

# *Power and Solidarity in the Iraqi Political Discourse*

By: *Jawad Kadhim Jabir*  
*Jasim Khalifah Sultan*

## **Abstract**

*Building on the tradition of Critical Discourse Analysis, this study explores the ways in which the two dimensions of power and solidarity are manifested in the Iraqi political discourse with special reference to Saddam Hussein's (former President) and Noori Al-Maliki's (current Prime Minister) speeches. The purposes of the study include how discourses represent certain actions and social relations especially via employing certain linguistic items, how discourses affect the behavior, actions and the minds of social categories, especially addressees. This study is also an attempt at finding similarities and differences between Saddam (the name Saddam is used because it is more popular than Hussein) and Al-Maliki in connection to their discourse representation and their style and how to shed light on the Iraqi political scene in the periods represented by our two research participants, namely Saddam and Al-Maliki. It has been found out that the former sticks to the past via history whereas the latter focuses on the future. Lexical items encapsulating violence and obsession in fighting characterize the discourse representation and ways of being on the part of Saddam. On the other side, Al-Maliki's world of discourse is represented by the emphasis on freedom, unity and equality.*

**Key words:** *CDA, Iraqi political discourse, power, solidarity*

## **1. Introduction**

Social power entails controlling discourse, actions and the minds of the dominated social group members. Social resources that result in power include wealth, income, a good job, status, position, knowledge and education. It is a fact that "politicians have control over, e.g., governmental and parliamentary discourse, and preferential access to the mass media" (Van Dijk, 1995:20). CDA may be traced back to Gramsci, Habermas, and Althusser and to the work of Foucault on discourse (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). The adjective "critical" is associated with the Frankfurt school of philosophy, and it means both "self-reflexive" and "socio-historically-situated" (p. 261). Self-reflexivity and socio-historical situatedness, in addition to the concern with power, control, and ideology, are the defining characteristics of CDA (Fowler and Kress, 1979: 180). CDA takes it for granted that inequality of power is prominent among the social structures, which influence linguistic structures (Fowler and Kress, 1979; see Mazid, 1999, for a review of the history of CDA and its critiques of traditional linguistic approaches). CDA focus is on the ideological representations of reality and the cultural constructs of the world. CDA tries to discover traces of ideological bias in texts. In addition, the textual choices are ideologically motivated. For example, we will find that the religious textual choices adopted by Saddam have their ideological objectives and implications in the orientation of convincing others of his aims. This also represents one of the aims of this study. CDA has matured into a full-fledged discipline. Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 262–267) distinguish eight approaches to CDA (see Mazid, 1999). All of these approaches to CDA have in common the concern

with “the partially linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structures” (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997: 271), with “power in discourse” and “power over discourse” (273), and also power through discourse, how discourse “constitutes” society and culture and how it is “constituted” by them (278). CDA has given attention to control and power because of their importance in the development as well as the interpretation of any linguistic interaction (Thomas, 1985). The distribution of control and power in a given interaction is based on the roles of the participants (Brown and Gilman, 1972). The relationships resulting from this distribution are always non-reciprocal because “two people cannot have power over each other in the same area at the same time” (Fasold, 1990: 4). As far as political discourse is concerned, Chilton and Schaffner (1997: 212-213) have identified four strategic functions: coercion, resistance, dissimulation and legitimation/deligitimation. Moreover, Chilton (2004:46) adds two more strategic functions. These are representation and misrepresentation, which are pan-human discursive functions corresponding to Van Dijk's ideological square. For example, by using presuppositions, which are useful concepts in CDA, the speaker can indirectly emphasize his good properties and the other's bad ones. These are evident in our two participants' speeches. What is also of importance in our study is the use of propaganda devices (Victoria, 2002) which include: name – calling, glittering generalities, transfer, the band- wagon, the plain –folks and fear. These devices will be singled out in the discussion of the two speeches under investigation.

This study is conducted within the domain of Critical discourse Analysis. It attempts at investigating the realization of lexical items that reflect power and solidarity in the Iraqi political discourse. The majority of the studies conducted in the domain of power and solidarity were limited to investigating pronouns in discourse. Thus, the gap to be bridged in this study is the use of certain linguistic items, such as vocabulary, to establish the two dimensions of power and solidarity. These two dimensions will be explained first by focusing on the literature with special emphasis on the facts followed in this study. A comparison of the analyses is also made so as to arrive at what characterizes the Iraqi political discourse before and after the toppling of Saddam. For this purpose, two political speeches have been chosen: one is Saddam's( former President) and the other is Al-Maliki's(current Prime Minister). Schaffner(1997:3) points out the political speeches are not a homogeneous genre. Instead, there is a range of subtypes that are decided by the particular communicative situation, including the characterization of the communicative partners (Who is speaking? To whom? When? Where? Why?).

Based on these criteria, a discourse analyst can look into all levels and aspects of language, into pragmatics (i.e. the interaction amongst speakers and hearers), semantics (i.e. meanings, structure of the lexicon), syntax (i.e. the internal organization of sentences), phonology/phonetics (i.e. intonation, stress patterns, pauses) (Schaffner, 1997:3). The purposes of these levels will be looked into in the discussions of the genres in question.

It is a shared knowledge that politicians do not deliver speeches as individuals, but rather as representatives of governments, parties or nations. In these conditions, they are recognized as political actors as to what they can do and say and how. Political texts are the outcome of politics in the sense that they are historically and culturally determined. These texts achieve different functions owing to different political activities. This study is also an attempt to uncover some of the underlying ideologies and implicit claims made by Saddam and Al-Maliki.

The dimensions of power and solidarity have been fundamental to sociolinguistic theory since Brown and Gilman (1972) introduced the concept in relation to the pronoun system. Tannen (1986) has explored the paradoxical nature of these two dynamics and the implications for conversational discourse. That is, the linguistic markers of power and solidarity are potentially signifying either power or solidarity. Sometimes, they are polysemous in the sense that they simultaneously signify each other. Tannen and Kakava (1992) refer to the linguistic choices that are made in languages that have polite and familiar forms of the second person pronoun. In French, the pronoun **vous** is the polite form, while **tu** is the familiar one. English and Arabic do not have such a distinction, but there are compensatory strategies like the use of **title+last** name in correspondence to the **vous** pronoun, while the use of the first name is to indicate familiarity ( Tannen, *ibid*: 11). Accordingly, one can say that the power dynamic is revealed when there is a difference in addressing. For example, situations like adult to child, doctor to patient, officer to soldier, teacher to student, boss to secretary ,etc. entail the power dynamic. The solidarity dynamic works when interlocutors speak to each other in the same way. For instance, both speakers use the version **tu** in addressing each other.

As far as the Iraqi context is concerned, it is hypothesized that there seems to be a change in the Iraqi political dialogue owing to social, political and economic changes. This can be supported by Fairclough (2007) in that social transformations in contemporary social life are extensively 'discourse-led', in the sense that it is discourses which change first. As new discourses enter and achieve salience or dominance..., dialectical processes may ensue in which discourses are enacted in ways of acting (e.g., new ways of managing, new procedures, routines, etc.), inculcated in ways of being in social identities 'leader', and materialized for instance in new spatial, including architectural, forms. (p. 77)

Texts are indicated in three main ways as part of events: in acting, in representing and in identifying. Genres represent ways of acting, discourses are ways of representing and styles are ways of being (Fairclough, p. 75). How this is evident in Saddam's and Al-Maliki's speeches is one of the goals of the present paper. Another goal is to identify how the social relations are manifested in discourse. Johnstone (2008: 124) refers to power and solidarity as the two important aspects of social relatedness that are shown and made in discourse. Power is concerned with asymmetrical relationships wherein one participant controls and shapes the discourse. On the other hand, solidarity concerns the symmetrical or reciprocal aspects of human relationships. Power and solidarity are both always at play in any relationship (Tannen,1994: 19-52). Solidarity is regarded as representing the opposite side of power on the interpersonal level of any discourse event.

According to Brown and Gilman (1972:225, as cited in Jaworski (2009: 1) power holds between two speakers when one "is able to control the behavior of the other" . This relationship is nonreciprocal, and it is matched by the power semantic, which is also nonreciprocal, and can be exemplified by the nonreciprocal use of pronouns as shown in French pronouns of second person. On the other hand, solidarity entails reciprocity in the social context of any discursal event. An example is when the two speakers are on the same social distance. In his article "The Silence of Power and

Solidarity in Fallen Sons", Jaworski (2009) furthers the argument of power and solidarity saying that communication is a ritualized process which allows the participants to construct and project desirable versions of their identities enacted in a succession of performances targeted at specific audiences. Due to the interdependence of social actors in conversation, the behavior of one participant defines and constructs social relations and identities of other members of the group (p.1).

It seems clear that via discourse we can detect a given identity of a given social actor by virtue of the performances acted by them. Via discourse orders, the elements of power and solidarity can be revealed. To van Dijk (1995:20), the aim of CDA is to "examine the nature of social *power* and power abuse, and in particular the ways dominance is *expressed* or *enacted* in text and talk" (emphasis his). With the aid of powerful discourse, those politicians try to convey knowledge, affect opinions, or change attitudes. They control properties of text and talk so as to be able to monitor the minds of their addressees. For example, they emphasize specific topics at the expense of others so as to influence the overall structures that are involved in discourse comprehension. In Saddam's speech, for example, he focused on the dominance of America and Zionism and the dangers brought about by it; whilst Al-Maliki focused on the importance of a united Iraq in the face of dangers. Drawing on Lakoff's terminology, we can show that during Saddam's reign America was conceptually pictured as the VILLAIN, but during Al-Maliki's as the HERO who saved Iraq from a (villain). Moreover, Gramsci (1971) quoted in Van Dijk (1995:355) pointed out that "the power of dominant groups may be integrated in laws, rules, norms, habits, and even a quite general consensus, and thus take the form of what Gramsci called "hegemony". Class domination, sexism and racism are characteristic examples of such hegemony. This is evident in the Iraqi context during Saddam's reign because his coercive power basically depended on his military and violent domination of Iraq. Power, dominance and inequality belong to the macro- level of the social order, whereas language and discourse represent the micro-level of analysis (Van Dijk, 1995:354).

## **2. Data and Methodology**

The data investigated in this study are two Iraqi political speeches. The first speech is one of Saddam's and the second is one of Al-Maliki's. Saddam's speech was given on the 17<sup>th</sup> of January, 1999. It was about the anniversary of the military attack of the Allied forces led by America against Iraq. Al-Maliki's speech was delivered on 26<sup>th</sup> of August 2006 to negotiate the issue of reconciliation and the national dialogue. . Following the tradition of Critical Discourse Analysis, this study explores the ways in which Saddam and Al-Maliki attempt to create both power and solidarity towards general social categories indexed by certain lexical items and structures. It is a qualitative analysis of two sample speeches of Saddam and Al-Maliki. The analysis will be influenced by the studies of Fairclough (2007). Both speeches came after the American attacks in that Saddam dealt with the anniversary of the first American attack in 1991, and Al-Maliki's speech came after the second attack in 2003. This is the basic rationale behind selecting these two speeches. A property of Saddam's speeches is that they are lengthy whereas those of Al-Maliki's are short; therefore, it is expected that our analysis of the speech will be quantitatively disproportionate. This study is hoped to be a contribution in analyzing and understanding the Arabic political discourse in general and the Iraqi one in particular as little has been done in this connection. In Fairclough's (2007) views, CDA has three basic properties: it is relational, dialectical and transdisciplinary. Discourse brings into the complex relations that formulate social life: meaning, and making meaning. For him, the system of

dominance and power is "partly discursive" in that it depends on sustaining the 'legitimacy' of the state and its representatives" (p. 4). Regarding the ideological aspects, the interactions that involve aspects of the interpersonal meaning and forms may be ideological (p.27). Fairclough also believes that ideology can be detected in both structures (language and discourse conventions) and events. Ideologies are representations that reproduce and transform social relations of power and domination. The world is discursively construed in a variety of ways, but there is a range of conditions that ties the socially constructive effects including for example power relations. So, Fairclough has drawn the conclusion that CDA is "a 'moderate' or 'contingent' form of social constructivism." (p.5). He is also of the idea that power and discourse are interrelated. The critical feature of CDA stems from the belief that "it focuses on what is wrong with a society..., and how 'wrongs' might be ... mitigated" (p. 7). That is to say, a critical analyst has to produce interpretations and explanations, which are ideological, of that area of social life. Fairclough considers language as a form of social practice. This way of thinking implies some other notions. First, language is a part of the society and not somehow external to it. Second, language is a social process. Third, language is a socially conditioned process, conditioned that is by other (non-linguistic) parts of society (Fairclough, 1989, 22). The remarkable point in Fairclough's view is that all linguistic phenomena are social, but it is not true the other way round. For instance, when we are talking about the political words such as democracy, imperialism, or terrorism we use linguistic elements, but this is only part of the whole politics. Therefore the relationship between language and society does not observe a one to one correspondence; rather, the society is the whole and language is a part of it. The second implied notion – i.e. language is a social process – is meaningful only when we take discourse as different from text, like Fairclough. Fairclough's notion of text is exactly the same as Halliday's, and this term covers both written discourse and spoken discourse. For him text is a product, not a process. Fairclough employs the term *discourse* to refer to the complete process of social interaction. *Text* is merely a sector of this process, because he considers three elements for discourse, namely *text*, *interaction*, and *social context*. In addition to text itself, the process of social interaction involves the process of text production and text interpretation. Hence, text analysis is a part of discourse analysis.

### 3. Power and Solidarity in Saddam's Speech

Saddam's speech was given on the 17<sup>th</sup> of January, 1999. It was about the anniversary of the military attack of the Allied forces led by America against Iraq. As usual, he started his speech with a Quranic verse, and then he used a group of vocatives addressing Iraqis and the people of the Arab homeland. Greetings followed these procedural techniques adopted by him. These greetings were encapsulated within a whole paragraph. What he tended to follow was mentioning his name here and there, which is a sign of celebrating the self. His speech opened as follows:

1. / ayyuhalsha'bu-l 'Deem/

**O people-the great**

(O, great people)

2. / ayyuhalnashaama fee quwaati-na-l musallaHal-baasila/

**O brave in forces-our-the armed the-brave**

(O, brave soldiers in our armed forces)

3. / yajamaaheerummati-na- l- 'arabyaal-majeeda/

**O people nation-our-the Arab the-glorious**

(O, people of our glorious Arab Nation)

4. /as-salaamu 'alaykum, walakumyaabnaaummatina fee al-shaari' al-'rabi, wa fee kulbayt  
**The-salam on you and to you o sons nation-our in the-street the- Arab and in all  
house  
washaari'.../  
**and street****

(Hi to you, O sons of our nation in the Arab Homeland, in every house and family....)

Then, he goes on sending Hi (salam) to everybody. This is a verbal strategy that characterizes Saddam's speeches. This testifies to what is called establishing phatic communion in discourse (Bloor and Bloor, 2005: 115- 119). One can easily recognize that he tends to use pompous words as if we had a ceremony of war or fight. The lexical items incorporated include /al-'aDeem/ (great), /shuj'aan/ (brave),/majeed/ (glorious), etc..If we take a closer look at the opening of Saddam's speech, we can single out four moves which are ordered as follows:

1. Quranic verse
2. Vocatives
3. Greetings
4. Congratulations

As a rule, the use of the possessive adjective 'our' is inclusive here in that the use of 'our' implies that the army represents the people of its nation; the nation should bolster the army because the latter belongs to the former. It also indicates that the Nation should depend on the president as he is the Commander in chief. Therefore, people should side with Saddam's decision. This is part of the second move. An example is the following:

5. / quwwaati-na l-mussalaHa/  
**Forces -our the- armed**  
(our armed forces)

It is shared knowledge that Saddam believed everything in Iraq and the Arab homeland belongs to him. If Iraq belongs to Saddam and Iraq belongs to the Arab homeland, then the Arab homeland belongs to Saddam, and he is the voice of the Arab world. A Quranic starting point is set to develop a sense of solidarity with the people in question. He follows this strategy out of the fact that the majority of people are affected and easily convinced by the speaker's intentions if he cites Quranic verses in his speech. Another strategic way of showing solidarity is the use of a greeting, and as for Saddam he used long pieces of greetings claiming solidarity and power at the same time. This is a point raised by Tannen (1984) that power and solidarity are polysemous. To further claiming solidarity, Saddam claimed that Iraqis are his brothers and sons, and he loves them. Ironically, he claimed that he was sick of their love, and he was proud of such a sickness as shown in the following piece:

1. / hu-washarafunla-na?annyakuunmarauD-naHub ?abnaa?i-ummati-na/

**It-is honour to-us that was sickness-our love sons nation-our**

(It is an honour for us that our sickness is our love for our people's sons)

It is interesting that the health/illness metaphor in English is used to indicate something unwanted such as the metaphor of "cancer". But, for Saddam, it is wanted, i.e. being ill. He goes on criticizing the Arab leaders for their "love" of America and Zionism. In the past, he was defending them, but now he is no longer so. In this connection, Fairclough (2007:19) refers to the emergence of discourses showing how the range of discourses changes over time due to crisis development. We have changes regarding the representation of events and actions and even the social agents. Saddam reminded Iraqis of the American attack saying that

2. /marratan ?ukhranuðakirukum ?ayyuha?al-ikhwal-?arabbiHalalaatunsaafa-miΘli  
**time again remind-you O the-brothers Arab in-state not forgotten so-in same**

hatðal-yawm ...kana l-laylu l- ?a'maayaHudu l- nahar... wa kana barzakhunyafSulu  
**this –the day... was the-night the-blind limit the-day... and was barrier-nom separate**

baynahuma ?aradahu ?allahu ?an yatasi' li-xatayawa ?rwaaHshirreeraliman ?irtakabu l-  
**between-them want-it the-Allah that take the-sins and souls evil for-who commit the-**

jareemawa-l- satushrif ?alayhi min- al-jihati – l-ukhraawatatarrafa' 'an huwwati-hi l-  
**crime and-the-witness on-it from-the side- the-other and be far from chasm-its-the**

saHeeqal-natinaqimmashamikhashahiqa min-al- mabadi? l-'aDeema– wa-l-  
**deep the-stink peak very high tall from-the principles the-great and-the**  
majd fi 'raaq l-?imaanwa-l-Sabrwa-l-taDHiyyawa- l-jihad/  
**glory in Iraq the- faith and-the patience and-the sacrifice and-the- Jihad**

(Once again, I remind you, you Arab brothers, of an unforgettable event. On this day... the blind night was limiting the bright day and there was a barrier separating them, a barrier which Allah wanted it to have the sins and the evil souls of those who committed crime and bad deeds. From the other side, there is a peak which takes itself away from its stink deep chasm, a very high peak of great principles and glory in Iraq of faith, patience, sacrifice and Jihad). All these words are virtue words and thus they show glittering generalities.

As usual, he cannot help glorifying himself describing his position as a high mountain peak, personifying this peak as having attributes like 'patience, faith, glory, sacrifice and so on'. This is to convince others of his deep involvement in religion, truthfulness and faithfulness so that he can control the minds of other group members in the society.

Saddam was proud of being attacked by 28 armies that faced disappointment for not achieving their targets, saying

1. /kanu ?kΘar minΘalaΘeenxaybahminmawaqifsayulaaHiqahal-  
**were more than thirty disappointment from stands follow-it the-**

'aar...waΘamaniytu 'shreenjayshanTashatsihaamu-ha ?ilaa l-laðeenakataba l-  
**shame..and eight twenty armies astray arrows-its but those wrote the**  
 laahu, wafi-l-Taraf ?al-?akharwaqaf man ?istalhama ?al-maDi ?al-majeed... wa  
**Allah and in-the-side the-other stood who absorb the-past the-glorious... and**  
 ?a'laasha?anwamajdbagdaad?al-taareekhwa- l-fadeelawa-l-ma'aani  
**raise status and glory Baghdad the-history and-the-virtue and-the meanings**  
 ?al-'aalyya...waqafasha'bu-l 'iraaq ...huwawaqiyadata- hu ?allati ?aHabat-hu/  
**The-high ... stood people-the Iraq... it is and leadership-its which loved- it**

(They were more than 30 disappointments which will be traced by shame...and 28 armies whose arrows went astray hit only those who were honoured by martyrdom and glory, and on the other side there stood the one who learnt the glorious past and who dignified Baghdad status, Baghdad of history, of virtue and of sublime senses).

This is to picture himself as a powerful and unbeatable leader. The destructions and ruins that are incurred by the American attacks are regarded as elevating Baghdad's status, pride, glory, history and other sublime meanings. Of course, Baghdad is metonymically used here to refer to Saddam himself or to Iraq. From time to time, he focused on his 'love' for his people despite the fact that many people were killed and executed at the behest of Saddam. In fact, Saddam was pictured by the Bush Administration as the VILLAIN who was irrational and a sadistic killer of innocents (Lakoff, 1992, 2003). As a signifying feature of all Saddam's speeches, he uses the attribute /muntaSir/ (victorious) and its related terms like the verb /yantaSir/ (to be victorious) despite all the collateral damage at the time of his reign to his country. He always focused on the idea that he was supported by Allah as in:

2. / waman 'aanahuallahu fi qawll-Haq?aw fi waqfatiHaqtusharrif ?al-nafsu -l zakiyya../  
**and-who support Allah in saying the-right or in stand right honourthe-soul the pure**

(and the one whom Allah has supported in saying the right or in a rightful position honouring the pure soul)

Thus, he considers himself as the "pure soul" who is supported by Allah and sent to exemplify humanity and righteousness.

Semino (2008:104) considers religion as influential and instrumental in political discourse and that the use of religious discourse has different manifestations and implications in different languages, countries and cultures.

This strategy was a ubiquitous property of Saddam's speech to the extent that over a period of time he was calling himself as / Abdullah ?al-Mu?min/ (the faithful worshipper of Allah). This expression was adopted by Saddam as a tactical choice to terminate his speech at that time. In his speech under investigation, we can find religious metaphors like:

1. / barzakhunyafSul-u bayna- huma/  
**Barrier-nom separate-nom between- them**  
 (a barrier situated between them)



2. /ʔal-nafsul-zakiyyatu l-ʔabiyyatuwa l- nazza'atu li-l-xayrwa-l fadeelah/  
**The-soul-nom the-pure the-brave and-the inclined to-the- good and-the virtue**  
(the purified, proud soul which is inclined to the good and honesty)

3. /ʔal-Saadiqu- l ʔameen/  
**The- truthful –the honest**  
(the faithful, honest man)

In the first example, there is a reference to the Quranic verse(20) in Al-Rahman Sura in which the word / barzakh/ ( barrier) refers to 'death'. In terms of Islamic interpretation, / barzakh/ represents the next stage which Man undergoes after his/her death, i.e. in the grave until resurrection. Saddam's use of this 'Barrier' signified the separation of the darkest night (America) and the brightest day (Iraq). This Barrier separates the evil from the good. The last example is a reference to the prophet Moses whom Allah has described as / ʔal-qawwiul ʔameen/ ( the strong, honest). He was lavishing the prophets' traits upon himself so that he could build a distance from others. In fact, he was after establishing the dichotomy **Us/Them** which indexes solidarity/distance and is characterized by positive attributes assigned to **self** and negative attributes to the **other** (see Reisigl and Wodak 2001). In this case, the **other** is America. Many of Saddam's statements are representative of this distinction. In fact, the dichotomy the Hero (Saddam) and the Villain (enemy) prevails his speech. This enemy undergoes role transfer according to the events and the situation.

Personification is yet another strategy by which speakers achieve certain goals. Semino (2008: 103) shows that the function of personification in discourse is to construct and maintain a sense of national identity. Mentioning nations and countries gives a sense of identification and affective involvement on the part of citizens. In addition to their emotional involvement, nations promote feelings of sameness and homogeneity, and play down differences and dissent. Thus, these are used to establish solidarity and reciprocity as shown in the following:

1. /ʔal-Taraf ʔallaḏinahashajildabagdad /  
**The-side which crushed skin Baghdad**  
(the side which crushed Baghdad's skin)
2. / waqafa l-'iraq-u kulla-hu fihaḏa l-yawm /  
**stood the- Iraq-nom all-it in this the-day**  
(All Iraq stood on this day)

In (1), Baghdad was treated as a person whose skin was crushed by a wild animal; whereas in (2), 'Iraq' is given the capacity to 'stand' as if it were a human being. In addition to that, consider the following piece from Saddam's speech:

3. /ʔal-'iraqka-ssad-in 'aDeem/  
**The-Iraq as-dam-gen great**  
(Iraq as a great dam)

There appears to be a simile comparing Iraq to a dam. This simile uncovers Saddam's obsession with power in that he considered Iraq as a great dam that prevented floods. Projecting himself as Iraq, it can therefore be deduced that Saddam was the great dam. This is in connection with what Lakoff (1991) has referred to as the metaphor of "the person as the state". Moreover, he made a connection of the collapse of that dam to a 'flood' which would drown the whole nation for a long time as shown below:

4. /ðalikali?anna ?inhiyaaru- huyufDee ?ilaaTufaanyugriq ?al-ummazamananTaweelan /  
**that because destruction-it..leads to flood drown the-nation time long-acc**  
 (... that because its collapse will result in a flood drowning the whole nation)

Another linguistic trope Saddam relied on, like other politicians, to convince others of their targets, was the use of emphatic particles and repetitions. This strategy was overt in Saddam's speeches in that we can find, for example, the use of the emphatic particle /?inna/ (truly) was employed 19 times in the speech in focus. As for Johnstone (2008:131), the use of emphatic particles is basically to convince your readers or audience in that "people might not automatically take his opinion seriously, but at the same time, all are calculated to make them [people] more likely to do so". Such devices like emphatics make the speaker's discourse more powerful and thus give him the chance to influence other members' behaviors, actions and minds. In Arabic, there are different functions for the use of emphatic structures. The basic function is to remove doubts from the listeners' minds. Other functions include inclusion, extension and expressing totalitarianism ( Al-Samarra?i, 2007: 115). Another significant structure that is heavily used is relative clauses. The basic function of relative clauses in Saddam's speech is to maximize things as in:

1. /khaab-a man khaab /  
**disappointed who disappointed**

(A disappointed one always got disappointed)

In the above example, Saddam was magnifying the situation that those who attacked him got disappointed. In fact, he adopted the political strategy of 'dissimulation' introduced by Chilton and Schaffner (1997) by diverting the attention of his audience from troublesome issues in that he portrayed himself as not affected by the mentioned blow.

One can notice that he was a man's who stuck to the past only when there was mention of battles and immortal heritage; there was no room for future in his discourse. Thus, he made heavy use of the past tense especially the defective verb /kaana/ (was, were), referring to the old Iraqi heritage and civilizations. The very use of such virtue words like "civilization" represents a propaganda device which is glittering generality. Another important device adopted by Saddam is "the plain folks" or "common man" so as to convince his addressees that he was reflecting the common sense of the people. This is completely associated with establishing solidarity in the sense that he enacted the humanization of leaders and soldiers and a discourse of togetherness. But, sometimes, he referred to the past as something annoying to remember in that the Iraqis were in poor conditions till he came and saved them. An example is the following:

2. /kaanatbagdaad ?allatitaHmalkullmaataHmilu-hu min taareekh ?ummamajeedahwa  
**was Baghdad which carries all what carries –it from history nation glorious and**  
 dourinHaDaarinkabeer ?aqrabilaaqaryatinkabeeratinmuhmalah/  
**rolecivilized great near to village big neglected**  
**(Baghdad, though it had great history and civilized great role, was like a big neglected**  
**village)**

He was praising and criticizing Baghdad (as a symbol for Iraq) at the same time. Through his criticism, he was exalting himself in that when he took power, great economic changes occurred in Iraq. This is one of the moves that Saddam employed in his speech. By comparing Iraq before and at his time of ruling, Saddam's discourse showed two different epochs. It showed qualitative shifts in the cultural dominant discursive practices ( Fairclough, 2007: 96). We can say, following Lakoff (1991), that Saddam used the metaphor of "the ruler standing for the state metonymy".

Saddam's fourth move in his speech is the use of metaphors indicating the good vs. the evil. In the whole bulk of his speech he focused on the division of the world into two forces: the good which is represented by Saddam and the evil represented by America and the Zionism. Building on Mouffe (2005), Fairclough (2007: 240) asserts that there is a tendency within mainstream politics towards the political division and contestation. This tendency creates a major political danger; not only is it a threat to democracy, it also creates a vacuum to be filled by nationalism and xenophobia. Moreover, it is worthy noticing that 'fear' is one of the propaganda devices used by politicians (Victoria, 2002) to prepare the people for a possible war to come. To Saddam, foreigners signify an expected threat to his power. For Fairclough, this strategy is called 'legitimation' which involves claims about danger and unprecedented threat (p. 494). This kind of division is exemplified below:

1. / waqafasha'bu-l-'iraq?al-?abiyantakhihuwawaqiyaadata- hu ...wa'alaastood **people-**  
**the Iraq the-braverise it and leadership-its and on**

Taraf?al-?ashraar?al-mu'tadeen...qaadat-hu ?amreekawa-l Sahyuniyya/  
**sidethe-evil the- aggressive...led-it America and-the Zionism**

(The proud Iraqi people with its leadership stood bravely... and on the other side there were the aggressive evil... headed by America and the Zionism)

Saddam frequently emphasizes the idea that he represents the spiritual faith, truthfulness, sacrifice, struggle, Jihad and that America represents the opposite side. In other words, "violence" creeps in the textual choices adopted by the omniscient voice in Iraq. This reminds us of Bourdieu metaphor that language is symbolic violence (Hanks, 2005:78). In line with Hanks, Schaffner (1997: 2) shows that "any political action is prepared, accompanied, controlled and influenced by language", and by using such words, Saddam exercises his power. In addition, Saddam used the glittering generality which refers to the use of "virtue words" to make his audience accept what he was trying to prove.

The system of domination is categorized into traditional, rational/ legal and charismatic. As for the charismatic authority, it rests on the power of the person or on his charisma (Heywood, 1997: 193-195). Accordingly, we can say that Saddam has a charismatic authority. The use of intervals that are filled by "shouts" (high pitched calls) like: / ?alaahu ?akbar/ ( Allah is the greatest) is yet another strategy that Saddam relied on. These enthusiastic calls are preceded and followed by silences. Sometimes, silence is employed to signify power especially in a political context (Jaworski, 2009). Historically speaking, shouts of *Allah is the greatest* were used by great warriors in the old days of the Islamic battles to commence fighting and when they were victorious. In this connection, Saddam was adopting the device of "the band-wagon" which is combined with the theme of inevitable victory. In discussing the First Gulf war, Lakoff (1991) uses the conceptual metaphor (**War as a Fairy Tale**) where the source domain **Fairy Tale** is mapped onto the target domain **War**. This conceptual metaphor presented America as a hero and Saddam as a villain. Thus, the reason behind the use of such shouts in Saddam's discourse was to exercise power because in the Arabic tradition the one who uses such shouts is the strongest. Sometimes, these intervals were filled by vocatives. An example is the following:

1. /?ayyuha l-?ikhwa?abnaa? ummati-naayahawaa -nawalaysamingayri-hihawaa?/  
**O the-brothers sons nation-our air-our and not from but –it air**  
(O, brothers, sons of our Nation, you are the only air which we breathe)

The comparison of his love for his people to the necessity of air is metaphorical here, helping him establish solidarity with the people. Another trope is the use of proverbs as in:

2. / wa?innagadanli-naDiri-hi la-qareeb/  
**and truly tomorrow to-witness his truly-near**  
(Tomorrow will be definitely seen by the one who waits for it)

Proverbs are rhetorical devices that create a sense of understanding between speaker and listener. Above all, they are good tools for explaining the politicians' intended messages (Mieder, 1997: 139). The proverb entails that unknown facts will be revealed sooner. Using proverbs helps Saddam establish solidarity and picture himself as a wise man. Wisdom lavishes a sense of power to discourse. In fact, the function behind his use of such a proverb is a kind of coercion.

The tone of violence and power constitutes a major part of Saddam's speech. The past, present and the future in his 'dictionary' were full of violence, i.e. no anticipation of peace. An illustrative example is the following:

3. / yataqdamu-ha 'inwaansha'buil-I'raaqul 'aDeem liyaHmalraayat?al-laahu?akbar/  
**precede it title people-the Iraq great to carry flag the-Allah great**

(The people of Iraq are marching in front of others, carrying the flag of Allah is the greatest)

The image of / raayah/ (flag) is deeply rooted in the Arabic culture as a symbol of power. Carrying a flag is an omen of a fight for sure. As is expected, he closed his speech by enthusiastic terms and by wishing mercy for martyrs. Saddam's battle was represented in his speech as one between good and

evil, light and darkness. In fact, his speech established a division between two kernels, one good led by Saddam and the other bad led by America. The two kernels are at war and Saddam was so certain that Allah was to his side.

The last strategic move adopted by Saddam is suggesting "resistance" towards America which represents the 'axis of evil'. He calls for establishing a 'front' for facing the danger of America by asking other good countries and friends to help him and unite together. This strategy is also called 'unification' (Thompson, 1990: 65) which is a way of establishing "a form of unity" to gather individuals and groups collectively. Saddam suggested:

6. / ta'awinjiddifilmayaadeen l-?iqtiSaadiyyahwalsiyyasiyyah.../  
cooperation serious in fields the-economic and the-political  
(serious cooperation in the economic and political fields...)

He added that this cooperation is to preserve the balance in the world so as to face America and its allies. By creating an enemy, Saddam called for this gathering which is 'legitimized' because of the 'unprecedented threat' posed by America.

To sum up, all the clues and evidence given signify that Saddam was a man of violence, pride, fight, power and what not. In terms of moves, we can summarize Saddam's speech as having the following basic moves:

- a. Quranic verse
- b. Vocatives + Welcoming
- c. Reference to the 1991 American attack
- d. Metaphors indicating good vs. evil
- e. Giving reasons of the attack via comparing the Iraqi situation pre-Saddam's time and in his time
- f. Giving suggestions to face America via his leadership, and finally
- g. Ending his speech via statements of glorification.

#### 4. Power and Solidarity in Al-Maliki's Speech

The authorship of the second part of the data is one of Al-Maliki's Speeches and the audience is a group of the Iraqi tribe chiefs (sheiks) on 26<sup>th</sup> of August 2006. They gathered to discuss the National dialogue and reconciliation so as to put an end to Sectarianism. The purpose was to strengthen ties and eliminate differences. When the objective is to stop troubles and end conflicts, the intention is to establish solidarity. Al-Maliki establishes the phatic communion by starting his speech with a vocative calling the tribe chiefs as brothers and then greeting them, saying:

1. / al-salaam-u 'alaykumwaraHmatul- laahiwabarakat-uh /  
**the- salam –nom. on you and mercy the Allah and blessings-his**  
(Peace upon you and the mercy and blesses of Allah)

He addresses the chiefs as his 'brothers' /ʔal-ʔixwa/ and 'reverened' / ʔal-muHtaramun/. Al-Maliki treats them as equal partners in that there is a symmetrical and reciprocal relationship between them. Formally, 'reverened' is used when the speaker considers himself in inferior position to the addressees to establish solidarity. By formally addressing them, he indicates that they are the ratified audience whom he is talking to. He uses both 'your' /...kum/ and 'us' /...na/ which are both anaphoric and deictic. It is plausible to consider 'us' an inclusive usage of the pronoun (Levinson,1983:69) because the speaker includes himself with the audience as one member of them. In this regard, Fairclough (2007: 65) calls this the democratization of discourse wherein overt markers of power are reduced between people of unequal institutional power. That is to say, we can find a shift from coercion to consent or pluralism in the exercise of power. Right from the very beginning, Al-Maliki refers to the past. The formulation of distant past also fits in a 'normal' deictic analysis. The address transfers from the present audience to what they represent. 'Your forefathers' /ʔjdaadu-kum/ is directly linked to the audience as a way to achieve solidarity as shown by Ensink's (1997: 14). Thus, he has emphasized the historical dimension of Iraq, and simultaneously suggesting that the government and the Iraqi people are the same. It is also the strategy of the "common man" which is one of the successful political styles. A clear example is below:

2. / laafarqabayna'arabiwakurdiwaturkumaani ...wa  
**no difference between Arabian and Kurdi and Turkman ... and**  
 ..laafarqabaynashi'aiwasunni/  
**.. no difference between shi'ai and sunni**  
 (there is no difference between an Arab and a Kurd or a Turkman...and no difference between a Shi'a and a Sunni)

Al-Maliki sees no segregations among Iraqis regarding their races, sectors, ethnicity, and so on. This is a good example of 'unification' so as to block the way in the face of those who want to exploit this 'fragmentation' to destroy the texture of Iraq. This is so because Iraq is facing 'social change' which include processes involving dialectical relations between diverse social elements ( Fairclough, 2007: 476).

His second ritual move is to welcome them briefly:

3. / yaTeebu li ʔan ʔukhaaTibu-kumwa ʔan ʔaqraʔ fi wujuhi-kum l-shmaaʔil

**Be good to me to address- you and to read in faces-your the- features**

- kareemah li l-qabeelah l-'iraaqiyyahwal-'arabiyyah/  
**generous of the- tribe the- Iraqi and the- Arabian**  
 (It is my pleasure to address you and read in your faces the generous traits of the Iraqi and Arabian tribe.)

The use of the verb / yaTeeb / (to have pleasure) reflects the true inner intentions to talk to others and thus to establish ties with them. You consider others as equal, i.e. the relation is reciprocal. Definitely, this verb is stylistically lofty and establishes solidarity between the author and the audience or speaker and listener. He uses terms that show intimacy with the addressees such as (the

generous traits of the tribe) as shown in (24) above. His commencing of his speech consists of the following moves:

- a. Vocative
- b. Greeting
- c. Welcome

The 'welcome' move is a step preparing the ground to go straightforwardly into the main topic of the speech. Afterwards, he starts with his intended topic, namely reconciliation and the national dialogue before he discusses his initiative:

7. / ?innakumtajtami'uun ?al-yawmtaHta'inwaan?al-muSalaHawalHiwaar?al-waTani /  
**That-you gather the-day under title the-reconciliation and dialogue the-national**  
(You are gathering today under the title of reconciliation and national dialogue)

The initiative is basically to get rid of troubles and unify the Iraqi people. His objective is to give the opportunity to every Iraqi to take part in the political operation and rebuild Iraq. He wants everyone to take part in taking decisions and rebuild Iraq. He does not consider himself as the only voice to be heard in Iraq. He says:

8. / ?anlaayabqaa?aHAdunmin-al muwaaTineenkhaarijwarshat?i'aadat  
**That not stay anyone from-the citizens outsideworkshop backbinaa?u-lwaTansiyaasyyanwa ?iqtiSaadyyanwa 'umraanyyan /**  
**Building-thecountry politically and economically and archeologically**

(No one of the citizens should be out of the workshop of rebuilding the country politically, economically and archeologically)

To invite someone to do something with you is to establish solidarity with him. He goes on saying that there are no differences or segregations among Iraqis in that they should unite and cooperate to rebuild their country and to confront the dangers incurred by terrorists. By so doing, Al-Maliki uses the two devices of propaganda, namely calling names and glittering generalities. In the first type, he is creating an enemy, namely terrorists, and with the second he uses virtue words to establish solidarity. He has identified his presuppositions to get the opportunity to create a distant, fearful, terrorist, uncivilized enemy of freedom. Thus, conceptually the target domain is TERRORIST and SADDAMIST (Meadow, 2005:9). Those terrorists try to incur collateral damage and destruction. To them, everyone is targeted. They do not differentiate between Shi'as and Sunnis; no one can escape. By his pragmatic rhetoric, Al-Maliki is preparing his people for fighting terrorists and setting the government to this task through 'unifying' the Iraqi people. He is creating his enemy through the use of the device of negative generalities such as 'terror' and 'fear', 'dictator' referring to Saddam and his party members, and other related words. Building on Fairclough's terminology (2007), we can say that Iraq is witnessing a restructuring in its social structure and categories in that Iraqis can have freedom of assembly, freedom of speech and the press, unlike the period when Saddam was ruling the country.

Al-Maliki refers to the things that are shared by everyone. Solidarity has to do with the relatively symmetrical aspects of human relationships (Tannen, 1994:19). In the following example:

1. / laayakhfaa 'alaykum?al-tadakhul ?al- ?ajnabi /

**Not hide on- you the-intervention the- foreigners**

(You are aware of the foreign intervention)

This awareness is assumed to be shared between speaker and listener. This is an invitation from Al-Maliki to other social categories to take part and cooperate to build Iraq which is a country of diverse communities

On the same dimension, respect-showing lexical items are inherently distancing as they reflect different footings on the part of speakers and listeners. Footing is a term introduced by Goffman to refer to speakers' and listeners' interactional stances, alignments or positions vis-à-vis one another as well as oneself, "as expressed in the way they manage the production or reception of an utterance" (Goffman, 1981:128 cited in Jaworski, 2009: 1). Moreover, in one of her papers, Tannen (1986) refers to the paradoxical nature of the dimensions of power and solidarity in that the same linguistic items that show power are used to reflect solidarity and vice versa. That is to say, they represent two faces of the same coin. For example, affectionate items that show intimacy can reflect power. For instance, when Al-Maliki addresses his invited audience as:

30. / ?ayyuha-l ?ikhwah /

**O -the brothers**

(O, brothers)

The expression 'brothers' is used intimately, but there is a tendency on the part of high status speakers to use it in addressing others who are in lower social rank.

Al-Maliki focused on peace, unity, and everything that is good through the repetition of such items within the flow of his speech as ?al-?maan ( safety),?al-silm (peace ),?al-wiHda(unity), ?al-khayr (the good), ?al-Hiwaar (dialogue), ?al-ta'aawun (cooperation), ?al-karaama (dignity), ?al-maSlaha (interest), ?al-tamaasuk (cohesion), ?al-'amal ( work), ?al-mustaqbal ( future), etc.. These represent the strategy of glittering generalities to gain support and establish solidarity. He is trying to achieve what is called 'consent' and 'legitimation' (Fairclough, 2007:502) which are rhetoric and dialectic ways of persuasion respectively. That is to say, Al-Maliki is achieving constructive effects through his discourse. This is the ideological dimension in his speech.

Thus, repetition is the primary strategy which enhances solidarity through the use of the above terms as illustrated in the following example:

1. /?inna l-'iraqyyeenkullamaasha'aru-u bimHnatwaTanihim ?iltaffu 'laa

**Truly the- Iraqis all of them felt -they crisis country their fold on**

ba'Dahimwata'aaDatrijaaluhum.../

**each other and support men their**



(Iraqis when facing a crisis in their country collaborate together and their men will support each other...)

Such expressions like / ?iltaffu 'laaba'Dahim / ( collaborate together) and / ta'aaDatrijaaluhum/ ( their men support each other) are indicators of unifying the social categories in question. Again, there seems to be an emphasis on the division between two categories: we (Iraqis) and enemy (others). The items that revolve round the concept of (we) are manifestations of solidarity and those for the (others) reveal distance. Critical discourse analysts point out that the use of the pronoun 'we' is problematic in that it might refer to the population of a country, the government, the people of the region or the people in the hall ( Bloor & Bloor, 2007: 118; Fairclough, 2007: 244). In Al-Maliki's speech, there is a heavy use of 'we' with two interpretations: First, 'we' entails the Iraqis in general and this is within the idea of rebuilding the country, and, second, 'we' is used exclusively to refer to his military and security forces in facing and fighting the terrorists. These two interpretations are characterizing Al-Maliki's political discourse in general. An illustrative example of the latter interpretation is the following:

1. /tamakan-na ...wanaHnunastimir fi binaa? ?jhizatu-na l- ?amniyyah  
**able-we ... and we continue in building services-our the- security**  
wa-l- 'askariyyah ?an naDrib-hum Darabaat-un muuji'ah/  
**and-the-military to beat – them beats-acc painful**  
(we were able while building our security and military services to direct painful attacks to them)

Talking about security and military services definitely entails the PM efforts to control the political scene in Iraq. Sometimes, he uses power-instigating items when talking about the *enemy* concept as shown in the following excerpt:

2. / laqadtaSaday-nabi- HazmwaSalaabahli-l-?irhaabeen/  
**did confront-we with-strictness and toughness to-the-terrorists**  
(we did confront the terrorists strictly and toughly)

The two linguistic items / Hazm / (strictness) and /Salaabah/ (toughness) are used by a person who dominates the situation.

For the sake of establishing solidarity, Al-Maliki focuses on the items that show unity, freedom, cooperation, support and other related items. He also emphasizes the importance of having a constitution to exercise law and assert unity and similarities in rights in a diverse community as Iraq. For instance, he says:

3. / ?al-dawlah... tasthanid li ?awwalmarra hilaadistuurdaa?im.../  
**The-state...go back for first time to constitution permanent**  
(The state follows for the first time to a permanent constitution)

The use of ' the state' does not refer only to the PM, but it includes every person in Iraq, especially the parliament which was elected by the Iraqi people. The concept of /?al-dawlah/ 'state' here strengthens the taking part of every single person in building the government. It testifies to the similarity holding among people. That is, it is strong evidence supporting the dimension of solidarity.

In fact, it is a deliberate metaphorical conception to diminish differences and seek unity. Sometimes, the use of / ?al-dawlah/ 'state' is exclusively intended to refer to Al-Maliki where he seeks to prove his power to control the actions and discourse of his addressees. This goes in line with Tannen's (1984) opinion that power and solidarity are paradoxical in nature.

On the other hand, he condemns and avoids using negative and bad connotative lexical items such as Harb (war), tadmeer (destruction), damaar (ruin), 'unf(violence), qitaal(fight), Hammaam l-dam (bath of blood), ?irhaab (terrorism), qatl (killing),

diktatoriyya (dictatorship), etc.. These are negative generalities which is a political strategy used to help creating an enemy. This is one of the basic moves in his speech where he identified 'terror' as the enemy.

To solve problems, Al-Maliki abandoned the use of arms; instead, he favoured the use of 'dialogue' as the only option and nothing else. Via language use, one can agitate or make the situation peaceful. He emphasizes the need for a peaceable country. From time to time, he focuses on the importance of /?al-wiHda l- waTaniyyah/ (the national unity). Through this concept, Iraqis will make their country safe and stable, and as a result, their true solidarity will be fulfilled. The function behind the use of such linguistic items as Al-Maliki's is resisting the terrorists and those who pose threats to Iraq. More important is the function of legitimizing the Iraqi constitution and making it the only judge to settle the differences and solve problems.

Being a politician, Al-Maliki also embodies the use of proverbs within his political speeches, which is also in line with the propaganda device of the plain folks. Within his argument, he refers to the following proverb:

1. / yujaazajazaa?usinmaar/  
**rewarded reward Sinmar**  
( Iraq is rewarded like Sinmar's reward)

The story of this historical proverb was about an Iraqi engineer during the days of Al-Nu'man, the Iraqi King. He built the palace of Al-Khawarnaq for the king. It was a very large, fantastic, grand and a beautifully-decorated palace. It took 20 years from the engineer to accomplish building. Because he told the king about the secret of the palace, the king threw him from over the palace so as not to let anyone else know about it. Thus, Al-Maliki uses this proverb to show that Iraq is rewarded just like Sinmar. This is also a link to the Iraqi history, a case related to establishing solidarity. This is another example of the political strategy of 'the plain folks'.

As far as the prevalent structures in Al-Maliki's speech, he has employed the emphatic structures and relative clauses. The basic grammatical function of relative clauses is the linking between an expression and its definition or identification (Leech and Svartvik, 1994: 372). A relative clause gives more information about someone or something referred to (Hewings, 1999: 140). Two excerpts from Al-Maliki are:

2. / ?al-qabeelah l-'iraaqiyyah... HayΘu l- karamwa-l shahaamah /  
**thetribe the-Iraqi ... where the-generosity and-the bravery**  
( the Iraqi tribe...where we find generosity and bravery)

3. /ʔal-wiHda ʔallatiSanaha ʔabaaʔunawa ʔajdaaduna/  
**the-unity which maintained fathers-our and ancestors-our**  
(the unity which our fathers and ancestors maintained)

In the first example, he is praising them by specifying the attributes of 'generosity' and 'bravery' to the Iraqi tribe. By describing them so, he is building solidarity and trying to gain their support as it is known that the majority of the Iraqi social structure is a tribal one. In the second, he is supporting his ideas by reference to the past when the Iraqi situation was much better than now. In a way, he is also gratifying them.

The emphatic structures are dominated by the use of /ʔinna/ (truly) and the particle /qad/ (do) which is basically used to emphasize verbs. The basic function of these emphatic structures in his speech is to remove doubts and consequently to focus on what he is raising. In fact, all of the paragraphs in his speech started with emphatic structures and this is one of the stylistic strategies adopted by the Iraqi leaders to draw attention and to assert what it is talked about. It is to be noted that the particle /ʔinna/ is used to emphasize nominal sentences, i.e. sentences with no verbs. The basic reason behind using nominal sentences is that they are states, and one cannot expect these states to change. They are not liable to change; therefore, a speaker removes the doubts of changing it out of his hearers' minds. That is to say, the speaker is denying the possibility of what is not mentioned. What is mentioned is true and nothing else (for further information about emphatics, see Jabir, 1999). We can summarize the basic moves of Al-Maliki's speech as follows:

- a. Vocatives + Welcoming
- b. Uncovering the topic of discussion (reconciliation)
- c. Emphasizing 'unification'
- d. Creating the enemy (terror)
- e. Iraq's success, and finally
- f. Suggesting forming committees to make agreements.

## 5. Conclusions

It is clear that the majority of political speeches contain historical background to see how historical roles and relationships were being shaped and oriented to in the various speeches -- in other words, how history was being re-enacted in a political-discursive event developing in a totally different context and, hence, allowing for far-reaching reinterpretations of historical events. The texts were seen as *momentary texts*, accompanied by *historical contexts* (Jan Blommaert, 2005:137). For Saddam, history represents two contradictory positions: on the one hand, he sees the Iraqi old history and civilizations as a source of power, and on the other hand, he attacks the old For Al-Maliki, the Iraqi history was a point of reference and departure from which he gains support and power. He reminded his audience of their great history and what the predecessors had achieved for the sake of Iraq. History was background, situated outside the texts, the texts themselves offering reflexes, reflections, representations, or comments on history. Conditions were created for synchronization.

Both Saddam and Al-Maliki used proverbs in their speeches. Nevertheless, their aims of using proverbs are different in that Saddam tended to threaten, while Al-Maliki tended to draw the attention of his audience to the Iraqi situation. The use of proverbs in politics is an effective rhetorical device. In Wolfgang Mieder's **The Politics of Proverbs** (2004), it has been explained that politicians use proverbs effectively in their rhetoric. Basically all presidents are quite proverbial in their communications with their people, and they try to express their political objectives and intentions in a language that is accessible to their audience, no matter what their ethnic, social, or intellectual background might be. In fact, proverbs are considered as the "common denominator" of wisdom of a nation. Interestingly, these rhetorical devices "add colorful metaphors to speeches that are often filled with setting political agendas, thus giving them a "folksy" touch with which people can identify" (Mieder, p. 139). In the Arabic world, the use of proverbs lavishes a sense of wisdom and control of speech in a given situation. Above all, it is a technique of expressing sharing knowledge among interlocutors, i.e. to give a sense of solidarity.

Successful politicians are aware of the importance of the power of language in achieving their goals, namely to convince their audience of their cause. Thus, two important points are attended to in this connection:

1. The dependence of language on history and culture, and
2. The work of language as a socially bonding device.

That is, politicians follow these two points to achieve successful negotiation. For this purpose, they try to select an event that is appropriate and understandable to their audience so as to achieve solidarity in the first place. Mulholland (1991: 3-4) points out that "if the event is socially appropriate enough for hearers to accept it, then the speaker's version of that 'event' becomes social currency and eventually part of a common understanding".

Saddam has, for example, selected the 'event' of the attack of the allied forces against Iraq. However, talking about wars is not favourable and consequently inappropriate since it brings to mind sad memories and deterioration incurred in all fields. In fact, Iraqis got fed up with wars and troubles, cases which Saddam brought about. Al-Maliki has chosen a socially appropriate currency, viz. forgetting differences and seeking unity among people. Thus, it has been met with understanding on the part of hearers.

On the structural level, Saddam tended to focus on the past tense where he could exercise comparisons and changes. In fact, he never showed a sign of hope for Iraqis. Sticking to the past was a characteristic of his representational discourses and ways of acting and being. Each paragraph started with an emphatic particle or structure, a technique by which he could convince his addresses of the cause he was presenting. His long speeches were presented within long paragraphs. A sentence of his might extend to one paragraph. This is also evident in his greetings which comprise long pieces of welcoming and expressions that invoke excitement. He was trying to evince his control over everything including discourse. On the other hand, al-Maliki's speech was more condensed and much shorter than Saddam's. He focused on the present and the future although he glorified the Iraqi past. The historical references were used to strengthen attitudes and connection with his fellow citizens. His greeting basically consists of one sentence. Emphatic starts, just like Saddam, are also

evident in his speech. Thus, we may argue that Arab politicians make use of emphatic particles and structures to convince others of the points they are negotiating. However, the points being emphasized are inversely proportional.

Both Saddam and Al-Maliki used the Quranic verses, but with different intentions. Saddam basically used these verses to support his inclination towards fighting and connecting himself with what the prophets had done so as to achieve power and convince others of the validity of his behavior. For Al-Maliki, Quranic verses are used to encourage others to unite and work forward.

There are social and political restructuring in the Iraqi scene. These are truly reflected in the Iraqi political discourse as it has been pointed out by Fairclough (2007) that changes are discourse-led. During Saddam's tenure, freedom had no room. Everything was represented by one man. He was the one to shape the Iraqi situation in every corner of life. It is a fact that Saddam tried to demonstrate his own powerfulness and the powerlessness of others, even by hidden discourse ways and acts. After his toppling, things are quite the opposite. More emphasis is given to equality and thus for establishing solidarity.

## References

Al-Maliki, Noori . (2006). *Address to the Iraqi Tribes Chiefs in the General Conference of Reconciliation and National Dialogue*. Accessed on May 13, 2012.

Al-Samarra?i , F. (2007) . **Ma'aani Al- Nahw** ( *The Meanings of Grammar*).Beirut: Al-Taareekh Al-Arabi Publishing Company.

Blommaert, J. (2005). **Discourse: A Critical Introduction**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloor, M. and T. Bloor. (2007) . **The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction**. London: Hodder Arnold.

Brown, R. and A. Gilman . (1972) *The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity*. In P.P.Giglioli , ed. **Language and Social Context** , pp.252-282.

Chilton, P. (2004) **Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice**. London: Routledge.

Chilton, P. and C. Schaffner. (1997) *Discourse and Politics*. In T.A. van Dijk ,ed. **Discourse as Social Interaction**. London and New Delhi: Sage , pp206-230.

Ensink, T. (1997) *The Footing of a Royal Address: An Analysis of Representedness in Political Speech, Exemplified in Queen Beatrix's Address to the Knesset on March 28, 1995*.

Fairclough, N. (2007) **Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language** .London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. and R. Wodak. (1997) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. . In T.A. van Dijk ,ed. **Discourse as Social Interaction**. London and New Delhi: Sage , pp. 230-250.

Fasold, R. (1990) .**Sociolinguistics of Language**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Fowler, R. and G. Kress (1979) *Critical Linguistics*. In R. Fowler et al ,eds. **Language and Control**. London and NewYork: Routledge , pp.185-213.

Goffman, E.(1979) *Footing* . **Semiotica** , vol. 25 , pp. 1-29.

Hanks, W. (2005) . *Pierre Bourdieu and the practices of language*. **Annual Review of Anthropology** , vol. 34,pp. 67-83.

Heywood, A. (1997) **Politics**. London: Macmillan.

Hewings, M. (1999) **Advanced Grammar in Use**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hussein , Saddam . (1999). *Speech on the Anniversary of the 30` State Aggression Against Iraq*. Accessed on May 8, 2012 at Al-Mansoor Network site.

- Jabir, J.K. (1999). *Modes of Emphasis in Standard English and Modern Standard Arabic: A Contrastive Study from a Hallidayan Perspective*. Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Basra.
- Jaworski, A. (2009) *The Silence of Power and Solidarity in Fallen Sons* (play by Edward Thomas). Accessed on Oct. 19, 2010.<http://T:ENCAP/resources/publications/jaworski-adam/papers/jawaorski.com>
- Johnstone, B. (2008) **Discourse Analysis**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). *Metaphor in Politics*. Accessed on April 25, 2012.<http://philosophy.uoregon.edu/metaphor/lakoff-1.htm>.
- Leech, G. and J. Svartvik .(1994) **A Communicative Grammar of English**. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983) **Pragmatics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mazid, B. M. (1999) . *Ideology and Control in Some Speech and Newspaper Genres :A Politico-Linguistic Approach to Discourse Analysis*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Ain Shams University.
- Mieder, W. (2004)**The Politics of Proverbs**. Nestport: Greenwood Press.
- Mulholland, J. (1991) .**The Language of Negotiation**. London: Routledge.
- Reisigl, M. and R. Wodak , eds . (2001) . **Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetoric of Racism and Anti-Semitism**. London: Routledge.
- Schaffner, C. (1997) .**Analysing Political Speeches**. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Semino, E. (2008) .**Metaphor in Discourse**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1986) **That's Not What I Meant! How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Your Relationship with Others**. New York: William Morrow.
- Tannen, D. (1990) . *Silence as conflict Management in Fiction and Drama: Pinter's Betrayal and a Short Story*. In Allen Grimshaw , ed. **Great Wits** , pp. 260-279.
- Tannen, D and C Kakava (1992) . *Power and Solidarity in Modern Greek Conversation: Disagreeing to agree*. **Journal of Modern Greek Studies**, vol. 10 , no. 1, pp. 11-34.
- Thomas, J. B. (1985) .*The Language of Power: Toward a dynamic pragmatics*. **Journal of Pragmatics** , vol. 9, pp 765-783.
- Van Dijk, Teun. (1995).**Discourse, Semantics and Ideology**. University of Amsterdam.
- Victoria, E. (2002) .*A Critical Analysis of President George W. Bush's State of the Union Address*. Accessed May 13, 2012.<http://www.freedomwriter.com/issue27/am1.htm>