997).

The following were the results of this "modest" paradigm shift in linguistics: (1) the rise of critical linguistics and CDA; (2) linguistic anthropology's focus on language ideologies and language of language; and (3) macro-societal studies of language and nationalism, language policy, and language planning (2–6). As academics realized the linguistic, discursive, and symbolic aspects of their work, linguistics underwent a political turn that informed and coincided with a linguistic turn in political science.4 According to Bell (1975), this movement represents a new paradigm that saw language as the "perceptual lens" through which to view political occurrences and the idea that political actions are "built of and around words." He contends that the three main concepts in politics—power, influence, and authority—refer to ways of speaking with people in order to achieve political objectives and outcomes (ix; see also Bell 1988). Politicians use language as a tactical tool to seize and maintain power, according to Hudson (1978). This perspective holds that political "statements" are not "cool," "objective," and "comprehensible" statements, but rather serve as a "screen, a false scent, a safety net" intended to further political objectives, forge coalitions, and oppositions and convey a picture of the country as a whole (61, 41). Political scientists, according to Dallmayr (1984), ought to concentrate on the ways that language and symbolic communication upholds and governs political groups and systems (2). The "architectronic role" that language plays in providing "a cast or grid for an entire way of life, that is, for preferred manners of thinking, speaking, and acting," is something he argues such work should understand (4, 2). Pelinka (2007) contends that political scientists have also made significant contributions

to the field of language and politics study, despite linguists and socioliguists traditionally making the most significant contributions (130).

Research in political science has defined the field's conception of language (Dallmayr, 1984, for example); investigated the role language and language policy have played in the formation of the modern nation-state and national identity (Bugarski, 2004); identified the verbal interactional features of international negotiation (Bell, 1988, for example); and examined the "mobilizing force" that language serves in relation to "social cleavages" (Pelinka 2007: 135, 134). Murray Edelman's (1964, 1971, 1977, 1988) research on language and politics' symbolic nature is a prime example of political science's linguistic revolution. His method is predicated on that producing meaning is vital to political activity and to the ‘‘construction of beliefs about events, policies, leaders, challenges, and crises that rationalize or challenge existing inequalities’’ (1988: 104). In fact, he maintains that "the issue is not political, by definition, if there are no conflicts over meaning." (1988: 104). Politics is a language that is used to describe political actions, and politics is a meaning-making activity.

Both are symbolic forms that influence and spread public interpretations of politically complicated and inherently confusing situations (1964: 1). To put it succinctly, "politics is a symbolic form," and as language mediates the public's perception of events, Edelman maintains that "political language is political reality." (1964: 1; 1971: 65; 1988: 104; original emphasis added). By insisting on and analyzing the "radical entanglement between textual and political practices," Michael Shapiro (1981, 1984, 1988) has also attempted to change how political scientists perceive the role language plays in political practice and in the field of political science (1988: xii). According to him, the discipline is flawed because it upholds a "anachronistic philosophical ideal of objectivity" and views political experience as a "autonomous, fully formed entity" that just has to be articulated using the "correct speech patterns" (1981: 19). Shapiro calls on analysts to pay attention to how discursive processes of describing, classifying, and assessing give meaning to the "world of things" in order to fully comprehend political phenomena (1981: 19). The key to this analytical focus is recognizing and deconstructing the characteristics of power and authority that are implicit in a variety of texts in order to politicize language practices of daily life and social science study.

Defining the Political

What can PDA teach us about political discourse and practice, and how is it conducted? What are the study topics? It is necessary to address the earlier issue of how PDA practitioners conceptualize politics and political discourse in order to answer these problems.

According to Wodak and de Cilia (2006), a crucial question in language and politics study is what constitutes politics and political action (713). Politics is recognized,

at the very least, to be the domain of the polity and to include the behaviors and activities of formal political institutions, professional politicians, and citizens who engage in political activity.

Furthermore, political practice is typically understood to include power conflicts and cooperative actions to achieve the objectives of a society or group (Chilton 2004; Chilton and Schaffner 2002; van Dijk 1997). It is the process by which social actors create, cling to, and reject authority positions, justification claims, and similar things (Chilton 2004: 4).5. Politics are implemented both at the "macro" and "micro" levels of society. Micropolitics include acts of persuasion and argumentation, threat, bribery, and other similar tactics and occurs between individuals, genders, and social groupings (Chilton 2004: 3). Macropolitics is the study of tensions between and among political institutions. These conflicts are expressed in democratic constitutions, historical practices, and legal codes (Chilton 2004: 3). Despite advocating for a narrow understanding of politics and political speech, van Dijk (1997) contends that analysis should concentrate on the discourse created by the "central players in the polity." (13), some people believe that politics is a socially created field rather than one that is "unambiguously delimited" (Fairclough 2006: 33). Political discourse and concepts should reach into the "lifeworld" in addition to the polity (Fairclough 2006: 33). According to Wodak and de Cilia (2006), concepts from institutionalized politics penetrate "everyday language" on a constant and inevitable basis (709). According to Seidel (1985), discourse "of any kind" is political since it acts as a battleground and a "semantic space in which meanings are produced and/or challenged" (45). Likewise, Lemke's (1995) definition of "textual politics" maintains that political discourse and political understandings need to take meaning-making activities into consideration.

And for texts as the places where these kinds of actions take place (1). According to Fairclough (2006), the political sphere consists of "unstable, fluctuating, and emergent" grassroots social movements, "mediatized politics," and the generally stable institutionalized institutions and practices of the polity (33). According to Okulska and Cap (2010), almost "any kind of human communication" is included, and it is directed toward various discourse purposes in various social contexts, organizations, and relationships that are characterized by power imbalances (6). This perspective is predicated on the fundamental tenet that political definitions must be contextualized and ultimately left up to interpretation(Chilton 2004; Chilton and Schaffner1997; Joseph 2010).

According to Chilton and Schaffner (1997), the political is defined as "the potentially political," and they contend that the process of politicization that leads to the identification of political Social actors, institutions, occurrences, and acts of

communication are all shown as having political potential. In order to carry out this process, four functions of communicative conduct must be understood: dissimulation, resistance, opposition, and legitimation. Muntigl (2002) contends that this understanding of politicization is necessary to go beyond studies of "stable, rigid forms of political actions" and media representations of political action in order to broaden the "conceptual horizon of politics" of political discourse. According to Muntigl, politics is a collection of discursive activities that carry out political tasks. Because of this, PDA focuses on a wide range of "contingent, alternative forms of doing politics"—a sub-politics made possible by the "repoliticization" process.

Critical Discourse Analysis as Political Discourse Analysis

The discourse analytic approach of CDA is strongly aligned with the critical study of political discourse.Six PDA and CDA alignment is predicated on the ideas that political discourse is (and should be) conducted via a critical perspective and that CDA is fundamentally a political undertaking. Van Dijk (1997) argues that a political approach to discourse analysis and the analysis of political discourse should be included in this field of study, calling for a "more critical reading of the label" PDA. Furthermore, he maintains that political discourse analysts must adopt a critical viewpoint in order to be "studied most interestingly." The methods via which "political power, power abuse, or domination" manifest in and are enacted through discourse structures and practices are examined in this "critical-political discourse analysis.

The majority of CDA research might be classified as PDA, or only research that focuses explicitly on the speech of formal political institutions and actors would be, depending on how inclusive or exclusive one defines political discourse. Depending on how broadly or narrowly political discourse is defined, most CDA research might be classified as PDA, or only research that focuses on the discourse of formal political actors and institutions would be. We embrace an inclusive definition of political discourse that acknowledges the political dimension of discursive practice as well as the critical role language plays in exchanges for power, meaning, and material resources as well as in cooperative and resistive actions (Muntigl 2002). In addition, We agree with Luke (2002) when he describes CDA as a "clearly political investigation into social, economic, and cultural power" . The first explanations of CDA are provided by Fairclough (1985) and van Dijk (1990). Discourse analysts should pay attention to the larger macro-level social and political circumstances that precede micro-level behaviors and interactions, according to Fairclough (758). He contended that the allocation and use of power in social structures and formations should be the main subjects of such critical study . Furthermore, "critical discourse analysis" ought to investigate and elucidate the ways in which discursive practices and structures facilitate the naturalization of ideology (Hall, 1982). In turn, this ought to elucidate the ways in which discourse participants are typically blind to the social determination and effects of discourse .

Van Dijk (1990) presented a new critical paradigm as a counterbalance to discourse analysis's more conventional methods. He criticized orthodox discourse analysis for ignoring political and social issues in favor of academic issues like theory construction and discourse description . Van Dijk emphasized that discourse analysts should look at how textual and spoken structures and strategies are conditioned by social, political, and cultural processes and structures, and how those processes and structures in turn help condition discourse analysts. They should also address issues of power, dominance, inequality, resistance, and other related topics . Such a project would aim to address issues of inequality, discrimination, contemporary power abuse, and other related concerns in addition to studying societal problems .

In order to do this, van Dijk presented a multidisciplinary discourse analytical approach that aimed to "reconceptualize the analysis of both discourse and society" by acknowledging that social and cultural reproduction processes are primarily discursively mediated. Since its founding, CDA has grown to become "one of the most influential and visible branches of discourse analysis," according to Blommaert and Bulcean (2000). In fact, since its inception, CDA has undergone extensive development, refinement, and modification through a multitude of books, essays, reviews, and critiques (e.g., Blommaert 2005; Blommaert and Bulcean 2000; Luke 2002; McKenna 2004; Schegloff 1997; Slembrouck 2001; Verschueren 2001; Widowson 2004), as well as Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard 1996; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; van Dijk 1993a; Fairclough 1989, 1992a, 1995a,b, 2003; Kress 1993; van Leeuwen 1993, 2008; O'Halloran 2003; Titscher et al. 2000; Weiss and Wodak 2003; Wodak 1996; Wodak and Chilton 2005; Wodak and Meyer 2001; Young and Harrison 2004. Blommaert's (2005) description of the CDA "programme" provides a comprehensive analysis of its merits and demerits.9. In summary, he praises CDA's dedication to tying linguistic analysis to other social science research initiatives and its emphasis on institutional (rather than everyday) environments for scrutinizing the connections between language, power, and social processes. He also credits CDA with helping legitimize a socially conscious approach to discourse analysis. But he makes clear that these characteristics are not specific to CDA, as they are present in other critical methods like sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology (6). Blommaert contends that the theory, methodology, and viability of CDA as a critical language study approach are its flaws (31). In terms of approach, CDA is
criticized for generating constrained and biased interpretations of the data (31), for combining semantics and pragmatics by assuming that textual meaning determines textual function (32), and for presuming the relevance of specific context elements (like power) rather than identifying pertinent contextual features through methodical analysis (32).

Blommaert accuses CDA of being a critical paradigm that limits analysis to texts and downplays the analytical importance of the production and interpretation environments around them . CDA is overly dependent on an SFL framework. Furthermore, CDA is indifferent to non-Western civilizations and what examination of them might teach us about discursive practice in an era of globalization as it concentrates on societies and institutions at the "core of the world system" (i.e., late-modern, Western) (35). Ultimately, CDA's "closure to a particular timeframe"—the present—prides texts' historical growth in favor of their present-tense nature (35, 37).

RACE AND RACISM

Since language and discursive practices are widely believed to be closely linked to race and racism, critical studies of discourse have paid close attention to these topics. The ways that race and racism are present in elite discourses (such as those found in the media, politics, and educational system) as well as in the discursive practices and interactions of non-elites have been the subject of this research. Van Dijk's seminal research investigated racism in the news media (1987, 1991; also see Teo 2000), politics, education, and business. (1993b; also see Martin-Rojo and van Dijk 1997 and Del-Teso-Craviotto 2009). Additionally, he has looked at how elite expressions of racial attitudes are repeated through non-elites' text and speech (1987, 1993b) and linguistically attenuated (1992, 2000; also see Bonilla-Silva and Forman 2000). Since this pioneering study, studies of non-elites' discursive interactions in a range of social contexts have been included in research. For instance, Bailey (2000) investigates interracial contact that takes place between Korean store owners and African-American patrons during service interactions. This field study investigates the two groups' culturally distinct communication practices and makes the case that each group's interpretation of the other's actions contributes to the understanding of their conflict. The shop owners believe that African American customers lack self-control, while the African American customers believe that the shop owners avoid interpersonal interaction and engagement . Bailey connects these regional modes of interaction to larger social conflict, language and cultural variances, and microcommunicational patterns

In order to comprehend participants' discursive stance around themes of respect and contempt, Buttny and Williams (2000) also look at interracial contact, paying particular attention to how they use reported speech while discussing race. They offer information from two studies: African American and Latino students' conversations about a documentary on racism, and African American students' testimonies of their interactions with White store owners. The first research identifies three structural elements of the speech that was reported and employed in the filmed discussions: the performative nature of the phrase "respect" repeated; a comparison between "like" and "respect"; and the participants' framing of the recipient of their remarks as White people. The second study looks at the stories African American participants used to describe their

experiences receiving subpar treatment from business owners. These stories focused on how much or how little attention the individuals received. The authors draw the conclusion that African Americans frequently view "ordinary symbols of respect" as troublesome when interacting with White people. Del-Teso-Craviotto (2009) investigates the manner in which Argentinian immigrants are impacted by the racist and xenophobic discourse of Spanish elites. Noting the need for more research on how the targets of racist speech react to xeno-racist ideology held by the elite, the author examines how users of an online forum appropriate, interpret, and occasionally even embrace discourses about them by the elite (586). Three characteristics of discourse about race have been identified in their postings: the creation of ingroup and outgroup identities (578); positive and negative characterizations of in-group and out-group actors (582); and the poster's position (583). The language-race link should be rebuilt, according to a 2011 Discourse & Society special issue, which looks at how race and racialization are created between communities and along a variety of linguistic and social factors, such as class, occupation, gender, religion, and so forth (Alim and Reyes 2011).

Bucholtz (2011) investigates the confluence of race and gender in a study of how European American pupils at an ethnoracially divided high school discuss minority groups using interactional analysis and ethnography. Her findings highlight the issue of "racial reversal," which takes the form of three discursive practices: "interracial fight stories," "tales of racialized fears and white persecution," and the angry sentiments of white students over "perceived reverse discrimination" (387). Buckhotz discovered that the combat tales involved intersections between gender and race. Males tended to focus on real violent interactions, while girls tended to emphasize verbal confrontation and simply make hazy connections to risk (389, 395). The boys positioned themselves on a hierarchy of masculinity based on these narratives, which drew on ideas of masculinity. compared to their non-white peers in terms of physical strength (395). Chun (2011) looks at how high school students interpret race in interactions with others of other races, particularly how they use racial vocabulary to describe individuals or behaviors. She views this racialized discursive activity as a negotiated process where gender, class, racism, and authenticity ideas come together. Chun discovered that racial reading relied on regional conceptions of authenticity and that this discourse practice functioned as a means of making regionally relevant comments about gender and class, particularly through the use of terms like "ghetto boys" and "prep girls" (417).

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY/POLITICS OF LANGUAGE

"Any sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein 1979: 193) are the main targets of research on the politics of language and language ideology. Language ideologies play a significant role in decisions and policies pertaining to official and standard languages, language academies, language planning, and language education

programs, as described by Davies (1994) (3212). Language ideology is a vital but frequently overlooked phenomena that acts as a mediator between social structure and discourse patterns, according to Woolard (1992) (235). Thus, by analyzing the influence of dominant cultural models on language and social behavior, the institutional enactment of language ideology, and the "multiplicity, contradiction, and contention" between various ideologies that circulate within a given society or group, she and her colleagues have worked to position language ideology as an important field of inquiry (235, 244-5).

For instance, Blommaert and Verschueren (1992) provide a "view from below" by analyzing language ideologies as they appear in newspaper articles about minority politics, separatist movements, and ethnic violence (355). The writers pinpoint two major themes—language as a distinctive characteristic and language in Empire—through pragmatic analysis of word patterns (357, 370). They contend that the general public marginalizes difference as undesirable and unachievable, and promotes societal homogenization as the normal order of affairs. Additionally, they point out a difference in "popular language ideologies and the way that language is used in multilingual societies." (375). Using the Arizona Tewa culture as a case study, Kroskrity (1992) employs Silverstein's theory of language ideology to comprehend how cultural actors justify their language use. This study shows how local models of common discursive forms and practices are impacted by the community's usage of ritualized ceremonial discourse, or Kiva talk (299). According to Kroskrity, the purposes of specialized language practices go beyond the communication of beliefs and support established social hierarchies and power structures (307). The subject of how language ideologies are created and propagated is examined in the edited collection Language Ideological Debates, according to Blommaert (1999), who views it as a neglected field (1). This inquiry covers many topics, such as the origins of language ideologies, the reasons behind the rise of certain ideologies and the marginalization of others, and the connections between language ideologies and more general social and political changes.

The essays in this volume address these problems by looking at various language disputes from throughout the globe. Blommaert outlines the volume's objectives as a "reform and redocumentation" of key social approaches to language study and as a "refined approach" to discourse data that successfully takes into account the lived dimension of ideology (33). Peled (2011) provides a political science viewpoint on language politics, concentrating on the disagreement among political theorists over how important language rights issue. normative language policy (NLP) research (441). He makes the case for a fresh conceptual framework that more closely links political theorists to NLP sociolinguistic research. According to Peled, such a framework would allow political theorists to extend their project to include language ethics, integrate their analytical tools with those of sociolinguistic research, acknowledge the advantages and disadvantages of concentrating primarily on language rights issues, and give their work

an applied dimension by addressing real-world issues (447–9). The volume by Okulska and Cap (2010) aims to highlight "the frequently overlooked areas of the field that confront cases of discursive and political violation of linguistic human rights."

Minority language rights (MLR), or "who has the right to use their own language, where, when, and how," are covered in Blackledge's (2010) work (301). He contends that multilingualism-related policies and practices incorporate two competing ideologies: one that views bilingual education as the best method for some kids, and one that views the "use and visibility of minority languages" as a "threat to social cohesion, security, and national identity" (311). Blackledge investigates these opposing viewpoints via an anthropological study of students, instructors, administrators and parents of a Bangladeshi-language supplementary school in Birmingham, England. He discovered that, in the framework of the family, bilingualism was the accepted norm. On the other hand, community people established their own venues for teaching kids their mother tongue in opposition to state-approved monolingualism.

Blackledge also describes how students innovatively combined community-based language materials with those that are available globally (like Bollywood movies). Blackledge locates the current MLR argument "at the interstices of nation, heritage, global movement, and new communication," which is the process of combining local and global linguistic resources and practices (322). Pfaff (2010) investigates the rise of multilingualism in Germany after unification to emphasize the function of language and language policy as tools for social policy. She looks at particular language policies and practices, as well as official and popular discourses around them, and she finds two opposing ideologies: the idea that language is a tool for empowerment in education and the symbolic relationship between language and nation (328). Pfaff contends that the alternatives available to immigrant families for where to live, work, and receive an education have been controlled and regulated through language proficiency.

LANGUAGE AND WAR

PDA has made significant use of critical investigation into the discursive aspects of militarism and war, especially in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks and the ensuing "war on terrorism." The naming practices of US officials (Arkin 2005; Collins and Glover 2002), media portrayals of 9/11 (Chermak et al. 2003; Kellner 2004; Stoltz 2007), the Bush administration's "preventative war" policy (Dunmire 2009; Ferrari 2007), the use of metaphor (Cienki 2004; Lakoff 2001; Lule 2004; Skinner and Squillacote 2010), and legitimation strategies (Cap 2008; Chovanec 2010; van Dijk 2007; Hodges 2011; Oddo 2011) are just a few of the discursive and linguistic phenomena that have been studied in this work. In Silberstein's (2002) analysis of 9/11 language and politics, various discursive episodes in the immediate wake of the terrorist attacks are highlighted.

She focuses on the use of language during a time of national emergency and how it helped to legitimize both the war in Afghanistan and the larger fight against terrorism.

Silberstein looks into, for Consider the grammatical decisions (pronouns, military language, etc.) that made up President Bush's remarks in the moments following the attacks and how they portrayed the United States as a warring nation. Her examination of media narratives takes into account the distinct identities that are generated via them as well as the way that the narratives were developed from highly polished and prefabricated tales to real-time accounts of events that happened on the ground. In addition, Silberstein emphasizes a report from the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) that charged certain people with waging a "blame America first" campaign. She examines the report's underlying reasoning errors and contends that it embodies "The New McCarthyism," which is a feature of the post-9/11 world. The discourses surrounding 9/11, the Iraq War, and the "War on Terror" were the focus of special issues published in Discourse & Society (2004) and Journal of Language & Politics (2005). According to Edwards (2004), analyzing a "momentous event" like September 11th highlights a number of sociopolitical issues. He examines how people view and interpret the terrorist attacks, especially the idea that they fundamentally altered global history.16 By highlighting the severity of the attacks and denigrating those who disagree with the official policy responses to them, the author highlights rhetorical techniques intended to "raise the psychological ante" (157).

According to Edwards, the purpose of such discourse is to mobilize the populace in support of specific laws and initiatives. He goes on to say that rather than bringing about a great deal of change, the 9/11 attacks made it possible for the United States to keep up its long-standing foreign policy goals and plans for the Middle East and Central Asia as well as its domestic consumer habits. By analyzing public statements made by politicians and a variety of media platforms, the articles to the Journal of Language and Politics special issue "The Soft Power of War" examine the symbolic conflict "that has been raging around military operations" (Chouliaraki 2005: 1). Using a collection of speeches made in public by John Howard, Tony Blair, and George W. Bush, Graham and Luke (2005), For instance, make the case that the post-9/11 global economy is better understood as a type of "neofeudal corporatism" rather than a capitalist one. (12). Their thesis is based on an investigation of particular aspects of this economic system and how they appear in discourses related to the Iraq War and the fight against terrorism. According to the writers, "the reinvention of an embodied and lived warrior state" best captures the social relations that have come to define the post-9/11 age. Neofeudalism does this well.

The authors contend that this discursively-driven, widely mediated style of political and economic interactions permits an elite control structure that supplants individual accountability, civic engagement, and enterprise with a framework based on

"loyalty, secrecy, and bondage." (35). Machin and van Leeuwen (2005) investigate how the movie and video game "Black Hawk Down" portray the 1993 U.S. conflict with Somalia, arguing that modern Hollywood films and video games are the locations of "the most important political discourse" of the post-9/11 context (119–20). Their three areas of analysis are as follows: the political history of the conflict between the United States and Somalia, the linguistic analysis of "special ops" discourse and social actors, and a critical examination of the cooperative relationship between the entertainment industry and the U.S. military (119).

They contend that the use of documentary lead-ins, participant representation, naming, and classification techniques, and special operations language aim to harmonize viewers with the geopolitical objectives and activities of the U.S. military (120). The authors draw the conclusion that the special operations discourse has taken hold in the public's perception of international relations and events, and that it offers a prefabricated justification and set of guidelines for American military action (136). Contributions to Hodges and Nilep's (2007) Discourse, War, and Terrorism show how discourse that emerged after September 11, 2001 influenced how people understood and interpreted the terrorist attacks and contributed to the formation of the post-attack sociopolitical reality. When read as a whole, the collection looks at how identities, ideologies, and foes are discursively constructed, as well as how citizens and national leaders respond to the attacks. For instance, Lemons (2007) uses feminist theory to analyze two major themes found in articles from the New York Times temporary section "The Struggle for Iraq: Equal Rights": the way women behave as a symbol of relative progress and Islam as a tool of repression (89). Lemons contends that these tropes limit critical engagement with alternative interpretations of religion and liberty, reducing religion to "a practice indifferent to and therefore both protected from and unable to interfere with the State" and restricting freedom to negative liberty (90). Lemons goes on to say that the articles place debates and evaluations of advancements in Islam and the female body in a context that prevents analysis of the articles' underlying premises or careful consideration of their intricacy and subtlety. They "participate in a discourse and regime with which readers... are familiar" as a result. (101).

German chancellor Gerhard Schroder was interviewed on television by two separate news agencies, and Becker (2007) looks at these interviews to show Schroder's tactics for staying neutral in the discussion surrounding the U.S.-led war against Iraq. She analyzes how Schroder constructs Us and Them and negotiates these constructions in regard to diverse themes by looking at the chancellor's response to a prompt demanding "a German position" on the Iraq War (163). According to Becker's analysis, the interviews vary in terms of how personalization and abstraction are balanced in terms of pronoun usage and transitivity structure (171-2). She also goes into detail on how

participants employ the engagement and graduation appraisal elements to negotiate a variety of diverse, frequently contradictory, stances (176).

Concluding Remarks

Social scientists studied the critical role discourse plays in forming "social formation and discipline, economic exploitation and power" in the second half of the 20th century. Luke 2002: 97. PDA has made significant contributions to this discursive turn by clarifying the role discourse plays in a variety of political contexts and practices as well as the inherently political nature of discursive practice. It has done so by drawing on a variety of conceptual frameworks, techniques, and data. The structure and purpose of political speech, the relationships between political conduct, cognition, and discourse, and the effects of textual and conversational characteristics on political systems and processes have all been explained in this study

Furthermore, via addressing discussions and matters beyond the purview of politics, PDA has contributed to the politization of society as a whole. PDA is no longer a developing field of study; rather, it has played a significant role in the 21st century, the first ten years of which have been characterized by a wide range of complex issues and phenomena, not the least of which are the spread of new media technologies, the ongoing war on terror, and the emergence of popular resistance movements that aim to overthrow authoritarian governments, neo-liberal austerity policies, and U.S. hegemony. Of course, these phenomena are not entirely discursive and call for the attention of many analytical methods, as do the difficulties, problems, and opportunities they provide to modern global society. Nevertheless, PDA can be very helpful in identifying the specific ways that they materialize discursively, influence macro- and micro-level socio-political processes, and determine how socio-political life develops in the new millennium.

Refrences

Achugar, Marianna. 2008. What we remember: the construction of memory in military discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alim, H. Samy, and Angela Reyes. 2011. Complicating race: articulating race across multiple dimensions. Discourse & Society 22(4). 379–84.

Aristotle. 1954. The rhetoric and poetics of Aristotle. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Modern Library.

Arkin, William. 2005. Code names: deciphering U.S. military plans, programs and operations in the 9/11 world. Hanover, NH: Steerforth Press.

Bailey, Benjamin. 2000. Communicative behavior and conflict between African-American customers and Korean immigrant retailers in Los Angeles. Discourse & Society 11(1). 86–108.

Becker, Annette. 2007. Between 'us' and 'them': two TV interviews with German chancellor Gerhard Schroder in the run-up to the Iraq war. Discourse, War, and Terrorism, ed. by Adam Hodges and Chad Nilep, 161–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bell, David. 1975. Power, influence, and authority: an essay on political linguistics. New York: Oxford. 1988. Political linguistics and international negotiations. Negotiations Journal, July 4(3). 233–46.

Billig, Michael. 1991. Ideology and opinions: studies in rhetorical psychology. London: Sage.

Bitzer, Loyd. 1981. Political rhetoric. Handbook of political communication, ed. by Dan Nimmo and Keith Sanders, 225–48. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. 1987. Rhetorical public communication. Critical Studies in Mass Communication 4. 425–8.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. 1990. The rhetorical tradition: readings from classical times to the present. Boston: Bedford.

Black, Edwin. 1965. Rhetorical criticism. New York: MacMillan.

Blackledge, Adrian. 2010. The practice and politics of multilingualism. Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. By Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap, 301–26. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.

Blommaert, Jan. 1997. Language and politics, language politics and political linguistics. Belgian Journal of Linguistics 11. 1–10. (ed.) 1999. Language ideological debates. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.2001. Investigating narrative inequality: African asylum seekers' stories in Belgium. Discourse & Society 12(4). 413–49.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1997. Discourse pragmatics. Discourse as social interaction (Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction Vol. 2), ed. by Teun van Dijk, 38–63. London: Sage.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and Tyrone A. Forman. 2000. 'I'm not a racist but…': mapping white college students' racial ideology in the USA. Discourse & Society 11(1). 50–85.

Boussofara, Naima. 2011. Bleaching a dialectical voice in political discourse: sociolinguistic choices in re-writing political speeches. Journal of Language and Politics 10(2). 204–26.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2011. 'It's different for guys': gendered narratives of racial conflict among white California youth. Discourse & Society 22(4). 385–402.

Bugarski, Ranko. 2004. Language policies in the successor states of former Yugoslavia. Journal of Language and Politics 3(2). 198–207.

Buttny, Richard, and Princess L. Williams. 2000. Demanding respect: the uses of reported speech in discursive constructions of interracial contact. Discourse & Society 11(1). 109–33.

Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen Rosa, and Malcolm Coulthard. 1996. Texts and practices: readings in critical discourse analysis. London: Routledge.

Cambell, K. K., and K. H. Jamieson. 1990. Deeds done in words: presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cap, Piotr. 2008. Legitimization in political discourse: a cross-disciplinary perspective on the modern U.S. war rhetoric, 2nd edn. New Castle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Chermak, Steven, Frankie Y. Bailey, and Michelle Brown (eds). 2003. Media representations of September 22. Westport: Praeger.

Chilton, Paul. 1985. Language and the nuclear arms debate: nukespeak today. London: Pinter.

Chouliaraki, Lilie. 2005. Introduction: the soft power of war: legitimacy and community in Iraq war discourses. Journal of Language and Politics 4(1). 1–10.

Chovanec, Jan. 2010. Legitimation through differentiation: discursive construction of Jacques Le Worm Chirac as an opponent to military action. Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. by Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap, 61– 82. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.

Chun, Elain. 2011. Reading race beyond black and white. Discourse & Society 22(4). 403–21.

Cienki, Alan J. 2004. Bush's and Gore's language and gestures in the 2000 US presidential debates: a test case for two models of metaphors. Journal of Language & Politics 3(3). 409–40.

Collins, John, and Ross Glover. 2002. Collateral language: a user's guide to America's new war. New York: New York University Press.

Critical Discourse Studies. 2011. Special issue: ethnography and critical discourse analysis: toward a problem-oriented research dialogue 8(4). 231–309.

Dallmayr, Fred. 1984. Language and politics: why does language matter to political philosophy. London: University of Notre Dame.

Davies, Alan. 1994. Politicized language. The encyclopedia of language and linguistics (vol. 6), ed. by Ron E. Asher, 3211–4. Oxford: Pergamon.

Del-Teso-Craviotto, Marisol. 2009. Racism and xenophobia in immigrants' discourse: the case of Argentines in Spain. Discourse & Society 20(5). 571–92.

van Dijk, Teun. 1987. Communicating racism: ethnic prejudice in thought and talk. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dunmire, Patricia L. 2009. '9 ⁄ 11 changed everything': an intertextual analysis of the Bush Doctrine. Discourse & Society 20(2). 195–222.

Edelman, Murray. 1964. The symbolic uses of politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Edwards, John. 2004. After the fall. Discourse & Society 15(2-3). 155–84.

Ekstrom, Mats. 2009. Power and affiliation in presidential press conferences: a study on interruptions, jokes, and laughter. Journal of Language and Politics 8(3). 386–415.

Fairclough, Norman. 1985. Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. Journal of Pragmatics 9. 739–63.

Ferrari, Federica. 2007. Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: investigating a 'preventive war'

persuasion strategy. Discourse & Society 18(5). 603–25.

Fowler, Roger. 1987. Notes on critical linguistics. Language topics: essays in honor of M.A.K. Halliday, ed. by

Ross Steele and Terry Threadgold, 481–92. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gastil, John. 1992. Undemocratic discourse: a review of theory and research on political discourse. Discourse & Society 3(4). 469–500.

Geis, Michael. 1987. The language of politics. New York: Springer-Verlag. Goodman, Simon, and Susan A. Speer. 2007. Category use in the construction of asylum seekers. Critical Discourse Studies 4(2). 165–85.

Graber, Doris. 1976. Verbal behahavior and politics. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Graham, Phil, Thomas Keenan, and Anne-Marie Dowd. 2004. A call to arms at the end of history: a discoursehistorical analysis of George W. Bush's declaration of war on terror. Discourse & Society 15(2-3). 199–221.

Hall, Stuart. 1982. The rediscovery of 'ideology': return of the repressed in media studies. Culture, society, and the media, ed. by Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran and Janet Woolacott, 56–90. London: Methuen.

Halliday, Michael. 1978. Language as social semiotic. London: Edward Arnold.

Harris, Sandra, Karen Grainger, and Louise Mullany. 2006. The pragmatics of political apologies. Discourse & Society 17(6). 715–37.

Hart, Roderick P. 1984. Verbal style and the presidency. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Heer, Hannes, Walter Manoschek, Alexander Pollak, and Ruth Wodak (eds). 2008. The discursive construction of history: remembering the Wehrmacht's War of Annihilation. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hodges, Adam. 2011. The war on terror narrative. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hudson, Kenneth. 1978. The language of modern politics. London: MacMillan.

Jamieson, Kathleen H. 1988. Eloquence in the electronic age. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jarana, Enrique, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield. 1994. New social movements: from ideology to identity. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Joseph, John (ed.) 2010. Language and politics (vol. IV). New York: Routledge.

Journal of Language & Politics. 2005. Special issue: the soft power of war 4(1). 1–168.

Kellner, Douglas. 2004. 9 ⁄ 11, spectacles of terror, and media manipulation. Critical Discourse Studies 1(1). 41–64.

Kress, Gunther. 1983. Linguistic and ideological transformation in news reporting. Language, image, media, ed. By Howard Davis and Paul Walton, 120–38. New York: St. Martins.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 1992. Arizona Kiva speech as a manifestation of linguistic ideology. Pragmatics 2(3). 297–309.

Lakoff, George. 2001. The power of images. Metaphorik.de. http://www.metaphorik.de/aufsaetze/lakoff-september11.

Lazar, Annita, and Michelle Lazar. 2007. Enforcing justice, justifying force: America's justification of violence in the New World Order. Discourse, war, and terrorism, ed. by Adam Hodges and Chad Nilep, 45–63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Leeuwen, Theo. 1993. Genre and field in critical discourse analysis: a synopsis. Discourse & Society 4(2). 193– 225.

Lemke, Jay. 1995. Textual politics: discourse and social dynamics. London: Taylor Francis.

Lemons, Katherine. 2007. Discourses of freedom: gender and religion in US media coverage of the war on Iraq.

Discourse, war, and terrorism, ed. by Adam Hodges and Chad Nilep, 89–104. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Luke, Allan. 2002. Beyond science and ideology critique: developments in critical discourse analysis. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 22. 96–110.

Lule, Jack. 2004. War and its metaphors: news language and the prelude to war in Iraq, 2003. Journalism Studies 5(2). 179–90.

Machin, David, and Theo van Leeuwen. 2005. Computer games as political discourse: the case of Black Hawk Down. The Journal of Language and Politics 4(1). 119–41.

Martin-Rojo, Luisa, and Teun van Dijk. 1997. 'There was a problem, and it was solved': legitimating the expulsion of 'illegal' migrants in Spanish parliamentary discourse. Discourse & Society 8(4). 523–66.

Mazid, Bahaa-eddin M. 2007. Presuppositions and strategic functions in Bush's 20 / 9 / 2001 speech: a critical discourse analysis. Journal of Language and Politics 6(3). 351–75.

McKenna, Bernard. 2004. Critial discourse studies: where to from here? Critical Discourse Studies 1(1). 9–39.

McLeod, James. 1999. The sociodrama of presidential politics: rhetoric, ritual, and power in the era of teledemocracy. American Anthropologist 101(2). 359–73.

Miller, Gerald R., and Herbert W. Simons. 1974. Perspectives on communication in social conflict. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Morris III, C. E., and Stephen Browne. 2001. Readings on the rhetoric of social protest. State College, PA: Strata Publishing.

Muntigl, Peter. 2002. Politicization and depoliticization: unemployment policy in the European Union. Politics as text and talk: analytic approaches to political discourse, ed. by Paul Chilton and Christine Schaffner, 45–79. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Myers, Greg. 2010. Stance-taking and public discussions in blogs. Critical Discourse Studies 7(4). 263–75. Oddo, John. 2011. War legitimation: representing 'us' and 'them' in four presidential addresses. Discourse & Society 22(3). 1–28.

O'Halloran, Kieran A. 2003. Critical discourse analysis and language cognition. Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press.

Okulska, Urszula, and Piotr Cap. 2010. Analysis of political discourse: landmarks, challenges, and prospects. Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. by Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap's, 3–22. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.

Peled, Yael. 2011. Language, rights and the language of language rights: the need for a new conceptual framework in the political theory of language policy. Journal of Language & Politics 10(3). 436–56.

Pelinka, Anton. 2007. Language as a political category: the viewpoint of political science. Journal of Language & Politics 6(1). 129–43.

Pfaff, Carol W. 2010. Multilingual development in Germany in the crossfire of ideology and politics. Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. by Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap, 327–58. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.

Schegloff, Emmanuel. 1997. Whose text? Whose context? Discourse & Society 8(2). 165–87.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 2001. Language and public memorial: 'America's concentration camps.' Discourse & Society 12(4). 505–34.

Seidel, Gil. 1985. Political discoures analysis. Handbook of discourse analysis: discourse analysis in society, ed. By Teunvan Dijk, 43–60. London: Academic Press.

Shapiro, Michael. 1981. Language and political understanding: the politics of discursive practices. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Silberstein, Sandra. 2002. War of words: language, politics, and 9 / 11. London: Routledge.

Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. The elements: a parasession on linguistic units and levels, ed. by Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks and Carol L. Hofbauer, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Skinner, Daniel, and Rosa Squillacote. 2010. New bodies: beyond illness, dirt, vermin and other metaphors of terror.

Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. by Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap, 43–60. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.

Slembrouck, Stef. 2001. Explanation, intepretation and critique in the analysis of discourse. Critique of Anthropology 21. 33–57.

Stoltz, Gergory Ian. 2007. Arabs in the morning paper: a case of shifting identity. Discourse, war, and terrorism, ed. by Adam Hodges and Chad Nilep, 105–22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Teo, Peter. 2000. Racism in the news: a critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspaper. Discourse & Society 11(1). 7–49.

Titscher, Stefan, Michael Meyer, Ruth Wodak, and Eva Vetter. 2000. Methods of text and discourse analysis. London: Sage.

Verschueren, Jef. 2001. Predicaments of criticism. Critique of Anthropology 21. 59–81. Vickers, Brian. 1988. Indefense of rhetoric. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Weiss, Gilbert, and Ruth Wodak. 2003. Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

West, Candace, and Sarah Fenstermaker. 2002. Accountability in action: the accomplishment of gender, race and class in a meeting of the University of California Board of Regents. Discourse & Society 13(4). 537–63.

Wetherall, Margaret. 1998. Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. Discourse & Society 9(3). 387–412.

Widdowson, Henry G. 1995. Discourse analysis: a critical view. Language and Literature 4. 157–72.

Wilson, John. 1990. Politically speaking: pragmatic analysis of political language. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Windt, Theodore. 1983. Presidential rhetoric: 1961 to the present. Dubuque: Kendall / Hunt.

Wodak, Ruth (ed.) 1989. Language, power, and ideology: studies in political discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Jan-Ola Ostman, Jan Blommeart and Chris Bulcean, 205–10. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Woolard, Kathryn A. 1992. Language ideology: issues and approaches. Pragmatics 2(3). 235–49.

Young, Lynn, and Claire Harrison. 2004. Systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis. London: Continuum.

Zarefsky, David. 2004. Presidential rhetoric and the power of definition. Presidential Studies Quarterly 34(3). 607– 19.