

**IDEOLOGY AND POLITICAL DISCOURSE: A CRITICAL
DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF R.T.ERDOGAN'S AND J.W.BUSH'S
POLITICAL SPEECHES**

Yusufjonova Sevara Oybek qizi,

second-year master student of, Faculty of English Linguistics,

UzSWLU

Supervisor: Oybek Saporbaevich Akhmedov,

UzSWLU, Professor, Doctor of Philological Sciences

Abstract: The given article reveals the interrelation of ideology with political discourse, additionally, analyzes the political speeches of R.T.Erdogan and J.W.Bush.

Key words: ideology, political discourse, component, linguistic units, rhetoric, imperatives.

INTRODUCTION

The way we perceive language is the foundation of our social construction and individual or group relationships, and studies in sociolinguistics have tried to explain this relationship between the use of language and the importance of perceptions. A particular discourse, spoken or written, can stem from different sources such as power, cultural or social background, region or social status. This paper aims to discuss the realisation of identity and background by means of language use in a political discourse, which is mainly grounded in Norman Fairclough's assumptions in critical discourse analysis. For this aim, the discursive strategies of the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan during a debate in the World Economic Forum in Davos in January 2009 will be examined within the context of his ideological, cultural and language background.

METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Politics is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. In this process, language plays a crucial role, for every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. This paragraph analyzes discourse of political speech, namely by the Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan during a debate. Given the enormous domestic and global significance of the said speech, it is crucial to decipher ideological traits typical of Erdogan enshrined in his political discourse. The aim of this paper is to examine the impact of identity and linguistic background on Prime Minister Erdogan's political discourse and the ideological components of his speech.

The main purpose of politicians is to persuade their audience of the validity of their political claims. Political influence flows from the employment of resources that shape the beliefs and behaviours of others. Common resources include expert skills, the restriction of information, the ability to confer favours on others or to injure them without physical force, and subtle or crude bribery. Edelman (1977) states that the knowledgeable politician becomes successful by "using his or her knowledge of informal influence" (8, 123).

Van Dijk (2006) notes that political situations do not simply cause political actors to speak in certain ways, instead "there is a need for a cognitive collaboration between situations and talk or text, that is a context" (Van Dijk, 2006, p.733). Such contexts define how participants experience, interpret and represent the for-them relevant aspects of the political situation. Political discourse is not only defined with political discourse structures but also with political contexts. Thus, acting as an MP, Prime Minister, party leader, or demonstrator will typically be perceived by speakers or recipients as a relevant context category in political discourse.

RESULTS

A linguistic analysis of political discourse in general and of political speeches in particular, can be most successful when it relates the details of linguistic behavior to

political behaviour. This can be done from two perspectives: we can start from the linguistic micro-level and ask which strategic functions specific structures (e.g. word choice, a specific syntactic structure) serve to fulfil. Alternatively, we can start from the macro-level, i.e. the communicative situation and the function of a text and ask which linguistic structures have been chosen to fulfill this function. Language use, discourse, verbal interaction, and communication belong to the micro-level of the social order. Power, dominance, and inequality between social groups are typically terms that belong to a macro-level of analysis.

Given the power of the written and spoken discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA, henceforth) can be used for describing, interpreting, analyzing, and critiquing social life reflected in text. CDA aims to systematically explore relationships between discursive practices, texts, and events and wider social and cultural structures, relations, and processes. Precise analysis and descriptions of the materiality of language are factors which are always characteristic of CDA. It strives to explore how these non-transparent relationships are a factor in securing power and hegemony, and it draws attention to power imbalances, social inequities, nondemocratic practices, and other injustices in hopes of spurring people to corrective actions (Fairclough, 1992). It tries to illuminate ways in which the dominant forces in a society construct versions of reality that favour their interests. This means that CDA can theoretically bridge the gap between micro and macro approaches, which is a distinction that is a sociological construct in its own right (Van Dijk, 2003, p.354)

This paragraph specifically analyses discourse of political speech, namely the short speech of the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan during a debate with Israel's president, Shimon Peres, in the World Economic Forum in Davos in 2009.

Given the enormous domestic and global significance of the speech in terms of international relations, it is important to decipher the ideological traits of Mr. Erdogan enshrined in his speech. The aim is to examine the realization of power in Mr. Erdogan's language use and its ideological component through a linguistic analysis

based on CDA. When Erdogan walked out from a debate with Israel's president, Shimon Peres, in the World Economic Forum in Davos this year, he immediately became the most popular political leader around the world. Not only people of high socio-economic status, but also people of low socio-economic status, have shown great interest in what happened in the Davos debate. This specific incident can significantly explain how political discourse is constructed and affected through experience, and how people's attitudes and perceptions can change according to the given situations. The next day, Radikal Daily (30/01/2009) went with the headline "A Kasimpaşa tune in Davos," a reference to the President's birthplace. President Erdogan said:

Erdogan: [In English] Excuse me.

Ignatius: Mr. President [touching his shoulder] I would apologize to Mr. Erdogan...

Erdogan: [In English] One minute ... one minute [touching Ignatius' arm] One minute. No way out! [Olmaz!], [Applause rises from the audience]

Ignatius: Only a minute.

Erdogan: Mr. Peres, you are older than I am. The volume of your voice is too high. And I know this is because of the guilt psychology. My voice will not be that loud. Know this like that. When it is time to kill, you know how to kill well. I know well how you kill children on beaches, how you shoot them. (...)

Ignatius: [Ignatius touches Erdogan's shoulder to warn him to end his speech] Mr. President we cannot start the debate again.[Pushing each other's arms]

Erdogan: Do not interrupt me.

Ignatius: We really need to let people go to dinner.

Erdogan: The Old Testament's sixth amendment says "Thou shalt not kill" There is murder here.

DISCUSSIONS

From a sociolinguistic perspective, there are three points to be discussed about the President's political discourse and people's attitudes to his language. First, Erdogan demonstrated a good example of attitude and identity construction through his use of language. It should be noted that the use of „you“ in Turkish as a second person subject is different from in English. That is, there are two different „you“ subjects for formal and informal situations. „Sen“ is the informal one and „siz“ is the formal one. A careful look into the President's talk shows that he always used „sen“ in his speech to the moderator and to Israeli President Shimon Peres until he addressed Perez as the representative of the whole Israeli nation (“When it is time to kill, you know how to kill well”). The use of „sen“ was a sign of anger and bluntness as well as an indication of “My behaviours do not resemble those of diplomats, especially not those of Mon chers at all.” Mon cher is a negative connotation to portray a Turkish diplomat. As Mr. President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has implied, the general image of a Turkish diplomat at home is one that is doing nothing but hopping from one cocktail party to the other with a whisky glass in his hands.

The second important point in the Mr. President's talk was his biblical reference, a quote from the Old Testament. It is customary in Turkey's right-wing political discourse to employ religious language, which is an inherent part of traditional Turkish public speaking. However, given the neoliberal stand of Mr. President Erdogan and that it was not a quote from the Quran, the Islamic Sacred Book, it is essential to analyze this biblical reference of Erdogan's and give a possible explanation of the particular choices made by him. All Old Testament canons are related to the Jewish Bible Canon (Tanakh), but with variations. The choice of this particular biblical reference can be perceived as Prime Minister Erdogan's attempt to criticize the Israeli Government's military actions, by implying that their actions were against their own religion and that they should be ashamed of their guilt.

The last issue to be discussed is how Turkish people perceived Erdogan's reaction in the debate. The comments and virtual polls on the internet suggest that

80% of Turks supported Erdogan's actions. Daniel Steinvorth (30/01/2009) from the Der Spiegel daily website notes that the Prime Minister has never made much of an effort "to keep his exuberant temper in check." On the contrary, Erdogan once said in a TV interview in response to a question about his character "Anger is an art of rhetoric," and continued, "This idea of showing the other cheek, we don't have that. I am not some kind of patient sheep." (February, 2009). According to

Fairclough (2000) the image-making rhetoric, an attempt to self-portray as a normal person, can be seen as a characteristic of a new-generation politician. This is why Turkish people mostly admired him even more after his performance at the World Economic Forum in Davos. Preston (2002) notes that it is unsurprising to observe that people have attitudes towards languages and their varieties and these attitudes are mostly tied to the attitudes towards the groups of people as well.

Fairclough (2000) notes that political identity is constructed, and leader identity in contemporary politics is generally built upon a tension between the public office and the private individual, "the extraordinary position of the leader and the ordinary person who holds it" (Fairclough, 2000, p.97). In terms of language, this means a tension between the public language of politics and everyday language.

Communicative style is a matter of language in the broadest sense with the use of verbal language as well as other aspects contributing to the complex bodily

performance that constitutes political style. "A successful leader's communicative style is not simply what makes him or her attractive to voters in a general way; it conveys certain values which can powerfully enhance the political message" (Fairclough, 2000, p.4). Studies in sociolinguistics have made it clear that people living in different areas display differences in the use of language, which can reflect and cement the ideas of groups they are used in.

As a result, attitudes towards language can be positive or negative, stemming from issues such as social or cultural background, power and status.

This article analyzed the ideological component and linguistic background enshrined in the Turkish Mr. President's speech during a debate. The result is in line with Fairclough's notions of ideology residing in text and that "ideology invests language in various ways at various levels" and that ideology is both "property of structures and of events". Despite serious criticisms, Erdogan has retained his background throughout his political time in government, even in the recent Davos debate, where he used language as a powerful social tool to present his characteristics. His attitude and linguistic behaviour were the reflection of a particular social group, and the attitude of this particular group towards him was positive. Our attitudes to language are significantly important, and our perceptions of the characteristics of a person or a social group may be influenced by these attitudes. An awareness of language attitudes, thus, may not only help one understand him and his abilities better within a society, but also help him evaluate others and their influence more correctly.

As you know, one of the aspects of the analysis of a linguistic personality, in our case, a linguistic personality in politics, is its speech, namely, the individual language of a person, which consists of a certain set of words, phrases, speech turns typical of the speaker. We believe that by analyzing the speech of political figures, it is possible to determine a set of lexemes that are constitutive in discourse.

For the analysis, we selected the 43rd President of the United States, J.Bush Jr., because, as it seems to us, his style of presenting his thoughts (political ideas) is unusual and significantly different from others. Of course, the whole world knows the so-called "bushism" - an expression from American English, meaning funny or comical words or phrases from speeches and speeches of the 43rd US President George W. Bush, especially his impromptu speeches. Over the past year and a half, seven books have been published in the United States, which collected "bushisms" – phrases that contained stylistic, grammatical, factual flaws and inaccuracies.

Anyway, there was a certain political program in Bush's speeches. And in this chapter we will focus on (lexical units of language) linguistic expressions that organize

the political discourse of George Bush. It is noteworthy that in the speeches of George Bush, as a rule, the level of patriotism is high. The leader feels full belonging to his country and people, which is proved by the high level of correlation of I/We:

«I want people to be able to understand...», «I would like to be part of making that real history...», «...I will forever be optimistic about our country», «We took on big issues», «We worked to extend freedom...» и т.д. [Bush's Remarks in Midland, Texas, 20 January.

All kinds of variations of the country's name are often used, for example, «America», «The United States of America», «The United States», «our Nation». At the same time, these names, as a rule, mean the whole people and the government, functioning as a single whole, like a living organism. This is evidenced, in particular, by the following excerpts from the texts of his speeches: «America has never been united by blood...», «America is compassionate», «America's faith in freedom...» [George W. Bush Inaugural Address Washington, DC, 20 January 2001].

Thus, there is an animation of the country and the assignment to it of features characteristic of a living being, in particular, a person. For example, often in the texts of his speeches we can find that America is associated with a politician with a person who faces a difficult task – solving the problem of terrorism and violence:

«Did we do everything in our power to protect America and win the war on terror? That's the fundamental question facing this country...» [George W. Bush, CAMPAIGN 2006].

It should be noted that Bush seeks to awaken a sense of patriotism by pointing out the great merits and achievements of the American people, as well as by indicating a high degree of devotion to his country and its ideology. At the same time, Bush does not forget to draw the audience's attention to all sorts of positive qualities that form a certain system of values that allows US to form a positive image of US citizens in which we want to believe.

So, necessarily, there are references to the achievements of a citizen The United States, for example:

«...they wanted to serve the United States of America, and they did a fabulous job...» [Bush's Remarks in Midland, Texas, 20 24 January 2009];

«...willingness to sacrifice...» [President Bush's Remarks on the 20th Anniversary of the National Endowment for Democracy on Democracy in the Middle East, 6 November 2003];

«Americans have always held firm» [The President George Bush on the War on Terror, 28 June 2005];

«...every day I have been inspired by the greatness of our country and uplifted by the goodness of our people» [President George W. Bush's address, as provided by the White House, 6 January 2009];

«Americans are generous and strong and decent» [George W. Bush Inaugural Address Washington, DC, 20 January 2001].

The theme of faith and devotion to the country and patriotism is represented by the following lexemes: patriot, to sacrifice for, willingness to sacrifice, commitment to, make the ultimate sacrifice, to give life for, to serve, to fight for the country, to risk the life for, patriotism, spirit of patriotism.

The American leader expresses confidence that loyalty to the country and love for their country are highly achieved by those people who are ready to risk their lives, give it up, and sacrifice themselves for the sake of the country's well-being. Therefore, even such lexemes as to fight and to risk, being initially negatively colored linguistic units, because of the shades of the meaning of "violence" and "danger to life", in this context carries a powerful positive message, allowing speakers to reach people's consciousness and awaken a sense of faith in their country, the spirit of patriotism.

Lexical units of the language with the general meaning of "freedom / independence" also grab the attention; these are such language units as "freedom", "liberty", "independence" and other turns of speech expressing a similar meaning:

«I believe in the universality of freedom» [George W. Bush, Arkansas, November 6, 2006];

«Liberty and democracy are the source of America's strength, and liberty and democracy will lift up the hopes and desires of those you are trying to destroy» [George W. Bush, Post-Election Press Conference: The Resignation of Donald Rumsfeld, Washington, DC, November 8, 2006];

«I have been sharing this story with our fellow citizens all around the country because I want people to pay attention to the power of liberty to help us defeat this ideology of hate», « We're in an ideological struggle between extremists who cannot stand liberty and millions who want to live free» [George W. Bush, Colorado Victory 2006 Rally, Greeley, Colorado, November 4, 2006];

«On the one side of this struggle are those who believe in freedom and moderation, the right of people to speak, the right of people to worship freely – one of the great privileges in America, isn't it?» [George W. Bush, Orrin Hatch for Senate Reception, Salt Lake City, Utah, August 31, 2006];

«You know when nearly 12 million Iraqis voted, I was pleased, but I was not surprised, and I'll tell you why I wasn't surprised. I believe there is an Almighty. I believe a great gift of the Almighty to every man, woman, and child on Earth is the desire to be free» [George W. Bush, Nebraska Victory 2006 Rally, Grand Island, Nebraska, November 5, 2006].

It is interesting to note that in the political speeches of J. Bush Jr., the national motto of America "In God We Trust" is clearly reflected, it was first used in 1864 when minting new coins, and in 1956 it became national (approved on July 30, 1956 by the decision Congress). As you know, the phrase "In God We Trust" (Rus. "На Бога мы уповаем") is the official motto of the United States, as well as the state Florida.

It is impossible to ignore such a favorite topic, which is reflected in the speeches of many US politicians, including George Bush, as the theme of the "American Dream" ("Американская мечта"). This phraseology denotes the ideal life of the "average resident" of the United States. The American Dream is the ideal of freedom or opportunity, which was formulated by the "founding fathers"; the spiritual power of the nation. If the American system is the skeleton of American politics, then the American dream is its soul. This expression contains representations of the American citizen about the ideals of freedom and open opportunities for all, based on the belief in the limitless possibilities of the United States and its exceptional place in the world. In a broad sense, these are any American values, from the highest to the simple dream of an American about his own business, house, lawn around him, dog, etc. This is manifested in the speech of the studied politician:

«He understands that governments don't create wealth, that governments create an environment in which the entrepreneur can flourish, or which the small business owner can grow bigger, or which a person can realize their dreams by creating their own company» [George W. Bush, Lynn Swann for Governor Reception, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, August 16, 2006];

«America has always been driven by a powerful idea: that with hard work and good values, we can give our children a better life. Our economy, our society is built on that basic bargain: Everyone who works hard and does right should have the chance to get ahead» ["Four Days to Change America" – Remarks in Florida, October 29, 2004, Orlando, FL].

The political discourse of the speaker under study reflects the theme of faith in the power of a free America, in victory over difficulties. Politicians (presidential candidates) are confident and sincerely believe that their country will overcome any challenges, will go through difficult times (time of great tension), will not give up, will not lose his dignity and will definitely come out victorious. The following excerpts from the speeches of Bush Jr. are the brightest examples:

«That's the challenge of the 21st century. As I told you, we'll stay on the offense. As well, I made it clear that if you harbor a terrorist, you're just as guilty as the terrorist, and you're an enemy of the United States, and you will be held to account» [George W. Bush, Orrin Hatch for Senate Reception, Salt Lake City, Utah August 31, 2006];

«And so we're on the offense, and that's part of our strategy. The other part of our strategy is do everything we can to protect you here at home. And it's a challenge. It's a challenge because we have to be right 100 percent of the time to protect Americans, and they only have to be right one time» [George W. Bush, Iowa Victory 2006 Rally, Le Mars, Iowa, November 3, 2006].

As a result of the analysis of the key linguistic units appearing in the texts of George Bush's political speeches, we came to the following conclusions:

- the main range of topics covered in the speeches is represented by such topics as "The American Dream", "the strength of the American nation", "the will to fight", "the world mission of the American nation", "value traits characteristic of the whole nation", "diversity of the American people", etc.;

- key the linguistic units in the rhetoric of Bush Jr. are such as (freedom and independence) "freedom", "liberty", "to be free"; "unity", "strength and struggle"; "faith", "Earth", "best life", etc.

- when arguing his political and ideological views, the politician focuses, on the one hand, on simple human relations, which in turn echo the eternal elements of human existence (the relationship of mother and child, man and woman), on the other hand, on the relationship of man and the state; Bush pays special attention to the relationship of generations (grandchildren, great-grandchildren, past generation, ancestors, etc.);

- as the central functions of Bush's political speeches, we will call orienting, manipulating, influencing, agonistic; the first two functions are expressed, firstly, in the elements of solidarity (unity with the people);

- a high degree of patriotism of speech is also a distinctive a feature of Bush's rhetoric; the speech of the 43rd president of the United States is particularly expressive,

here one can note favorite techniques - a rhetorical question, linguistic units in the semantics of which there is a "negative" connotation or opposition. A comparative analysis of the political discourse presented by the statements of various American leaders is seen as a promising task.

CONCLUSION

The given article in a detailed way revealed the key linguistic units appearing in the texts of Recep Tayyip Erdogan's political speeches, and as a result, it was found that Erdogan demonstrated a good example of attitude and identity construction through his use of language. It should be noted that the use of „you“ in Turkish as a second person subject is different from in English. His attitude and linguistic behavior were the reflection of a particular social group, and the attitude of this particular group towards him was positive.

As a result of the analysis of the key linguistic units appearing in the texts of George Bush's political speeches, we came to the following conclusions: the main range of topics covered in the speeches is represented by such topics as "The American Dream", "the strength of the American nation", "the will to fight", "the world mission of the American nation", "value traits characteristic of the whole nation", "diversity of the American people", etc. As the central functions of Bush's political speeches, we will call orienting, manipulating, influencing, agonistic; the first two functions are expressed, firstly, in the elements of solidarity (unity with the people); a high degree of patriotism of speech is also a distinctive a feature of Bush's rhetoric; the speech of the 43rd president of the United States is particularly expressive, here one can note favorite techniques - a rhetorical question, linguistic units in the semantics of which there is a "negative" connotation or opposition. A comparative analysis of the political discourse presented by the statements of various American leaders is seen as a promising task.

REFERENCES:

1. D. McLellan. (1986). *Ideology*, University of Minnesota Press.
2. Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (Eds.). (1998). *Political linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
3. Geis, M. L. (1987). *The language of politics*. New York: Springer.
4. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *What is political discourse analysis?* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
5. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London, England UK: Sage Publications.
6. Atkinson, J. M. (1984). *Our masters' voices: the language and body language of politics*. London: Methuen.
7. Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
8. Lane R. E. (1964). *Political Life. Why People Get Involved in Politics*. The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., p.374.
9. Madson R. (1991). *Contentless Consensus. The Political Discourse of a Segmented Society // America at Century's End. / ed. by Alan Wolfe*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; Oxford: University of California Press, pp. 440–460.